

2016-17 Annual Report

Division of Academic Affairs

Introduction

The annual report is used to gather summaries of the highlights and accomplishments of each of our academic units and, overall, to appraise the institution's culture of quality. This year's annual report will focus on three areas: (I) *student learning, engagement, and success*; (II) *direct evidence of student learning*; and (III) *our teacher-scholar model*. The annual report is divided into three sections, with some sections designed to gather information at the department-level and other sections providing college-level (or equivalent) summaries of goals and plans. Also, please note the submission process and deadline for each section.

Due Dates

Report Section	Due Date: Department to College	Due Date: College to Provost's Office	Provost's Office Recipient of Report
Section I: IA and IB	June 16, 2017	August 1, 2017	Sep Eskandari seskandari@cpp.edu
Section II: IIA and IIB	June 16, 2017	June 30, 2017 (note: include Section IIC)	Larisa Preiser-Houy lpreiser@cpp.edu
Section III	June 16, 2017	August 1, 2017	Sep Eskandari seskandari@cpp.edu

Section I. Student Learning, Engagement, and Success

IA. Graduation Initiative

Instructions to the Departments: Reflect on and summarize the Department's efforts in AY 2016-2017 to increase the retention and graduation rates of students, including efforts to close the equity gap of Pell-eligible and underrepresented minority students (URM). More specifically, focus on the following strategies, which were our strategic priorities this year in alignment with the CSU graduation initiative.

1. Address high DUF courses **N/A for GSC courses**
2. Address high-demand enrollment bottleneck courses **N/A for GSC courses**
3. Increase Individual Academic Plan (IAP) submissions and approvals **Geology faculty met with Geology majors during fall qtr 2016 to introduce our own personalized degree progress spreadsheet that generally keeps students on track (these degree progress spreadsheets are required of all students during quarterly advising for pre-registration). Later, in February we held a student meeting with Advising Center personnel to go through the process of completing the IAPs. Geology majors recorded a very high rate of IAP submissions and approvals.**
4. Address URM and Pell equity gaps. **Geology has a large proportion of URM majors (typically about 35-45%). Accurate URM and Pell equity gap data at department level has not been provided by the University. From internal Geology Department records and quarterly academic advising, we are able to effectively monitor the progress of our URM majors.**

Instructions to the College: After reviewing your college success plan and college-specific goals, please describe specific programs, actions, and/or strategies your college will implement in 2017-18 to achieve the stated goals and other goals. Address your goals, any challenges, and resource implications – please be specific.

IB. High Impact Practices

Instructions to the Departments: Provide an example of at least one High Impact Practice (HIP) that has enhanced student learning and/or made a significant impact on student success. Specify the degree program referenced in this example and how you are defining impact.

Drs. Van Buer and Nourse took Geology grad student Paula Soto, and undergraduate majors Karissa Vermillion and Michael Dykstra to Stanford University in April 2017 to analyze rock samples in the electron microprobe laboratory and the SHRIMP (Sensitive High Resolution Ion MicroProbe) laboratory over a 4 day weekend. This was a special opportunity for the students to see fruits of their labors (previously they had spent weeks collecting and preparing the samples in our labs at CPP). Important publishable results included U-Pb radiometric age dates from several rock samples collected in the San Gabriel Mountains, and micro-scale elemental mapping across metamorphic mineral grains from rocks of the Mojave Desert. This was an especially valuable experience for the students. Soto gained important data for her MS thesis. Dykstra is joining our MS program in fall 2017; the new ages provide a significant starting point for his thesis project. Vermillion will be applying to PhD program next year, and this trip provided practical training for the kind of laboratory research she hopes to pursue.

Instructions to College: Please combine the high-impact reports submitted by your departments. In addition, please describe your plans and strategies for implementing and supporting high-impact practices and how these activities can be sustained and become enduring.

Departments should send materials related to this section as well as materials related to Section III to their college’s **Dean’s Office by June 16, 2017**. College authors should combine this report with the responses to the prompt for Section III. Send the report as a single Word document to **Sep Eskandari by August 1, 2017**.

Section II. Direct Evidence of Student Learning

II A. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) and Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of the Degree (MQID)

Instructions to the Departments: For each degree program in your department, please update the IEEI and MQID documents with information for the 2016-2017 AY. The IEEI and MQID documents will be reviewed and referenced by the WSCUC Working Groups in preparation of the essays that will comprise Cal Poly Pomona’s self-study to WSCUC for re-accreditation (www.cpp.edu/~wasc). Furthermore, the documents for each degree program will be posted on the campus website and included as attachments in the Institutional Report that we will be submitting to WSCUC in Fall 2018.

IEEI Document

Guidelines	Supporting Resources
<p>Update your last year’s IEEI document with information for 2016-2017 AY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use IEEI Rubric (Attachment 1) to self-assess the revised IEEI document and adjust, as needed, to meet or exceed expectation levels before submission. IEEI template (if needed) is provided in Attachment 1a. • For Direct Evidence column: elaborate on the use of assessment results to strengthen student learning. For an example of explicit “direct evidence” content, please reference Attachment 2. 	<p>Attachment 1 – IEEI Rubric Attachment 1a – IEEI Template Attachment 2 – IEEI HRT Example</p>

MQID Document

Guidelines	Supporting Resources
Update your MQID document based on the feedback from the APAC and by referencing the MQID Rubric (Attachment 3). MQID template is provided in Attachment 4 and an MQID example is provided in Attachment 5.	Attachment 3 – MQID Rubric Attachment 4 – MQID Template Attachment 5 – MQID (Music)

II B. Highlights of Direct Evidence of Student Learning in the Department

Instructions to the Departments: Provide highlights of direct evidence of student learning in the department during 2016-2017 AY as per the guidelines listed below. The department’s “highlights” document will inform the WSCUC Institutional Report essays on the Meaning, Quality, and the Integrity of Degrees (Essay 3), Educational Quality (Essay 4), Student Success (Essay 5), and Quality and Improvement (Essay 6).

Guidelines	Supporting Resources
1) Provide ONE specific example of what faculty learned overall in carrying out assessment of student learning AND how one or more of the following (e.g., curriculum, pedagogy, assessment process, faculty developments, etc.) changed (or is in the process of being changed) as a result of assessment of student learning. (Specify the degree program referenced in this example). [note: refer to Attachment 6 for an example of CSU San Marcos’ “Annual Assessment Highlights”]	<p>Geology MS degree program: During the first three years of our new graduate program (2012-15) we recognized that the final component of the culminating experience (GSC 696-Master’ Thesis) is serious bottleneck for several students. The process of writing thesis drafts and submitting the final library-ready thesis document takes too long. Several faculty meetings have addressed this issue to discuss possible solutions. We are all struggling with the fact that many students have poor technical writing skills. Also students appear to have little concept of the time commitment required to write and format a formal thesis document. To correct these issues beginning 2015-16, Graduate Faculty have written several documents: that outlines the process, timeline, deadlines, and requirements for completing the Master’s thesis. These documents are posted under “Path To Graduation:” http://www.cpp.edu/~sci/geological-sciences/masters-program/path-to-graduation.shtml . We also held an orientation session during the first week of Fall quarter for beginning and continuing graduate students. At that meeting we describe the thesis process and refer students to the University Writing Center as a source of assistance with writing mechanics.</p>

	<p>The Graduate Faculty also understand that proactive advising and regular meetings with students are key during the time when students are acquiring data.</p>
<p>2) Provide ONE specific example of the undergraduate course in which the results of direct assessment were used to improve student learning of one of WSCUC's core competencies¹. (Specify the degree program referenced in this example).</p>	<p>Geology BS degree program: GSC 415 (Engineering Geology II), team taught by 3 instructors, utilized student poster presentations of final research projects rather than Powerpoint talks as required in past years. Teams of 2 students designed posters to address written and oral communication core competencies. An 11x 17 draft of the poster was submitted mid quarter for instructor feedback. During the last two class sessions (3 hrs each), each student team presented a 5 minute oral synopsis of their poster (projected on a screen) to the entire class. Then the class congregated in the hallway to view the posters and ask questions of the authors. Each student was required to fill out a simple evaluation form for each poster. The three faculty members also conducted detailed written evaluations. Through this back and forth exchange of comments and ideas, much learning was accomplished.</p>
<p>3) Provide ONE specific example of the graduate course in which the results of direct assessment were used to improve ANY student learning outcomes. (Specify the degree program referenced in this example).</p>	<p>Geology MS degree program: The GSC 600 (Thesis-proposal) --GSC 696 (Master's Thesis) course sequence is an excellent example of the assessment process that includes faculty evaluation of oral and written work, constructive feedback at several stages, and improvement of learning outcomes during iterative submissions of work products leading to the final thesis document. 4 to 6 faculty members evaluate the initial thesis proposal that is presented as a 15-20 minute talk. Q& A session provides immediate feedback to the student that is incorporated into the written proposal. As the student writes the</p>

¹ WSCUC's Five Core Competencies are: written communication, oral communication, information literacy, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning. Core competencies are to be demonstrated in courses "at or near graduation" (e.g., capstone, senior project, GE Synthesis)

	<p>thesis document, much back-and forth discussion, evaluation, and feedback is accomplished with the thesis advisor. Finally during the thesis defense, 3 plus faculty members meet with the student in an intensive session to evaluate the final draft thesis, and make suggestions for its improvement. Submission of the final corrected thesis document to the library closes the feedback loop.</p> <p>Overall, the process assesses half of our Geology MS learning outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5) Develop and present scientific proposal for Master’s thesis 6) Conduct original research related to Master’s thesis 7) Write a Master’s thesis document 8) Defend results of Master’s thesis research with a formal oral presentation to graduate peers and thesis committee
--	--

Instructions to the Departments: Please submit the updated IEEI and MQID documents for each degree program and the departmental “highlights” document (in word format) to the **Dean’s Office by June 16, 2017.**

II C. Highlights of Direct Evidence of Student Learning in the College

Instructions to the College: After reviewing departments’ IEEI, MQID, and “Highlights of Direct Evidence of Student Learning” documents, please summarize the most significant accomplishments in this area at the college level, as per the guidelines listed below. The college’s “highlights” document will inform the WSCUC Institutional Report essays on the Meaning, Quality, and the Integrity of Degrees (Essay 3), Educational Quality (Essay 4), Student Success (Essay 5), and Quality and Improvement (Essay 6).

Guidelines
A) Provide at least ONE [undergraduate] example from ANY program(s) in the college in which the results of direct assessment were used to improve student learning of core competencies (note: definition of core competencies is listed in the footnote). (Specify the degree program referenced in this example).
B) Provide at least ONE [graduate] example from ANY program(s) in the college in which the results of direct assessment were used to improve <u>any</u> student learning outcomes. (Specify the degree program referenced in this example).
C) Please reflect and share on what makes examples specified in questions A and B of particular significance and importance to the college from the perspective of educational quality and improvements.

Instructions to the College: By **June 30, 2017**, please forward to **Larisa Preiser-Houy** the following documents: 1) IEEI, MQID, and the departmental “highlights” documents from each department, and 2) one college “highlights” document. In July 2017, these documents will be reviewed by the Office of Academic Programs and shared with the WSCUC Working Group teams for planning the essays of the Institutional Report.

Section III. Teacher-Scholar Model as Instantiated by Faculty Scholarly and Creative Activities
(January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016)

Instructions to Departments: First, departments are asked to collect and archive the *curriculum vitae* for each tenure-track faculty member. Departments should ensure that each document presents a clear and accurate record of each faculty member's accomplishments in the categories of:

1. Research, scholarly, and creative Activities – works published, juried, or judged in academic forums, shows, venues, journals, works, etc.
2. Presentations at conferences related to their work as a faculty member at Cal Poly Pomona
3. Professional grants, fellowships, awards, and honors
4. Scholarship with students – as co-authors, research assistants, mentees, etc.
5. Service to the profession and the university

Second, departments should review their faculty members' achievements and create a summary report that highlights their faculty members' achievements during the 2016 calendar year (January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016) in the five areas listed above. Department authors are asked to highlight exemplary activities. This report of departmental achievements should move forward as a Word document to their college's **Dean's Office by June 16, 2017.**

Instructions to the College: Reflect upon the Teacher-Scholar model and summarize the ways in which the faculty in the college engage in research, scholarly, and creative activities. Does the college have a distinctive sense of purpose in this area? In other words, does the college have an agenda for action on how it will support and advance the Teacher-Scholar model? Please explain.

College authors should combine this report with the responses to the prompt for Section I. Send the report as a single Word document to **Sep Eskandari by August 1, 2017.**