Humanities Liaison Report prepared by David Richardson

I.   Department Buy-In and Outcome Definition

Philosophy: This phase opened and closed in the fall of 2016 with an email poll of philosophy faculty members regarding their preferred assessment work/area of inquiry. Possibilities included a cross-class rubric for writing assignments, critical reading evaluation, survey of reading and learning beliefs, and others. Eventually, the instructors settled on student critical reading abilities and reading/learning beliefs as our primary areas of interest and inquiry.

Music: This phase was largely completed in the previous year. However, in initial discussions with the previous liaison and faculty members, I learned that there was consensus regarding the need for some revisions to the procedures to improve the efficiency of the measure related to data collection.

II.   Assessment Research and Design

Philosophy: Design involved reviewing various forms and examples of critical reading assessment in college and grad school readiness tests and test-prep books and adaptation of the model. I found an argumentative passage from a journal article and developed questions related to our specific learning goals in philosophy classes, and then attached a survey of student learning behaviors and a survey of student learning and reading beliefs that I had developed separately as part of my sabbatical project. All of this was formatted together as a single document and prepared for piloting.

 Music: This involved adapting the already developed rubric to an electronic (Google Doc) format and simplifying its categories for both space considerations and ease of use. We also needed to develop new procedures related to providing faculty with the means of immediate electronic submissions. Working with the IT department, we came up with a plan to reserve an iPad cart over the last two weeks of the semester and make it available to our music jurists. We developed and tested procedures and instructions in the weeks prior to the jury testing period of the fall semester and found them to be an improvement, even if not quite flawless.

III.   Pilot Assessment Tools and Processes

Philosophy: This measure was piloted toward the end of the semester in the fall of 2016 across five philosophy classes taught by full-timers and adjuncts. Data from the pilot showed "robust" reliability and validity in the measure (the assessment set a new high-score for reliability as based on a Cronbach alpha test). Two questions were adjusted between the pilot and the full-scale assessment based on Point Biserial scores, and I collected feedback from instructors leading to a suggested 30-minute time frame for the administration of the measure in the spring 2017 semester.

Music: This stage was skipped since the measure had been previously piloted. Throughout the initial administration, though, faculty feedback flowed in regarding the edits that had been made to the measure and the new procedures. Real-time adjustments were made where possible, and all of it was noted for future administrations.

IV.   Administer Specific Assessment

Philosophy: As of this writing, full administration of the Philosophy Assessment is ongoing, with distribution to all sections of all of our philosophy classes for administration over the last two weeks of the semester.

Music: This went well, leading to the collection of our first workable pool of data for the 52 music juries (102 entries) conducted in fall 2016. The administration for the spring will take place during the final week of the spring semester and allow us to do our first comparative work with the data sets.

V.   Data Analysis

Philosophy: Having the support of the committee data analysts has been invaluable and, going forward, promises exciting possibilities related to the insights and usefulness of the data we collect through this assessment. I am very excited to work with our analysts to dig into the data and the differences in student learning reflected there. This data, in combination with other data related to student learning beliefs and specific reading behaviors, should give us actionable teaching points and a means of measuring their impact in future semesters, as well as a variety of ways of getting at new questions as they arise.

Music: The primary data analysis interests for the music assessment will require longitudinal data over multiple semesters in order to track individual student progress through the sequence of individual lessons and identify patterns (or their absence), as well as develop larger pools of data for each level. In the meantime, we will focus on rater consistency and determination of the weight and impact of the various categories on the final rating.

VI.   Supporting Evidence-Based Change (Use of Findings)

Philosophy: With luck and funding, analysis will be complete in early fall 2017, leading to direct suggestions by the midterm of the fall semester, perhaps in time to see results in the fall administration of the assessment.

Music: Immediate changes include the reviewability of ALL jury data by all of the music faculty and improved transparency related to past jury requirements (in the form of faculty expectations

as exemplified in required performances). Additional changes are expected once we have multiple semesters to compare.

Success Factors: Working in the role of Liaison Coordinator, Erica McCormack has been an invaluable source of wisdom, knowledge, and encouragement. Her advice and suggestions and general excellence as a colleague, and department/college leader, have made my job feel easy and exciting. The data analysts, Phil Vargas and Sarah Kakumanu, have also been critical to my work and any successes that have resulted. Being able to build on work that I did while on sabbatical—work that could not have been completed without that sabbatical—has been really great and, again, speaks to the importance of administrative support for faculty research and learning conducted in lieu of teaching duties as well as the lasting value of support for sabbatical projects. Finally, working in the best department of the college has allowed for easy collaboration, efficient and productive development of ideas, and useful, actionable feedback on the tools and procedures, allowing us to power through work at twice the speed, at least, typical for these kinds of projects.

Recommendations: Next year, assuming continued administrative support for this work, we are going to work on developing new versions of the critical reading portion of the philosophy assessment, piloting at least one, possibly two, for reliability and validity assurance amid the regular administration and begin discussing the possibility of expanding the assessment across Humanities classes.

Appendices:

 ~Philosophy Pilot Assessment Results (initial/basic)

Philosophy Assessment Raw Initial Pilot Results (FA16)

Critical Reading (Perry Scheme)

1. E is correct Inference (Meaning)—27.5% (A is top answer)

2. D is correct Analysis (Audience)—52.7% (D)

3. B is correct Inference (Meaning)—62.6% (B)

4. A is correct Analysis (Conclusion)—19.8% (D)

5. C is correct Comprehension (Assumption)—42.9% (C)

6. B is correct Inference (Meaning)—52.7% (B)

7. E is correct Evaluation (Criticism)—70.3% (E)

8. C is correct Inference (Support)—28.6% (B)

9.   A is correct Inference (Prediction)—49.5% (A)

10. E is correct Inference (Exclusion)—54.9% (E)

27. B is correct--Evaluation (After)—15.4% (A)

28. A is correct--Evaluation (After)—19.8% (B)

29. B is correct—Validity—13.2% (A)

30. B is correct—Validity defined, not named (should match #29)—45.1% (A)

Reading Behaviors (Before/During/After)

11. Title/Prior Knowledge (Before)—60.4% (Yes)

12. Preview (Before) –51.6%

13. Purpose (Before)—49.5%

14. Purpose/Protocol (Before)—(yes to 13 should link to yes here)—44%

15. Metacognition (During)—78%

16. Annotate (During)—18.7%

17. Visualized (During)—59.3%

18. Vocabulary/Selection (During)—67%

19. Connect (During)—70.3%

20. Metacognition (During)—71.4%

21. Metacognition (During)—match to #20—84.6%

22. Questioning/Annotating (During)—26.4%

23. Prediction/Metacognition (During)—38.5%

24. Metacognition (During)—match to #15—80.2%

25. Metacognition/Summary (After)—69.2%

26. Metacognition (After)—76.9%

Reading and Learning Beliefs

<u>Stance (% Agree)</u>

32. 15.4%-Stance: Transmission--Good readers remember most of what they read verbatim (meaning "word for word").

35. 73.6%-Stance: Transmission--The main purpose of reading is to learn new information.

36. 59.3%-Stance: Transmission--When I read, I try to bring away exactly what the author meant.

42. 11 % - Stance: Transmission--People should agree on what a book means.

48. 74.7%-Stance: Transmission--I like books in which the author's message is strong and clear.

54. 59.3%-Stance: Transmission--When I read, I focus on what the author says is important.

39. 48.4%-Stance: Transaction--I often have strong emotional responses to what I read.

45. 69.2%-Stance: Transaction--When I read, I like to imagine I am living through the experience myself.

46. 74.7%-Stance: Transaction--Reading for pleasure is the best kind of reading.

52. 72.5%-Stance: Transaction--I enjoy sharing the thoughts and reactions of characters in a book.

55. 82.4%-Stance: Transaction--The meaning of a book depends on *more* than just what the book says.

56. 33 % - Stance: Transaction--When I read, I focus more on how I feel about the information than on what I learn.

<u>Mindset</u>

33. 13.2%-Mindset: Fixed--Your intelligence is something very basic about you that you can't change very much.

40.   8.8%-Mindset: Fixed--You can learn new things, but you can't really change how intelligent you are.

53. 14.3%-Mindset: Fixed--You are a certain kind of person, and there is not much that can be done to change that.

60. 37.4%-Mindset: Fixed--You can do things differently, but the important parts of who you are can't be changed.

37. 76.9%-Mindset: Growth--No matter what kind of person you are, you can always change substantially.

43. 80.2%-Mindset: Growth--No matter how much intelligence you have, you can always change it quite a bit.

49. 75.8%-Mindset: Growth--You can always substantially change how intelligent you are.

57. 75.8%-Mindset: Growth--You can always change basic things about the kind of person you are.

Development

34. 31.9%-Development: Dependent--When I read, I don't think about goals or strategies, I just read.

38. 4.4%-Development: Dependent--Good readers don't struggle with texts.

41. 34.1%-Development: Dependent--When I have a hard time reading, I stop and wait to find out what it means in class.

47. 18.7%-Development: Dependent--When the text gets tough, I just keep going in the same way, at the same speed.

50. 25.3%-Development: Dependent--I read magazines and science books and novels and everything else the same way.

31 46.2%- Development: Independent--I do NOT count on teachers to tell me if I got the right thing out of my reading.

44. 30.8%-Development: Independent--I write while I read.

51. 83.5%-Development: Independent--When the text gets tough, I stop to figure out what I know & what's confusing me.

58. 52.7%-Development: Independent--When I read I consciously set a specific goal of my own choosing for my reading.

59. 69.2%-Development: Independent--When I struggle with a text, I know of multiple strategies I can use to get unstuck.