

# Eastern Kentucky University

## Quality Enhancement Plan 2017

### Year 3 Assessment Report, 2019-2020



In 2019-2020, the Eastern Kentucky University Quality Enhancement Plan 2017, *Read with Purpose*, continued to engage the campus community in the development of critical readers through metacognitive strategies. Faculty and staff participation in QEP-sponsored professional development is comparable to last year's, despite seven QEP sessions being cancelled in the spring term due to the Coronavirus pandemic.

QEP Co-Directors Lisa Bosley and Jill Parrott led 16 workshops for faculty and staff (11 unique workshops), interacting with approximately 175 participants to develop faculty with metacognitive critical reading strategies. Of these, 5 workshops were developed for specific programs, including for First-Year Courses, Mathematics, English, Psychology, Parks and Recreation, and Safety, Security and Emergency Management. Two sessions of the introductory QEP session, *Developing Critical Readers through Metacognitive Strategies*, were held on south campus and reached faculty from the College of Business and the College of Justice and Safety who might not have been able to attend a TLI in the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning.

The Co-Directors also presented information about the QEP at New Faculty Orientation for 25 participants.

In fall 2019, the Co-Directors facilitated a QEP professional learning community (PLC) with 6 faculty participants completing.

The QEP Critical Reading DEEP (Developing Excellence in Eastern's Professors) online professional development course has enrolled 32 participants since 2018.

14 other faculty members helped lead QEP professional development workshops for their colleagues through the Teaching and Learning Innovations Series, interacting with an additional 107 faculty and staff participants. These included the QEP coordinator for program assessment, Jackie Jay, leading 2 workshops for 45 participants on Annual Planning and Progress Reports: Best Practices; and QEP assessment coordinator for General Education, Erin Presley, leading 2 workshops for 31 participants on General Education Reports: Best Practices, which addressed the role of critical reading in Gen Ed course assessments.

Starr Wentzel, First-Year Courses Director, who completed Reading Apprenticeship training funded through a spring 2019 QEP Leadership grant, led a critical reading professional learning community (PLC) with 9 staff and faculty GSD instructors completing.

QEP Co-Directors led 6 workshops for student leaders, facilitating training for 117 Student Success Center peer leaders, Noel Studio Consultants and Course Embedded Consultants to

introduce them to metacognitive strategies for critical reading. These student leaders support students' critical reading skills across the disciplines.

The QEP awarded Leadership Grants to eight faculty members in 2019-2020; these are meant to further faculty and staff development in critical reading scholarship and pedagogy and result in sharing new knowledge with ECU colleagues. The grant awards help extend QEP leadership and responsibility across the university.

Although leadership grant project plans were impacted by the pandemic during Spring 2020, three grant recipients reported on their work at the Pedagogicon Sp. 2020.

[Leadership grants have been awarded to 16 faculty/staff for 18 projects since 2017.](#) Eleven of these faculty/staff members, so far, have contributed to QEP professional development for their colleagues.

## SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS

**Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials.**

**General Education:** This outcome is measured through the integrated ECU Critical Reading rubric and General Education (GE) rubrics with a criterion of **85% at competent or accomplished** on course assessment.

In the GE program, the criterion for students meeting the GE goals is defined as **85% of students at accomplished, competent, and developing** on course assessment. The rationale is that “developing” some competencies is a reasonable goal in many GE courses where students may be introduced to disciplines and disciplinary ways of thinking for the first time. The QEP has set a more ambitious goal in order to promote growth from the **developing** to the **competent** categories.

As most General Education programs have begun assessing their courses using the integrated Gen Ed and QEP rubrics, the General Education Assessment Committee asked programs to use a new narrative reporting form for this year's reports that asks a question related to critical reading. Summer 2020, the General Education Assessment team provided QEP specific feedback to departments on their 2019-2020 General Education assessments via a new feedback template reflecting critical reading efforts and results. The GE Assessment Committee will share exemplary critical reading assessment activities on the Gen Ed and QEP web sites.

**Element 1A/B (First-Year Writing):** Assessment with the integrated rubric was reported spring 2020 and included reports on use of data results for program improvement. While the program met or came close to meeting the GE program criteria for success in reading-related categories, results meeting the QEP were below the performance target of **85% at competent or accomplished** on course assessment.

INTEGRATED QEP & GE: ELEMENT 1 A/B	ACCOMPLISHED: Exceeds Course Expectations	COMPETENT: Meets Course Expectations	DEVELOPING: Incomplete in Meeting Course Expectations	BEGINNING: Inadequate in meeting Course Expectations	Total N	QEP: Total Accomplished & Competent	QEP: Percent Accomplished & Competent
Comprehension	11.3%	47.5%	36.3%	5.0%	80	47	58.8%
Information Literacy Analysis	5.0%	27.5%	51.3%	16.3%	80	26	32.5%
Information Literacy Synthesis	3.8%	21.3%	53.8%	21.3%	80	20	25.0%
Evaluation	1.3%	25.0%	51.3%	22.5%	80	21	26.3%
Coherence	1.3%	30.0%	58.8%	10.0%	80	25	31.3%
Rhetorical Awareness/Style	3.8%	28.8%	58.8%	8.8%	80	26	32.5%
Surface Features	12.5%	36.3%	45.0%	6.3%	80	39	48.8%

**Elements 3A, 3B, and 5A:** Assessment with the integrated rubric was reported spring 2020 and included reports on use of data results for program improvement. While the programs met or came close to meeting the GE program criteria for success in reading-related categories, results meeting the QEP were below the performance target of **85% at competent or accomplished** on course assessment.

INTEGRATED QEP & GE: ELEMENT 3A	ACCOMPLISHED: Exceeds Course Expectations	COMPETENT: Meets Course Expectations	DEVELOPING: Incomplete in Meeting Course Expectations	BEGINNING: Inadequate in meeting Course Expectations	Total N	QEP: Total Accomplished & Competent	QEP: Percent Accomplished & Competent
Comprehension	8.6%	39.5%	37.8%	14.1%	291	140	48.1%
Analysis	16.7%	34.4%	38.1%	10.7%	215	110	51.2%
Theoretical Application/Evaluation	16.7%	35.2%	38.9%	9.3%	216	112	51.9%
Integration Across Course/Synthesis	15.3%	37.2%	36.3%	11.2%	215	113	52.6%
Clarity of Expression	19.9%	39.8%	31.5%	8.8%	216	129	59.7%

INTEGRATED QEP & GE: ELEMENT 3B	ACCOMPLISHED: Exceeds Course Expectations	COMPETENT: Meets Course Expectations	DEVELOPING: Incomplete in Meeting Course Expectations	BEGINNING: Inadequate in meeting Course Expectations	Total N	QEP: Total Accomplished & Competent	QEP: Percent Accomplished & Competent
Comprehension	11.2%	50.4%	33.8%	4.6%	367	226	61.6%
Clarity of Expression	11.7%	51.0%	33.2%	4.1%	367	230	62.7%
Analysis	7.1%	51.0%	36.0%	6.0%	367	213	58.0%
Theoretical Application	7.6%	53.1%	33.2%	6.0%	367	223	60.8%
Methods	5.7%	56.1%	31.9%	6.3%	367	227	61.9%
Integration Across Course	7.1%	51.2%	35.4%	6.3%	367	214	58.3%

INTEGRATED QEP & GE: ELEMENT 5A	ACCOMPLISHED: Exceeds Course Expectations	COMPETENT: Meets Course Expectations	DEVELOPING: Incomplete in Meeting Course Expectations	BEGINNING: Inadequate in meeting Course Expectations	Total N	QEP: Total Accomplished & Competent	QEP: Percent Accomplished & Competent
Comprehension	19.6%	38.1%	31.4%	10.9%	341	197	57.8%
Application/Analysis	8.4%	35.1%	38.6%	17.9%	308	134	43.5%
Methods/Evaluation	5.8%	31.6%	37.1%	25.5%	310	116	37.4%
Synthesis	4.8%	21.3%	46.1%	27.7%	310	81	26.1%

**Elements 1C, 2, 4, and 5B and 6:** All will begin assessing courses with the merged rubric in the next assessment cycle beginning Fall 2020. Reports with integrated rubric are due 2022. Some programs have already begun using the integrated rubric and critical reading assessment activities.

**Students within Disciplinary Majors:** This outcome is measured through the ECU Critical Reading rubric with a criterion of 85% at competent or accomplished on assignment assessment.

Programs across the university have developed a critical reading SLO. In 2018-2019, 31 *undergraduate* programs did not have a critical reading SLO, along with 34 graduate programs. In 2019-2020, 14 undergraduate and 13 graduate programs did not have a critical reading SLO, a substantial improvement. QEP co-directors and the QEP coordinator for program assessment will follow up in Fall 2020 with programs missing the critical reading SLO.

QEP program leaders review the program SLOs to inform professional development. We also review Annual Planning and Progress Reports' stated use of results to help gauge institutional impacts.

QEP Co-Directors are working with QEP assessment coordinators to collect assessment data from QEP PLC participants' SoTL projects and from leadership grant recipients (where applicable). In summer 2021, they will develop an online survey to ask PLC and Leadership Grant recipients to report on assessment results of their projects and/or conduct individual interviews with department assessment coordinators.

They are also working with 2020-2021 PLC leaders to build in a stronger assessment component for PLC participants' projects.

As administrators and faculty begin developing the new 2022-2027 Strategic Plan, they will ensure that each program will develop and plan to measure a critical reading SLO as part of the plan.

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

SLO 2 is assessed with the indirect measure of the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSII), originally 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."). Because the scaled choices are all whole integers, the Assessment Team revised the criterion to 85% of students marking 4 or higher. 4 indicates "I usually do this": we chose this higher score to challenge instructors to think about ways to move more students to greater metacognitive awareness.

All students enrolled in ENG 101R/ENG 101RZ and ENG 101 were asked to take the MARSII via a link in ECU Direct at the end of Fall 2019. 45% of these students took the MARSII at the end of the semester. Multiple reminders and directions for administering the survey were sent to all instructors, asking them to set aside class time for the survey. QEP Co-Directors will address the need to increase the response rate during August 2020 PD and throughout the semester.

The results indicate the following:

**ENG 101R:**

- Fall 2019:
  - 85% of students marked 4 or higher on 0 of 27 items
  - 85% of students marked 3 or higher on 8 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 3.0 or higher on all items
  - A mean score of 3.5 or higher on 15 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 4 or higher on 2 of 27 items
- Fall 2018:
  - 85% of students marked 4 or higher on 0 of 27 items
  - 85% of students marked 3 or higher on 17 of 27 items
  - A mean score above 3.0 on all items
  - A mean score 3.5 or higher on 21 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 4 or higher on 2 of 27 items
- Fall 2017:
  - 85% of students marked 4 or higher on 0 of 27 items
  - 85% of students marked 3 or higher on 11 of 27 items
  - A mean score above 3.0 on all items
  - A mean score 3.5 or higher on 12 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 4 or higher on 2 of 27 items

The 2 items consistently above a mean score of 4 are the same for the past three years and indicate a general rather than a specific strategy:

- #11: When the text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading; and
- #20: When the text becomes difficult, I reread to increase my understanding

**Summary:**

- There was a substantial increase in % of students marking 3 or higher and in mean scores from Fall 2017 to fall 2018;
- There was a substantial decrease in % of students marking 3 or higher and in mean scores from Fall 2018 to fall 2019.

This decrease in 2019 scores could be attributed to the following:

1. There was a large increase in the number of students enrolled in ENG 101R in Fall 2019

ENG 101R Enrollment	
Fall 2017	178
Fall 2018	302
Fall 2019	471

2. The ACT range for placement in ENG 101R has continued to expand since the course was first piloted in 2013. The original ACT placement score range in reading was 18-19. In Fall 2019 we began accepting students into ENG 101R with ACT reading scores as low as 12.

3. A large increase in the number of students in ENG 101R in Fall 2019 resulted in bringing on instructors at the last minute who had less experience teaching students with college readiness requirements and less QEP related intensive training in critical reading instruction.

4. An increase in enrollments in the ENG 101R program resulted in CECs being assigned twice as many students and fewer required contact hours with students in Fall 2019.

5. Fall 2019, ENG faculty began a collaboration with First-Year Courses to create learning communities for students in ENG 101R and GSD 101. These courses are designated ENG 101RZ.

Fall 2019, more than half of students requiring ENG 101R were placed into ENG 101RZ sections. Students placed in these courses have a learning contract. They may have lower ACT scores, or they may have multiple “Developmental” needs; high school GPA might also lead to requiring a learning contract; they tend to be the more at-risk students, and also include some of the students with an ACT 12 or 13 in English or Reading. The MARSII scores of these students are lower than the “regular” ENG 101R courses and may also help to account for the decreasing MARSII scores Fall 2019.

### **ENG 101:**

- Fall 2019:
  - 85% of students marked 4 or higher on 2 of 27 items
  - 85% of students marked 3 or higher on 11 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 3.0 or higher on all items
  - A mean score of 3.5 or higher on 22 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 4 or higher on 4 of 27 items
- Fall 2018:
  - 85% of students marked 4 or higher on 1 of 27 items
  - 85% of students marked 3 or higher on 9 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 3.0 or higher on all items
  - A mean score 3.5 or higher on 15 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 4 or higher on 3 of 27 items (note correction from previous report)
- Fall 2017:
  - 85% of students marked 4 or higher on 0 of 27 items
  - 85% of students marked 3 or higher on 6 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 3.0 or higher on 26 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 3.5 or higher on 12 of 27 items
  - A mean score of 4 or higher on 2 of 27 items

### **Summary:**

- Continued increase in the number of items scored at 3 or higher and 4 or higher by 85% of students from fall 2017 to fall 2018 to fall 2019
- Continued increase in mean scores from fall 2017 to fall 2018 to fall 2019

The scores suggest that ENG 101 instructors are having a positive impact on students’ awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.

MARSII data per item was shared with R Course and FYW faculty in Fall 2020 faculty development sessions and used to develop resources for more explicit and sustained instruction in metacognitive reading strategies. The data also informs development of training for student leaders.

**Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will express confidence in their abilities as critical readers.** This outcome is measured through the indirect measure of the EKU Confidence Scale, given during the graduating student survey, with a criterion of 3.0 or higher.

2019-2020 responses met and exceeded that goal with a mean of 3.5 or more for each of the 8 questions, which is the same as for 2017-2018 and 2018-2019.

## **FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS**

### **Strategy 1: Professional Development of Faculty and Staff**

QEP Co-Directors led 16 workshops for approximately 175 participants. 14 other faculty members helped lead QEP professional development with an additional 107 faculty and staff participants.

Surveys of faculty conducted following professional development sessions provide constructive criticism to guide continuous improvement; for example, faculty have let us know that they would like more information about

- “Motivating students to read,”
- “Working with vocabulary,”
- How to “incentivize reading without just begging for students to read ‘quizzable’ material,”
- Helping to identify students’ “competency levels.”

The majority of responses have been very positive, including the following:

- “Always tightly focused & excellent!”
- “Rhetorical genre of academic articles [is useful]: important, teachable, even fun.”
- It was useful to hear “how to counter [student complications] in the classroom.”

### **Strategy 2: Professional Development of Student Leaders**

QEP Co-Directors led 6 workshops for student leaders, facilitating training for 117 Student Success Center peer leaders, Noel Studio Consultants and Course Embedded Consultants. Survey comments of participants conducted following professional development sessions provide constructive criticism and are used to plan future sessions. For example, participants indicated they would like to know more about

- “How to create effective prompting questions for students.”
- “How to get students better engaged in annotating readings.”
- “Applying critical reading to understanding prompts.”
- “How to help students who have a limited vocabulary. How to help them understand these difficult texts.”

Overall, responses have been very positive, including:

- “Watching Dr. Bosley model her style [is useful]--it's different from mine, but still proves modeling is effective [in getting] an uncooperative/shy student to work with you.”

- “This was super helpful, not just for me as a consultant but also as a student.”

Additionally, students participating in Course-Embedded Consultant sections of ENG 101R are asked to provide feedback related to their experience with the peer leaders through a survey at the end of the course. Responses to the question: How helpful were your consultations with your CEC? Were as follows:

67% Very Helpful  
 23% Helpful  
 8% Somewhat Helpful

Students indicated that CECs helped them with metacognitive readings strategies such as annotating (62%) and previewing texts (47%) and working through difficult parts of a text (62%)

Responses to the question: What, in particular, did you find especially helpful about the consultations? Included:

- Having one on one time with someone to help me think and push me along
- She helped me figure out a good way to come up with a thesis and how to make my paragraphs stronger.
- Helping when I didn't understand what was needed for the paper or assignment
- She would run me through how to approach my topic in a more simple way and sticking to the main idea of the essays.

Survey data indicates that the Course-Embedded Consultants are instrumental in assisting students in critical reading and writing: the majority of students commented on the helpfulness of CECs and their appreciation for this essential aspect of the course.

**Course Level Student Feedback Survey (eXplorance 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 the 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.

Fall 2019, the mean score was 4.08 and Spring 2020, it was 4.13.

Fall 2018, 72.2% agreed or strongly agreed; Spring 2020, 73.6% agreed or strongly agreed

Fall 2018, the mean score was 4.03 and Spring 2019, it was 4.13.

Fall 2018, 70.6 % agreed or strongly agreed; Spring 2019, 73.6% agreed or strongly agreed

This is also similar to 2017-2018 scores.

**Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSİ):** In addition to the MARSİ working as a summative assessment for SLO 2, results of the MARSİ were used to guide professional development of all ENG 101R and ENG 101 instructors in August 2020 to



encourage more explicit instruction of metacognitive reading strategies. Faculty reflected on instructional strategies for helping students learn to preview text, determine purpose for reading, ask questions and summarize as they read. QEP Co-Directors and program leaders developed a series of videos and related assignments to provide instruction in critical areas of the MARSII, such as previewing, annotating, and asking questions while reading. These resources were developed for the online teaching environment necessitated by the pandemic.

## **REFLECTIONS**

These data suggest that we are meeting or progressing towards goals in most areas. Notably,

- MARSII scores for ENG 101R indicate that attention is needed to ongoing professional development and support for ENG 101R instructors and CECs.
- General Education data suggests that ongoing professional development is needed to help close the gap between the “developing” and “competent” categories in most areas of the program.

Focus areas for 2020-2021:

- Provide ongoing professional development and support for ENG 101R instructors and CECs
- Work with the GE Assessment Committee and Task Force on GE Teacher Certification to prioritize professional development needs for GE instructors
- Follow-up with programs that did not report a program level critical reading SLO
- Review disciplinary program SLOs and Annual Planning and Progress Reports’ stated use of results to inform professional development and assessment
- Develop stronger assessment component for PLCs to assess projects in disciplinary programs