



Cal Poly WASC Steering Committee

December 1, 2008
3:00-5:00 p.m.
38-114

In Attendance:

Peggy Browneller Paradis, Denise Campbell, Cassie Carter, David Conn, Susan Elrod, Bruno Giberti, Anna Gold, Brent Goodman, Rachel Henry, Doug Keeseey, Tom Mackin, Cheryl Ney, Skip Parks, Scott Steinmaus, Erling Smith, Susan Sparling, Tom Trice, Debra Valencia-Laver (for Linda Halisky), Mary Whiteford

Absent:

Linda Halisky, Angela Kramer, Mohammad Noori, Rick Ramirez, Craig Schultz, Dan Villegas, Kelley Wigton

Minutes

- One change: Third bullet under Update on Self-Study Timeline now reads: "...to create a draft of *their section of the CPR report*...."
- Minutes were approved.

Follow-up Item from Minutes: Direction to Working Groups

- Working group chairs, Bruno, David, and Cheryl decided not all themes needed to address diversity and sustainability in the survey but wanted to be sure to check this decision with the Steering Committee. Specifically, the Teacher-Scholar Model (TSM) did not seem to be related to creating a more diverse campus.
- Questions on the survey will ask in which venues the Diversity Learning Objectives (DLOs) are being addressed, but there will not a set of TSM questions related to diversity because the small group could not figure out what those questions would be.
- Possible questions include: To what extent do your professional development activities address diversity? To what extent does your teaching incorporate issues of diversity?
- Faculty of color are concerned that their service activities take them away from being as productive as they might like to be as scholars.
- There will be a place on the survey for faculty to express what their scholarly activities are.
- To what extent do we expect all faculty to be involved in diversity-related issues?
- The Diversity Planning Group (DPG) has developed some language regarding how the inclusion of diversity in TSM could prepare students for meeting the DLOs. This inclusion would get at discipline-specific ways of approaching diversity.
- Not all evidence will come from the survey. Academic Program Review includes an item in which programs explain how they meet DLOs. If there is other program-level data that needs to be included in the self-study, the Steering Committee needs to decide what that data is.

Report from Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Programs Meeting and Comments on Other Institutions' WASC Reviewer Reports on CPR Phase (Cheryl)

WASC Reviewer Reports on CPR Phase

- In all four reports Cheryl read, GE Assessment and Strategic Planning were mentioned.
- Three out of four institutions had changes to their EER timeline because they had insufficient capacity for GE Assessment and Strategic Planning. Some of the concerns regarding strategic planning were lack of coordination and ownership.
- WASC reviewers are serious about measuring capacity in the CPR phase.

Assessment

- Two forms of GE Assessment are taking place in the CSU: 1) Take some GE learning outcomes and look at them across all GE. 2) Pick some learning objectives, find where it happens in GE, and look at student work in those courses.
- New Executive Order on GE is also driving GE Assessment, as is the AAC&U work on the LEAP initiative.
- Faculty engagement with assessment was an area of concern for many CSUs. Some campuses are experiencing success in this area; some are not. Engagement improves when faculty see the value of assessment, which affirms Cal Poly's strategy of highlighting best practices. Assessment takes greater hold within the faculty when there is accountability in the dean's office.
- E-portfolios were discussed as a means to sustainable, effective assessment because they gather student work in a usable fashion.
- Institutional-level assessment: Collegiate Learning Assessment will be on hold after this year in order to study the CSU experience with it.
- Campuses with ULOs were making greater progress with assessment.
- Despite the budget difficulties, new initiatives are taking place at CSUN, SJSU, and Chico.

Discussion: e-portfolios @ Cal Poly

- Does the steering committee want to take a position on e?
- There are significant IT support concerns.
- A university-wide system is expensive.
- Is something smaller possible?
- COE purchased TK20, an e-portfolio software, and has worked out some of the IT issues along the way.
- For Cal Poly to be in the peer group it claims to be in, an e-portfolio system is necessary. Private sector, user-managed content is a possible step.
- OCOB is using a software called Digital Measures, which archives student and faculty work.
- E-portfolios could be recommended as a result of the CPR.
- They would engage students in their own learning, which would lead to life-long learning. Students would also become responsible for storing their own work.
- Faculty won't have to manage artifacts during APR.
- A key to successful e-portfolios is good rubrics.
- ULOs cut across colleges. E-portfolios would allow access to student artifacts to assess student learning of ULOs over time and between colleges.
- E-portfolios might lead to more support for departments from central administration.
- Someone may be needed to spearhead this discussion.

- CTL is offering a workshop on e-portfolios in February.

Survey

Status Report

- The Working Group Chairs have formulated a synopsis of the queries they want to explore and what they are going to use that information for. The synopsis will be submitted to a consultant at the CO who will help write the survey.
- The CO consultant said the survey is quite complex
- Updated timeline: The survey instrument will be ready by the beginning of January and will be administered to focus groups at the beginning of winter quarter. Focus groups, representing different constituencies, are ASI, Advising Council, Assessment Council, Senate Executive Committee, maybe PolyReps.
- Other potential audiences to survey are the college/department advisory boards and community partners, more generally.
- The survey will be broken down by audience because the questions will be different for different audiences.
- The student portion will be developed first.
- The next step is to clarify any lists of answers and also to clarify what we're trying to assess, e.g. frequency, confidence, satisfaction.
- "Where do students learn?" is one of the key questions and will be asked by giving students one ULO at a time and then asking them to rate how important a number of different venues are in their achievement of each ULOs.
- CO pointed out that we have no operational definitions. Part of the purpose of the survey is to help develop these definitions. The library developed unofficial definitions of many of these terms. Anna will send them to Bruno. LBD group agreed that a definition is necessary as a product of the WASC process.
- Demographics can be taken from PeopleSoft with a password identifier, which will save questions. Passwords can hurt the response rate, but that can be counteracted with advertising. The identifier will likely affect faculty response rate more than student response rate. Faculty might not be comfortable answering more controversial questions, especially if they are easily identifiable, e.g. the only woman in the department.
- Steering Committee would like to know what faculty information is stored in PeopleSoft.
- Goals for the survey are being developed. 1) Understand opinions regarding how current educational experiences offer students the opportunity to achieve the ULOs. 2) Understand opinions regarding how the teacher-scholar model affects student learning. 3) Understand opinions regarding how effective learn-by-doing is.
- Could the survey be done on a regular basis? Many members thought this was a good idea because it could then be used to assess whether changes made in response to the initial survey results were improving student learning.

Discussion on Questions

- Will the list of answers for where ULO learning takes place include student support services? Living/learning communities should be included.
- Making the list specific enough but not too specific is one of the challenges of survey development. The focus groups will be helpful in this regard.

- Will students be asked how their personal life experiences contribute to their learning?
Asking the question would help students realize they are learning outside of Cal Poly activities. How would the WASC self-study use the information gained from that question? Cal Poly may need to know the whole picture of the student.
- Another possibility is to ask students about barriers.
- Should the survey include questions about declaring major on entrance?
 - What will we do with this information? Is there any chance this policy will change? It could be given to the president, the deans, or made one of the recommendations of the CPR report.
 - The deans are currently discussing this topic, so it may be premature to bring it to students.
 - There's value just in knowing because otherwise it's the elephant in the room.
 - Will it raise false hope?
 - It would be valuable to survey students who left Cal Poly to find out if declaration of major was one reason they left.
 - The question will remain in the survey.
- Steering Committee in favor of keeping the LEAP question, possibly updated to Global Learning, which is the new LEAP.