

## **Department of Geography & Environmental Studies Annual Report for AY 2010-11**

### **Brief Self-Study**

The primary goal for the department this year, as it has been for the past four years, was to sustain the quality of our undergraduate and graduate offerings while increasing both the number of majors and overall enrollment (FTES). For Fall Qt, the marker term for institutional enrollment statistics (but rarely the highest for our department), FTES was 138.6, our second highest Fall Qt. since 2000 (only 2008 at 147.9 was higher). Total number of majors in the department's degree programs is 80, up slightly from 2009. Undergraduate majors are holding steady (Environmental Studies up, Geography down) while graduate students are increasing in number.

Our graduate program continues to use a cohort model, ensuring that the single graduate seminar offered each quarter meets the enrollment threshold set by the CLASS Dean. Since one-half to two-thirds of each new cohort of grad students arrives with undergraduate degrees in disciplines other than geography (often environmental and life sciences as well as traditional social sciences), we regularly offer supplementary upper division courses to ensure that our graduate students move through the program in a timely manner. In Spring Qt 2011 our graduate program includes more than 20 active students, a higher number than shown in any of the years represented in the accompanying Institutional Research statistics. Our graduate advisor reports that the number of applications for AY 2011-12 is the most we've ever received. Our graduate program's trend line is definitely rising.

Head count of regular faculty remains at six (6). The core faculty has seen no additions or separations since 2000, although some members regularly pursue and acquire extramural funding, leading to assigned time buy-outs or professional leaves of absence. So one or more core faculty are away part of every academic year. The department is able to meet its annual curricular obligations in no small measure due to the contributions of two part-time lecturers (.533 time base), both now with 3-year entitlements, and a well-known environmental professional who has taught one core Environmental Studies course each year since the mid-1990s. The department's staff consists of an Administrative Support Coordinator assigned to Geography & Environmental Studies who does double duty as ASC for Theatre & Dance. Her work year has been cut to 11/12<sup>ths</sup> effective summer 2011. And we have lost the services of a work-study student who assisted in the day-to-day details of running a main office that serves two distinct academic units.

A significantly revamped Environmental Studies major becomes operational effective the 2011 online catalog. The modified program allows for greater flexibility in course selection and fewer yet more robust Options, along with a decrease in total units equivalent to a typical full-time quarter. In 2011-12 the department will complete a structural modification of both the undergraduate and graduate Geography programs. Initial work on the redesign, begun a few years ago, was put on hold until we could get the Environmental Studies modification up and running. Once the undergraduate ENVT and GEOG programs are in alignment, we will aim to make assessment a realistic and implementable annual obligation. Institutional support in the form of assigned time for a department assessment coordinator would seem to be a necessary prerequisite.

Our primary goals for AY 2011-12 consist of some of the same goals we've had in recent years:

- Continuing recent success in the areas of increasing the number of majors and FTES

- Revamping the Geography major to better align it with the 5 Student Learning Outcomes
- Make measureable progress on Assessment imperatives, even without University support

### **Assessment**

A draft assessment plan was developed in 2001 which contained, for each of the degree programs, Geography BA/BS, Geography MA, and Environmental Studies BA, a mission statement, program goals, learning outcomes, performance indicators and assessment methods. A summary version of this assessment plan is presented on the CSUEB assessment plan site and we believe this dates back to 2004-05. The plan indicates that for each of the programs, the department will assess students at entry (i.e. when declaring the major), at some mid-way point (approximately 50% of the required units complete), and at or close to graduation (at the time of filing for graduation and the performance of a major check). The methods listed for outcomes assessment include interviews, questionnaires, evaluation of a portfolio of student work (referred to as an academic outcome file), program review, and alumni surveys (1 and 3 years post-graduation). The person responsible for compiling assessment results is listed as the assessment coordinator.

For 2010-11, the only component of this plan that was carried out to any degree has been the exit interview. On an ad-hoc basis, the Chair of the Department (who is also serving as Environmental Studies major advisor while Professor Karina Garbesi is on professional leave working for the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory) and/or the Geography major advisor have endeavored to meet, whenever practicable, with graduating seniors as part of the major check process. The purpose of these semi-structured interviews has been to collect feedback on the student experience and solicit their self-evaluation of their knowledge and skill-set acquisition and their disposition with respect to Environmental Studies and Geography. Constructive feedback received from exit interviews in prior years prompted the modification of the Environmental Studies program. No such interview process has been implemented with respect to the Geography MA program.

Due to the lack of faculty resources (out of the six full-time faculty, one has been on leave all year and two others have taken leaves for one quarter each), there is currently no designated assessment coordinator in the department with responsibility for the collection and analysis of information on undergraduate and graduate majors. Due to lack of faculty time, effective outreach mechanisms, and technology (e-portfolios, surveys, etc.), students currently do not maintain outcome files (portfolios), we do not administer tiered entry and mid-way interviews and self-evaluations, and we have not administered alumni surveys. It is difficult to see how assessment can be advanced to the level that the department and the University desire without assistance from the University in the form of assigned time and the services of an assessment specialist who can provide appropriate tools for data collection and analysis that can be implemented seamlessly with regular teaching and advising activities.

## Statistics from Institutional Research for 2005-2009

Geography and Environmental Studies					
	Fall Quarter				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>A. Students Headcount</b>					
1. Undergraduate	34	43	44	50	56
2. Post baccalaureate	0	1	1	1	2
3. Graduate	11	10	6	13	19
4. Total Number of Majors	45	54	51	64	77
	College Years				
	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09
1. Undergraduate	18	10	13	9	16
2. Graduate	4	2	1	0	3
3. Total	22	12	14	9	19
	Fall Quarter				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>C. Faculty</b>					
<b>Tenured/Track Headcount</b>					
1. Full-Time	6	6	6	6	6
2. Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	6	6	6	6	6
3b. % Tenure Track	75.0%	75.0%	66.7%	75.0%	75.0%
<b>Lecturer Headcount</b>					
4. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	2	2	3	2	2
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	2	2	3	2	2
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	25.0%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	
7. Grand Total All Faculty	8	8	9	8	8

<b>Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)</b>					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.7	4.5
9. Lecturer FTEF	1.8	1.5	3.0	0.5	1.1
10. Total Instructional FTEF	5.8	6.5	7.0	5.3	5.5
<b>Lecturer Teaching</b>					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	75.1	95.5	64.5	109.2	88.0
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	68.1%	72.0%	55.6%	73.8%	66.4%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	35.2	37.2	51.5	38.7	44.5
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	31.9%	28.0%	44.4%	26.2%	33.6%
13. Total FTES taught	110.3	132.7	115.9	147.9	132.5
14. Total SCU taught	1655.0	1991.0	1739.0	2218.0	1988.0
<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>					
1. Tenured/Track	18.8	19.1	16.1	23.1	19.7
2. Lecturer	19.4	24.3	17.2	72.6	41.7
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	19.0	20.3	16.6	28.1	23.9
4. Lower Division	32.7	36.9	27.6	38.5	34.2
5. Upper Division	16.5	14.1	10.2	24.2	19.3
6. Graduate	4.3	8.8	6.0	8.6	9.4
<b>E. Section Size</b>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	22.0	24.0	20.0	25.0	27.0
2. Average Section Size	28.2	24.6	25.8	29.7	28.2
3. Average Section Size for LD	41.5	40.1	40.1	39.6	45.2
4. Average Section Size for UD	24.4	18.1	16.7	24.2	19.9
5. Average Section Size for GD	9.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	17.0
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	3	5	5	5	4
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	6	9	9	17	14
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	6	2	1	2	7
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	1	1	2	2	2
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	5	4	3	3	2

11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	1	1	0	0
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Source and definitions available at: <http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>