

Eastern Kentucky University Quality Enhancement Plan 2017 Year 2 Assessment Report, 2018-2019



In 2018-2019, 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.

QEP Co-Directors Lisa Bosley and Jill Parrott led 17 workshops for faculty and staff (12 unique workshops), interacting with approximately 200 participants to develop faculty with metacognitive critical reading strategies. Of these, 5 workshops were developed for specific programs, including for NOVA and GSD staff and Mathematics, English, and Honors faculty. 11 other faculty members helped lead QEP professional development workshops for their colleagues through the Teaching and Learning Innovations Series. The Co-Directors also presented information about the QEP at New Faculty Orientation. In addition, the Co-Directors facilitated two QEP professional learning communities (PLC) with 6 faculty participants completing in the fall and 10 in the spring.

The QEP Critical Reading DEEP (Developing Excellence in Eastern's Professors) online professional development course has enrolled 7 participants.

Also, as part of the Teaching and Learning Innovation (TLI) series, QEP coordinator for program assessment, Jackie Jay, led 2 workshops for 40 participants on Annual Planning and Progress Reports: Best Practices, that included development of a QEP reading objective. QEP assessment coordinator for General Education, Erin Presley, led 2 workshops for 14 participants on Creating Effective Assignments for Student Learning which included the role of critical reading in course assessments.

QEP Co-Directors led 6 workshops for student leaders, facilitating training for 97 Student Success Center peer leaders, Noel Studio Consultants, and Bratzke Center tutors 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 five faculty members in 2017-2018; 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 and across disciplines. The 2017-2018 awards resulted in changed teaching practices for the awardees and three critical reading presentations to ECU faculty in TLI workshops and a poster presentation during ECU Scholars Week in 2018-2019. Leadership grants were awarded to eight faculty/staff members in 2018-2019.

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS

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

General Education:

Element 1A/B (First-Year Writing): Assessment with the integrated rubric is on track. The program will report use of data results for program improvement in spring 2020.

Elements 1C, 2, 4, and 5B and 6: All program leaders met Oct 2018 and merged their General Education assessment rubrics to include a critical reading SLO, then most programs submitted an assessment activity for courses in December 2018: these were reviewed by the General Education Assessment Team. All will begin assessing courses with the merged rubric in the next assessment cycle beginning Fall 2020.

Elements 3A, 3B, and 5A: Assessment with the integrated rubric is on track. Programs will report use of data results for program improvement in spring 2020.

Students Within Disciplinary Majors:

86 of 117 programs created a critical reading SLO and tagged this in their annual program report in 2019-2019. 31 programs did not have an objective tagged for critical reading; QEP program leaders will review the program SLOs to inform professional development and will follow up with programs that did not submit SLOs. We will also review Annual Planning and Progress Reports' stated use of results to help gauge institutional impacts.

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 (MARS), 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 this year 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.

The MARS was given to all students in ENG 101R and ENG 101 at the end of Fall 2018. The results indicate the following:

ENG 101R:

- A mean score of 4 or higher on 2 of 27 items (with all items above 3.0)
- Compared to fall 2017, Fall 2018 mean scores increased in all but 4 items

ENG 101:

- A mean score of 4 or higher on 2 of 27 items (with all items above 3.0)
- Compared to Fall 2017, Fall 2018 mean scores increased in all but 3 items

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. 2018-2019 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.

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS

Strategy 1: Professional Development of Faculty and Staff

QEP Co-Directors led 17 workshops for faculty and staff, interacting with approximately 200 participants. Surveys of faculty conducted following professional development sessions provide constructive criticism to guide continuous improvement; for example, one comment suggested that workshops are most effective that focus on applicable strategies and tips and avoid theory; another stated that the session needed more time for participants to share ideas. The majority of responses have been very positive, including the following:

- [The workshop] presented a variety of ideas that were adaptable. This is by far one of the best sessions I have attended.
- I like the interdisciplinary nature and many ideas shared [and] the enthusiasm of presenters and willingness to share ideas
- This was one of the most helpful TLIs I've yet attended, because it focused on sharing small, practical, usable skills that we could implement immediately...I used one of the new techniques later that day in class.

Additionally, QEP leaders administered a **QEP Faculty and Staff Survey** Spring 2019 as formative assessment of professional development. 77 faculty and staff responded to the survey. Comments on QEP professional development noted the value of learning how to provide explicit instruction and models for critical reading. Respondents also indicated challenges to attending QEP Professional development, such as lack of time and scheduling issues, and specified interest in future QEP topics; several commented that they would like discipline specific workshops offered during departmental faculty meetings. Co-Directors acted on this information in planning 2019-2020 professional development offerings and reached out to department chairs to offer additional departmental workshops: as a result, Co-Directors will facilitate four department-based professional development workshops Fall 2019, for the departments of Psychology, Geosciences, Parks and Recreation, and Safety and Security. We are also offering a critical reading workshop in the Business and Technology Center Fall 2019 to accommodate faculty on the south side of campus.

Strategy 2: Professional Development of Student Leaders

QEP Co-Directors led 6 workshops for student leaders, facilitating training for 97 student peer leaders, consultants, and tutors. Survey comments of participants conducted following professional development sessions provide constructive criticism and are used to plan future sessions. For example, participants indicated that they need more information about how to help students with reading graphs and charts, which resulted in more focus on reading in STEM subjects for the Student Success Center tutors. Overall, responses have been very positive, including:

- I liked how you asked us questions to get us to answer our own concerns. I can use this tactic in my own consultations with students.
- I think this was very useful in helping me to feel confident in my own ability to use strategies to help students.
- [I need to read] aloud to demonstrate the metacognitive process [and to better understand] where students are coming from when they struggle w/ critical reading.

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 reflective papers at the end of the course. Qualitative feedback 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. In Fall 2018, 70.6% of students either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, and all responses resulted in a mean of 4.03. In Spring 2019, 73.6% of students either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, and all responses resulted in a mean of 4.13.

These results are similar to the response in 2017-2018 and will be shared with faculty to encourage individual efforts to more explicitly promote critical reading strategies.

Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARS): In addition to the MARS working as a summative assessment for SLO 2, results of the MARS were used to guide professional development of all ENG 101R and ENG 101 instructors in August 2019 to encourage more explicit instruction of metacognitive reading strategies. Specifically, faculty reflected on instructional strategies for helping students learn to preview text, determine purpose for reading, ask questions and summarize as they read.

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 2019-2020 academic year.

- The QEP assessment coordinators will continue to follow-up with programs that did not report a program level critical reading SLO.
- The past two years have resulted in establishment of assessment measures for General Education and disciplinary programs through the development of integrated critical reading and General Education rubrics and the development of program level SLOs. These measures will assess results in the coming year so we can better determine progress in meeting QEP SLOs.
- Starting in 2018-2019, ENG 095R was no longer offered; ENG 102R began to be offered to further support students with college-readiness needs. QEP funding then shifted from funding CECs in ENG 095R to ENG 102R.