

Eastern Kentucky University Quality Enhancement Plan 2017 Year 1 Report



In its first active year, the Eastern Kentucky University Quality Enhancement Plan 2017, *Read with Purpose*, fully enacted programs to involve the entire campus community in the development of critical readers through metacognitive strategies.

QEP Co-Directors Lisa Bosley and Jill Parrott led 5 unique workshops a total of 15 times for 116 faculty participants as part of the Teaching and Learning Innovation series. The Co-Directors also led 6 workshops for a total of 133 student peer leaders, consultants, and tutors to introduce them to the program and metacognitive strategies for critical reading. QEP assessment coordinators Erin Presley and Jackie Jay led 3 workshops a total of 6 times for 75 total participants as part of the Teaching and Learning Innovation series.

In addition, the Co-Directors ran the first professional learning community (PLC) sponsored by the QEP with 6 faculty participants completing and launched the QEP Critical Reading DEEP (Developing Excellence in Eastern's Professors) online professional development course with 5 participants enrolled. We also led workshops in specific disciplinary contexts for 64 faculty members in Forensic Science, Chemistry, and English, as well as sessions for library staff and GSD instructors. The Co-Directors also presented information about the QEP at New Faculty Orientation.

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS

Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials. This outcome is measured through the EKU Critical Reading rubric with a criterion of 85% at competent or accomplished.

- 1. General Education:** We moved forward with plans to integrate all General Education assessment rubrics with the QEP Critical Reading rubric.

Element 1A/B (First-Year Writing): The Element 1A/B rubric was merged with the Critical Reading Rubric during the summer of 2017 and will be used for General Education assessment in the Spring 2019 collection cycle.

Elements 1C, 2, 4, and 5B and 6: Twelve faculty members from these elements attended a focus group discussion on QEP + GE Integration in Spring 2018 and will integrate in the 2018-2019 year.

Elements 3A, 3B, and 5A: Forty-five General Education courses piloted integrated assessment instruments from 15 departments and programs. Final drafts of these integrated assessments were submitted to the QEP Assessment Coordinator in August 2018.

- 2. Students Within Disciplinary Majors:** Thirty program leaders attended two workshops for developing a program-level critical reading Student Learning Outcome.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.

SLO 2 is being assessed with the indirect measure of the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSII) using the criterion of 85% of students marking 3.5 or higher on a 1 to 5 scale (with 1 being "I never or almost never do this." and 5 being "I always or almost always do this.") The MARSII was given to all students in ENG 095R, ENG 101R, ENG 101 in Fall 2017. We decided not to survey students in GSD 101 since this population overlaps with that of the first-year-writing courses.

The results indicate the following:

- ENG 095R: a mean score of 3.5 or higher on 24 of 27 categories (with all items above 3.0)
- ENG 101R: a mean score of 3.5 or higher on 14 of 27 categories (with all items above 3.0)
- ENG 101: a mean score of 3.5 or higher on 14 of 27 categories (with all but one item above 3.0)

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will express confidence in their abilities as critical readers.

This outcome is measured through the indirect measure of the ECU Confidence Scale, given during the graduating student survey, with a criterion of 3.0 or higher. Responses met and exceeded that goal with a mean of 3.5 or more for each of the 8 questions.

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS

Strategy 1: Professional Development of Faculty and Staff QEP Co-Directors led more than 21 workshops for faculty and staff, interacting with approximately 180 individuals to develop our faculty with metacognitive critical reading strategies, particularly in disciplinary contexts. We are using **Surveys of Faculty in Professional Development** to provide constructive criticism to guide continuous improvement; responses have been positive, reflecting that sessions are “helpful,” “applicable,” and “excellent,” and they “whetted my appetite for more.”

Strategy 2: Professional Development of Student Leaders QEP Co-Directors led 6 workshops for student leaders, facilitating training for 133 student peer leaders, consultants, and tutors to introduce them to the program and metacognitive strategies for critical reading. We are using **Surveys of Student Leaders in Professional Development** for feedback.

Student leaders completed surveys after professional development. Overall, responses have been very positive: “The QEP session was very helpful. . . since I’ll be leading a session on reading.”

Student Leader Feedback Surveys: Students participating in Course-Embedded Consultant sections of ENG 095R and ENG 101R are asked to provide feedback related to their experience with the peer leaders. Qualitative feedback suggests that the Course-Embedded Consultants are instrumental in assisting students in critical reading and writing: “My CEC spotted what I needed more work on to write my essays and helped me through those tough moments.”

Course Level Student Feedback Survey (eXploration blue): The statement “My instructor taught me strategies to help me critically read academic texts and materials” elicits student feedback related to course instruction in our university-wide course feedback surveys. Students are offered a 5-point response scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Students overwhelmingly “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that their instructors provide critical reading strategy instruction. In Fall 2017, 71.1% of students responding either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, and all responses resulted in a mean of 4.03. In Spring 2018, 72% of students either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, and all responses resulted in a mean of 4.07.

REFLECTIONS

These data suggest that we are on track to meet our goals. However, we acknowledge the following areas that we plan to explore or address in the 2018-2019 academic year.

- **SLO 1:** As program-level assessments are implemented, we look forward to seeing connections between our professional development (Strategy 1) efforts and teaching and learning in those programs.
- **SLO 2:** We realize it is impossible to determine the criterion of 85% of students marking 3.5 or higher because the scaled choices are all whole integers, so the Assessment Team will revise the

criterion as needed.

- **SLO 2:** MARS data was shared with first-year writing faculty at August 2018 workshops. A review of the data suggests that students demonstrate some awareness of most metacognitive reading strategies. Faculty agreed to focus on providing more explicit instruction in previewing, annotating, and questioning texts. Items scoring below 3.5 will continue to be the focus of professional development in the coming year to encourage explicit instruction in metacognitive reading strategies.
- **SLO 3:** Because the currently graduating seniors have not had the opportunity for consistent and extended critical reading instruction and therefore may be falsely confident, we hypothesize scores on the ECU Confidence Scale may decrease as awareness of these strategies increases.