Overview ~ Stepping aside from being immersed in a project, pausing to peer from above and view ourselves as “objects” for a moment instead of simply continuing to be “subjects,” is truly a gift provided by writing an annual report. While in the midst of refining what we mean by structured reflection (a concept and activity that is becoming pervasive at ‘K’ since emerging a few years ago through work done by Kiran Cunningham and Bob Grossman as part of our previous Teagle-funded project), being able to use our structured reflection triangle (please see first page of Appendix Six) as a heuristic device for organizing thoughts about what transpired over the past year is a pleasing outcome of our ongoing work. Reflecting on our “experiences” (i.e. what we accomplished) in light of our “assumptions” about what would happen and our structural knowledge of what a “vibrant learning environment” might be (i.e. our list of “attributes” along with theories/concepts put forth in our original proposal) reveals that we did, in fact, have a very busy year and are well on our way toward helping to transform Kalamazoo College into an environment with a “sustained, palpable, and systemic presence of evidential (and consequential) conversations about learning.” While projects supported by mini-grants to Teagle Learning Fellows and our third annual Symposium on Teaching and Learning helped foster an undercurrent of “positive restlessness” at ‘K’, other activities, connecting constituencies both across and beyond the college, seem to have occupied many of us over the past year and set the stage for an even more productive, engaging and enlightening year ahead. The first “half” of our project has been fruitful; we look forward to a second half that’s at least as good.

Accomplishments in 2009-2010 Academic Year ~ We will follow the same format as in previous reports and simply list tasks that occupied significant portions of our time during this past year, in more-or-less chronological order, using appendices to provide (again...probably more than enough) details where appropriate. NB: a recurring theme in what follows will be increasingly greater involvement of project participants in various assessment-related activities at ‘K’ and elsewhere.

1. We disbursed most, but not all, of our grant funds for the year to support various facets of our project. Our plans for allocating unexpended funds will link several developing threads of inquiry, outlined at the end of this report. Please see Appendix One for a budget narrative and list of expenditures.

2. After developing “fillable” Word documents for mini-grant proposal forms and project report forms needed for projects arising from our Triangulating Workshop (see below), we used what we learned to (re)revise our guidelines for Scholarship of Teaching and Learning projects. Please see Appendix Two for our current guidelines, which are similar to, but better than, those in our 2009 Annual Report.

3. We funded 11 Teagle Learning Fellows and their six projects, which, like last year, focused on questions at the course-level and more broadly at the college-level. (Appendix Three is a list of 2009-2010 projects, along with past and future projects to show inter-year linkages and, like last year, an increasing emphasis on “structured reflection” in projects, manifesting a growing interest at ‘K’ in the same.) The Brockington et al. and Cunningham projects clearly emphasized the importance of structured reflection from the start. And, while not explicit at the outset of projects, the Stevens-Truss and Warpehoski project and the Wiedenhoeft and MacLean project demonstrated that having students reflect in meaningful ways on their experiences deepened the learning that occurred.

4. Launching the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership (ACSJL - https://reason.kzoo.edu/csjl/) consumed considerable time and energy of many people at ‘K’, including several of us involved in our Teagle-funded project. For much of the year, we (Kiran Cunningham, Anne Dueweke, and Paul Sotherland) met weekly with several other colleagues to write an assessment plan for the ACSJL. An important, and very useful, outcome of that project was developing a glossary of assessment
language (Appendix Four), which helped guide our (individual and collective) thinking while devising the plan. The glossary is being shared around campus and will help align assessment work here. Watchwords for that year-long task were “We are the work as we do the work;” a very useful quote from Tim Fallon, an occasional consultant at K.’

5. Several project participants were involved in running a summer teaching and learning workshop for faculty preparing to develop and teach (primarily) sophomore seminars, which will become part the general education thread running through our Shared Passages Seminars. Once again, structured reflection was a key feature in these seminars.

6. We wrapped up our Colorado-Earliam-Kalamazoo (C-E-K) collaborative with a meeting at Kalamazoo in October and then wrote the “final” report to The Teagle Foundation for this endeavor.

7. Paul attended the Teagle gathering at Duke in mid-October, and then participated in the NSSE celebration a week later in Indianapolis.

8. Along with Chris Jackson, Program Manager at the CLA, Anne gave a presentation, “Returning to Learning in an Age of Assessment,” at the NEAIR conference in November.

9. Paul did a “CLA Spotlight” webinar in early December.

10. In mid-December, Anne and Paul collaborated with Charlie Blaich and ran a “Triangulating Outcomes of Undergraduate Education” workshop at the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts (CILA). The workshop was “sponsored” by the C-E-K collaborative; we allocated funds remaining from our project to defray costs of participating in the workshop. Representatives from seven institutions (which had administered some combination of CLA, NSSE, or WNS), eight Teagle Assessment Scholars, and representatives from the CLA, NSSE, SSRC and WNS met for three days to share data, discuss insights gained from those data, and develop action agendas based on the data and insights gained. Institutional representatives returned home with an action plan developed at the workshop. Another important outcome from the workshop was a Request for Proposals for mini-grants coming from what remained of the C-E-K collaborative grant. Please see Appendix Five for the workshop report and an example of a mini-grant proposal (from Kalamazoo College), which illustrates use of our “fillable” proposal form.

11. A very, perhaps most, important outcome of preparing for the “Triangulating” workshop was developing a focus on enhancing the learning environment at ‘K’ while sustaining our noteworthy learning outcomes. This intriguing project, which seems to be taking on a life of its own, grew out of a collaboration of Mickey McDonald (Provost), Kathy Smith (Chair of the Faculty Assessment Committee and soon-to-be co-chair of the college's self-study), Mike Sosulski (Chair of the Faculty Committee on Teaching), Anne, and Paul. Our attention was (and still is) focused on the problem posed by examining great news about our learning outcomes, revealed by longitudinal CLA data that arrived in the fall, alongside less-than-great news about declining NSSE-SFI “scores” at ‘K’ in the recent past. Patterns in our NSSE data were uncovered by Anne after she received a customized set of comparison-group data from Bob Gonyea at NSSE. Our simultaneous focus on learning environment and learning outcomes led to our report at the “Triangulating” workshop, our mini-grant proposal, presentation at the Winter All-Campus Gathering, and a subsequent Community Causerie, at which Anne and Paul engaged about 50 members of the ‘K’ community in a conversation about our CLA and NSSE data. Appendix Six is a collection of many of the slides shown at the Causerie. (As a result of the “story” told, Paul gave, at the request of our Admission Office, a truncated version of this presentation to several groups of prospective students and their parents at “Visit the Zoo” programs in spring term.)

12. In mid-January, Anne and Paul gave a presentation on our Teagle-funded project, “Creating a more vibrant learning environment through faculty and staff development,” at the AAC&U Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. At the well attended mini-workshop, Anne and Paul engaged the audience in a conversation about effectiveness of our approach to generating and sustaining a “buzz” on campus about curricular innovation, assessment, and improvement. Please see Appendix Seven for a description of the presentation and a collection of handouts used.
13. Paul participated in a Teagle Assessment Scholar Development Workshop at the CILA in February and brought back valuable insights into several of the CIRP surveys and how results from each survey are being packaged into “Constructs” and “Themes” that CIRP developed recently. We intend to use these new perspectives on CIRP survey data to triangulate NSSE data collected at the college.

14. Anne and Mickey gave a presentation on Kalamazoo College’s CLA results at the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Annual Meeting in April.

15. Paul participated in another Teagle Assessment Scholar Development Workshop (on the CLA) at the CILA in May. A topic of conversation after the workshop was the next round of the Wabash National Study. Paul returned home “knowing” that ‘K’ needed participate in the WNS this time around.

16. As a result of her presentation at the HLC meeting, Anne was invited to give a similar presentation at the VSA Learning Outcomes workshop in Baltimore in early June.

17. We held our third annual Symposium on Teaching and Learning during finals week. Approximately 50 colleagues attended this “bookend” to the academic year and heard presentations by this year’s Teagle Learning Fellows, as well as a presentation by a group of students, during a hectic time of the academic year. (The Symposium program is in Appendix Eight) By many accounts, the symposium went well, and some of the presenters used the symposium as a springboard for making plans to continue their projects next year. The student project was funded by our “Triangulating” mini-grant and will serve as a source of information, along with our NSSE results and results from the CIRP College Senior Survey (administered this past spring), for a presentation by Anne and Paul at the upcoming Fall Faculty Colloquium, the other “bookend” to the academic year.

18. Along with Charlie Blaich (and in his capacity as a Teagle Assessment Scholar), Paul visited Earlham College in mid-June to help foster enthusiasm, know-how, and momentum for regular reviews of departments and programs at Earlham.

19. Yesterday, Kalamazoo College applied to participate in the 2010-2013 Wabash National Study. With endorsement from Eileen Wilson-Oyelaran (President), Mickey McDonald, and Sarah Westfall (Vice President for Student Development and Dean of Students), Anne, Paul and Brian Dietz (Assistant Dean of Students and a collaborator on developing the ACSJL assessment plan) wrote and submitted the WNS application (Appendix Nine). We look forward to weaving together WNS activities with those in our Teagle-funded project.

**Challenge we faced** ~ Our biggest challenge was carving out time and energy for folks to accomplish what we did this past year. At times we encountered difficulties, and felt some reluctance ourselves, when attempting to schedule Teagle Learning Fellow events. With considerable attention at the college devoted to launching the ACSJL, an endeavor which certainly helped heighten the “buzz” associated with asking and attempting to answer “how do you know?” questions, we tried to be careful about adding “yet another meeting” to already-full calendars. That said, our project, and colleagues involved in it, seemed to be well in the mix of what was happening at ‘K’. That’s all good.

**Successes we enjoyed** ~ Our biggest success, which is still unfolding, is the project feeling like it’s “getting legs.” We trust that the list of accomplishments conveys this clearly. If Teagle Assessment Scholars were to visit ‘K’ to do a mid-term formative assessment, which we plan to have happen next year (perhaps as part of the WNS pre-visit…we hope), we feel confident that they would be able to check-off many of the “attributes” highlighted in the “Implementing and Assessing…” document included in our 2009 Annual Report. Having that happen would indicate that our proof-of-principle project is in the process of realizing its goal of helping to transform Kalamazoo College. An additional point in the “Implementing…” document, not highlighted because it was considered too pie-in-the-sky, will also be checked off, starting in July 2011, when “A ‘point person’ (or office), whose professional ‘self-worth’ derives from the institution being a vibrant learning environment, (will have) an administration-level appointment at the institution.” This is a break-through success for the project and the college. And, even though the college has yet to designate an “innovation fund” or have a “budget line (ideally
endowed) to support projects focused on improving student learning.” having the college commit to allocate funds necessary to participate in the WNS is a very positive step in a very good direction.

**Plans for Year Three** ~ We anticipate accomplishing the following (“routine” parts of our project) during the 2010-2011 academic year: we will collaborate with and convene gatherings of Teagle Learning Fellows; the Kalamazoo Project Implementation Team will meet with Mickey McDonald for formative assessments of the project; and we will hold our fourth annual Symposium on Teaching and Learning at the end of the 2010-11 academic year.

We will also continue our “enhancing the learning environment at ‘K’ while sustaining our noteworthy learning outcomes” project by doing the following: analyze and interpret data collected through the CIRP College Senior Survey this past spring; present those data, along with information collected by the students who ran the student focus groups in the spring, at the Fall Faculty Colloquium; engage those attending the Colloquium in focus-group conversations about topics raised in the spring focus groups; carry out additional student focus groups in the fall to increase the (small) sample sizes in the spring focus groups; and then use what we learn to write our report on the project and develop a plan for acting on what was learned about the college’s learning environment.

We also hope to augment what we learn through the “learning environment” project by administering the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) and the CIRP Your First College Year (YFCY) survey during the coming academic year. To accomplish this, we request permission to allocate unexpended funds in our grant, from the first two years, to pay for these two surveys. Having information from these additional surveys, along with information from the “learning environment” project will instill confidence in our attempts to “turn every stone” when trying to understand “experiences” encountered by our students and how they might affect (and effect?) learning outcomes.

We will enlist Teagle Assessment Scholars to do a mid-term formative assessment of our project.

If the stars align, we will begin participating in the Wabash National Study. Examining the “Call for Participation” and our application to participate will reveal how intertwined threads of our Teagle-funded project and our WNS project could become. Synergy will yield a whole greater than the sum of the parts.

Finally, many of us will become even more involved in the college’s self study in anticipation of the HLC reaccreditation visit in 2012-2013. Anne will serve on the Self-Study Steering Committee and Paul will chair the Criterion Three (Student Learning and Effective Teaching) Committee.

**Concluding Remarks** ~ At the outset of the conclusion to our report last year we noted: A very important outcome of Teagle-funded projects at Kalamazoo College over the past four years is our “discovery” of structured reflection and its key role in fostering deep learning. This year we would change “four” to “five” and underscore that assertion. While still discerning effective ways of encouraging folks to engage in structured reflection, we are becoming increasingly convinced that developing the ability to reflect meaningfully on what we know, what we assume, and what we encounter, and creating opportunities to learn deeply through that reflection, is paramount to becoming better educated. And, we know that this insight applies both to students and their mentors. What’s most exciting to us is that...paraphrasing Ken Bain...Kalamazoo College feels like it is continuing on a trajectory toward becoming a place where we have opportunities “to grapple with the dissonance (we) encounter - to try, fail, receive feedback, and try again - before anyone makes judgments of (our) efforts” and to learn deeply from the grappling among critical friends.

Yes, our project certainly seems successful. Thank you (again) – Teagle Foundation – for supporting our efforts to create (or become), foster, and sustain an environment in which learning thrives.
APPENDIX ONE

BUDGET REPORT AND NARRATIVE
Transforming Kalamazoo College through Multi-Layered and Systematic Improvement of Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course release for Project Director</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>-7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer stipend for Project Director</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-grants to Teagle Learning Fellows</td>
<td>13,000.00</td>
<td>-12,048.00</td>
<td>952.00</td>
<td>underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus workshops, meetings, TLF CoP</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>-694.69</td>
<td>1,305.31</td>
<td>underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Symposium on Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>-621.00</td>
<td>4,379.00</td>
<td>underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds set aside annually to administer CLA in 2012-13</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>planned set aside for CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Trust Meeting to establish evaluation criteria</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>-2,654.49</td>
<td>1,345.51</td>
<td>underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post-external review of project by TAS</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>-2,566.47</td>
<td>3,433.53</td>
<td>planned set aside for add'l visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1 Totals</strong></td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
<td>-28,584.65</td>
<td>16,415.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 - $35,000 from The Teagle Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course release for Project Director</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>-8,046.26</td>
<td>-1,046.26</td>
<td>College share of FICA was also charged: 510.77 in Yr 1 &amp; 535.50 in Yr 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer stipend for Project Director</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>We expect to pay out add'l $3,922.53 for Yr 2 projects in FY11 once all final reports are in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-grants to Teagle Learning Fellows</td>
<td>13,000.00</td>
<td>-8,104.22</td>
<td>4,895.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus workshops, meetings, TLF CoP</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>-1,188.68</td>
<td>811.32</td>
<td>underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Symposium on Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>-625.79</td>
<td>4,374.21</td>
<td>underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds set aside annually to administer CLA in 2012-13</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>planned set aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2 Totals</strong></td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
<td>-20,964.95</td>
<td>14,035.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yr 1 and Yr 2 Totals</strong></td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>-49,549.60</td>
<td>30,450.40</td>
<td>Fund remaining include $10,000 set aside for the CLA; $3,433 for the post TAS visit; and $3,922 for Yr 2 mini-grants leaving a balance of approximately $13,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUDGET NARRATIVE FOR 2009-2010

Course Release and Summer Stipend for Project Director ~ Funds provided Paul Sotherland with time and resources to manage the project effectively. With help from Anne Dueweke he organized meetings of the project team, gatherings of Teagle Learning Fellows, a campus-wide Community Causerie to share student learning data, and our annual Symposium on Teaching and Learning. He also engaged in project-related work, such as participating in Teagle Assessment Scholar visits, helping to design an assessment plan for K’s nascent Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership, and reading assessment literature.

Mini-grants to Teagle Learning Fellows (TLFs) ~ We allocated (or will have allocated as soon as second grant installments go out) nearly all of the $13,000 budgeted for scholarship of teaching and learning mini-grant projects. This year these projects included: Exploring relationships among students’ gender, academic major, and learning preferences in introductory psychology courses; Designing and implementing a replicable model of structured reflection in First-Year Seminars; Operationalizing insights gained from research on transformative learning and implementing them in key experiential components of the K-Plan; Enhancing student engagement in the General Chemistry classroom and laboratory; Conceptual growth from taking Thermal Physics; and Near(-)-native speakers: expectations for language learning on Study Abroad.

On-campus Workshops, Meetings, and TLF Gatherings ~ We spent a little over half of the funds allotted for quarterly gatherings of the TLFs to discuss how their projects were progressing and for meetings of the project team to plan and coordinate events. We also sponsored a campus-wide Community Causerie in January to share CLA and NSSE results and discuss as a community how to act on the findings.

Symposium on Teaching and Learning ~ We had another successful Symposium this year during which our TLFs presented results on their projects to the campus community. We underspent this line again mainly because plans for an external speaker fell through (as last year). Nevertheless, the event was well attended and the audience was interested and engaged in the presentations.

Funds for CLA ~ These funds (set aside annually) will be used to administer the Collegiate Learning Assessment to seniors in the final year of our project.

Discussion of Underspent Funds ~ As noted in the budget report, we are underspending primarily in the lines for on-campus meetings/workshops and the annual Symposium on Teaching and Learning. With regard to the latter, we have had speakers pull out after an initial commitment both years (in one case due to illness and in the other case due to work-related issues). Part of the problem is also due to the timing of the Symposium (mid June) when many potential speakers are well into their summer activities. We will try to arrange for an outside speaker again next year, perhaps starting earlier than we have in the past. We anticipate that we will continue to underspend the line for meetings, workshops, and TLF gatherings. We are finding that people are very busy and tend to tune us out if we invite them to too many events. Some of our recent assessment work on student-faculty interaction and student-staff interaction (funded by a mini-grant from our previous Teagle Assessment grant) has caused us to want to gather additional survey data. The College is already using the CIRP Freshman Survey, the NSSE, and the CIRP College Senior Survey (previously we used the HEDS Senior Survey). We would like to suggest that we put unused funds for workshops and meetings towards covering the costs of the FSSE (Faculty Survey of Student Engagement) and the CIRP YFCY (Your First College Year) in 2010-11.
APPENDIX TWO

REVISED PROPOSAL GUIDELINES FOR SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING PROJECTS

PROPOSAL FORM AND REPORT FORM
PROPOSAL GUIDELINES FOR SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING PROJECTS

With support from the Teagle Foundation, Kalamazoo College is encouraging faculty and staff to engage in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), in more systematic and effective assessment of student learning, and in using what is learned through these endeavors to improve teaching and learning at Kalamazoo College. To accomplish those goals, faculty and staff may apply for mini-grants to support SoTL Projects. Several $1000 mini-grants will be provided for smaller-scale SoTL projects (e.g. at the course or department level) and one $2500 mini-grant for a larger-scale SoTL project (e.g. at the program or college level). Grant recipients - designated as Teagle Learning Fellows - will develop projects over the summer and carry them out the following academic year. Teagle Learning Fellows will receive half of the grant at the outset of the project and the balance of the grant upon submission of a final report. We will dedicate a subset of mini-grants each year to projects involving the teaching of structured reflection and assessing its impact on transformational learning. The proposal deadline for 2010-11 projects is Friday, 16 April (Friday of third week Spring Term). Recipients of 2010-11 grants will be notified by 23 April 2010.

TO APPLY FOR A SOTL MINI-GRA nt: COMPLETE THE APPLICATION FORM ON THE NEXT PAGE.

BE SURE TO REVIEW “RESPONSIBILITIES,” INCLUDING QUESTIONS ON THE REPORT FORM, BEFORE APPLYING FOR A SO TL MINI-GRA nt TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU ARE WILLING TO COMMIT TO TAKING ON THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF A TEAGLE LEARNING FELLOW.

NOTE: PLEASE MAKE ALL RESPONSES TO PROMPTS ON THE APPLICATION FORM AND REPORT FORM CONCISE (I.E. NO MORE THAN ONE PARAGRAPH)

RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FACULTY AND STAFF RECEIVING SO TL MINI-GRA NTs:

- Participate in Teaching and Learning Community of Practice during the academic year
- Present results of your project at our annual Symposium on Teaching and Learning
- Submit a final report (due within two months of finishing the project) by completing and submitting the Report Form on the pages following the Application Form.

For more information about the Teagle-funded project, of which these mini-projects are integral parts, please contact Paul Sotherland (paulsoth@kzoo.edu).

MINI-GRANT APPLICATION – 2010
TEAGLE LEARNING FELLOW PROJECTS

PLEASE PROVIDE CONCISE (i.e. NO MORE THAN A PARAGRAPH) RESPONSES TO PROMPTS ON THIS APPLICATION FORM

Name(s)
Department(s)
Project Title

What question do you want to answer by carrying out this project?

What goal(s) do you hope to attain through your project?
(Please refer to the glossary of “assessment language” at the end of this document.)

Describe how your project and its goal(s) connects with what is already known (in general and at ‘K’) about student learning at one of the following institutional levels: course, department, program, or college.

(Potentially useful resources for linking your project to what is already known are can be found at the following: http://www.kzoo.edu/ir/)

What do you plan to accomplish by the end of August 2010 on the way to reaching your overall goal?

What do plan to accomplish by the end of winter term 2011 on your way to reaching your overall goal?

What do you anticipate will be measurable outcomes of these two objectives?

What information (quantitative and/or qualitative) will you gather? How will you gather it? How will you analyze and interpret the information gathered?

Please return this application to Paul Sotherland (paulsoth@kzoo.edu) by 16 April 2010.
How do you anticipate sustaining momentum built through the project proposed here?

In what ways do you anticipate insights from your project affecting teaching and learning at Kalamazoo College?

Please include an executive summary, of no more than one paragraph, of your project.

Please include a brief budget for spending your mini-grant.
Please provide concise (i.e. no more than a paragraph) responses to prompts on this report form.

Name(s)

Department(s)

Project Title

Please provide a short description of your project – including the specific goal(s) the project addressed, objectives met, and (anticipated and unanticipated) outcomes attained.

(Please refer to the glossary of “assessment language” at the end of this document.)

How did you gather, analyze, and interpret information about teaching and learning? With what existing information about teaching and learning did you triangulate the information that you gathered?

What narrative about teaching and learning emerged from your project?

By what means have you or will you share your project’s narrative on campus (and beyond)?

What effect will your project’s narrative have on you?

What effect do you anticipate your project’s narrative having on teaching and learning at Kalamazoo College?

What traces did you leave, or connections did you create on campus through your project?

Please return this report to Paul Sotherland (paulsoth@kzoo.edu) by 15 August 2011.
If unexpected synergies emerged while carrying out your project, please describe them and what they might lead to in the future.

What made this project worthwhile?

What was challenging while carrying out your project?

What could have been done to make your project more effective?

What advice do you have for future Teagle Learning Fellows?

Please describe how you spent the mini-grant.
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Teagle Learning Fellows and Projects
2008-11
KALAMAZOO COLLEGE – TEAGLE LEARNING FELLOWS

2008-09 TEAGLE LEARNING FELLOWS AND PROJECTS

CAROL ANDERSON AND ALISON GEIST  Department of Religion and the MJUS Institute for Service Learning
Critical Theory and Practice at Kalamazoo College

JEFFREY BARTZ  Department of Chemistry
Clickers: End of a Fifteen-year Search for Engagement with Accountability

ROBERT BATSELL AND GREG SLOUGH  Departments of Psychology and Chemistry
Pre-course Reputation: From Anecdote to Antidote

KIRAN CUNNINGHAM AND BOB GROSSMAN  Departments of Anthropology & Sociology and Psychology
Towards a Developmental Paradigm for Embedding Transformative Learning in a Kalamazoo College Education

LAURA FURGE  Department of Chemistry
Creating a Performance Task with Embedded Course Content: An HPV Vaccine Performance Task

MICHELE INTERMONT  Department of Mathematics
Writing + Math = ?

2009-10 TEAGLE LEARNING FELLOWS AND PROJECTS

KARYN BOATWRIGHT  Department of Psychology
Exploring relationships among students’ gender, academic major, and learning preferences in introductory psychology courses

JOE BROCKINGTON, ALISON GEIST, JOAN HAWXHURST, ZAIDE PIXLEY, AND MARGARET WIEDENHOEFT
Center for International Programs, Mary Jane Underwood Stryker Institute for Service Learning, Center for Career and Professional Development, and First-Year Experience
Designing and implementing a replicable model of structured reflection in First-Year Seminars

KIRAN CUNNINGHAM  Department of Anthropology and Sociology
Operationalizing insights gained from research on transformative learning and implementing them in key experiential components of the K-Plan

REGINA STEVENS-TRUSS AND MARTHA WARPEHOSKI  Learning Center
Enhancing student engagement in the General Chemistry classroom and laboratory

JAN TOBOCHNIK  Department of Physics
Conceptual growth from taking Thermal Physics, Physics 360

MARGARET WIEDENHOEFT AND KATIE MACLEAN  Center for International Programs and Department of Romance Languages
Near(-)native speakers: Expectations for language learning on Study Abroad
2010-11 Teagle Learning Fellows and Projects

JEFFREY BARTZ  Department of Chemistry
Promoting interest and performance in science through Structured Reflection

PATRIK HULTBERG, CHUCK STULL, AND HANNAH MCKINNEY  Department of Economics and Business
Integrating case study methodologies into the Introduction to Economics course

(Anticipated Continuation)  ZAIDE PIXLEY, ET AL.  First-Year Experience and Advising
Effects of implementing a refined model for structured reflection in college courses

(Anticipated Continuation)  MARGARET WIEDENHOFET AND KATIE MACLEAN  Center for International Programs and Department of Romance Languages
Effects of cultural immersion on language learning on Study Abroad

(Anticipated Continuation)  ANNE DUEWEKE AND PAUL SOTHERLAND (AND OTHERS)
Enhancing the learning environment while sustaining learning outcomes
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Glossary of Assessment Language
Glossary of Assessment Language

Assessment - The process by which evidence is gathered, analyzed, and interpreted to measure achievement of objectives.

Evaluation - A judgment made about the quality of a program (i.e. one of various facets of the curriculum - course, department, program, or entire college), often made as a result of assessment.

Mission & Vision - explanation of why a program exists and what it hopes to achieve in the future. It articulates the program’s essential nature, its values and its work.

Goals - General statements about changes that will happen as a result of what occurs in the program.

Objectives - Specific anticipated effects that the program will have on its participants and on the institution. Each goal has its own set of objectives which, if achieved, will result in attaining the goal. A few notes on objectives:
  - Something that might be confusing: currently, departmental assessment plans tend to refer to student learning outcomes that are actually learning objectives.
  - Much of the work of assessment is monitoring progress toward attaining objectives, so considerable thought needs to go into developing clear objectives for each goal.

Outcomes - The actual extent and kinds of effects that the program has had on its participants and on the institution. Whereas objectives look toward the future, outcomes reflect what is actually achieved. Outcomes are revealed by collecting evidence (i.e. assessment “data”) that measures the degree to and way in which specific objectives have been achieved.

Outputs - Actual products and services delivered. While it is important to track outputs, assessment is increasingly focused on tracking outcomes because outcomes are the actual changes that occur as a result of outputs.

Indicators (aka measures) - Evidence that will be gathered to reveal outcomes of the program.

Benchmarks - A data point that is used for comparative purposes. A program can use its own data as a baseline benchmark against which to compare future performance. It can also use data from another program as a benchmark. In the latter case, the other program often is chosen because it is exemplary and its data are used as a target to strive for, rather than as a baseline.

---

1 This description of assessment language was adapted from a similar document that was the product of a collaborative effort, led by Kiran Cunningham, of Kalamazoo College colleagues working to develop an assessment plan for the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership during the 2009-2010 academic year.
APPENDIX FIVE

KALAMAZOO COLLEGE
2009 TRIANGULATING WORKSHOP REPORT AND
2010 TRIANGULATING MINI-GRA nt PROPOSAL
Representatives from seven institutions (which had participated in some combination of CLA, NSSE, or WNS), eight Teagle Assessment Scholars (TAS, most of whom were also on institutional teams), and representatives from the CLA, NSSE, SSRC and WNS (Appendix 1) met for a three-day workshop to share data, discuss insights gained from those data, and develop action agendas based on the data and insights gained. Much was learned in the invigorating environment, created collaboratively by all participants, and everyone left with a renewed sense of purpose to act in accord with what is, or soon will be, known about effects of efforts back home – at colleges, universities, CLA, NSSE, SSRC, and WNS. Enlightenment and inspiration came in many guises, and, as “life takes over” after this weekend, everyone will engage what arises with an adjusted sense of what is, or what could be, “normal.”

Process

Format of the meeting seemed conducive to collaboration. As usual, Trippet Hall was a wonderful setting for a workshop composed of an opening poster session for institutional representatives to share information about student learning, followed by presentations about insights gained from national-level views of college student learning interlaced with institutional teams working on and giving reports about action agendas (Appendix 2). The poster session was a good tone-setter for the workshop; everyone rolled up their sleeves and got right to the tasks of sharing data and serving as “critical friends.” We found this approach to be a productive and engaging way for institutions to share, consider, and reconsider data. In addition to being a good “tone-setter,” the poster session seemed a much more effective means of grappling with issues than formal presentations followed by comments from the audience. Building in time to “write on walls” (i.e., write comments and ideas about other institutions’ data on clipboards by their posters), as well as coordinating movement of data from one poster to another to foster inter-institutional comparisons, would help make poster sessions even more effective at similar meetings in the future. And, alternating focused inquiry on intra-institutional data with broader consideration of findings from national studies of similar, but inter-institutional, data helped connect the local with the global. The questions we used to guide teams in planning evidence-based improvements on campus (see Appendix 3) helped focus conversations on action agendas (i.e., getting “boots on the ground”) instead of just more studies of what students are, or are not, accomplishing in college. All discussions were animated and engaging, tending to run over time allotted in the agenda, indicating good engagement in the issues. Limiting the number of participating institutions to five (we had seven), could help deepen and broaden collaborative conversations at future meetings.

Impact

Workshop participants revealed and discovered many new perspectives on complexities of using data to drive institutional change toward enhancing student learning. The workshop seemed eye-opening for the CLA and SSRC folks, who work diligently to gather and analyze large national data sets, but haven’t had many opportunities to interact with colleagues at institutions grappling with student learning data and trying to put them to use. Working directly with institutional teams yielded first-hand insights into complexities of using institutional data to improve student learning. TAS played an important role in helping institutional teams make action plans based on their data; having well-informed outside observers, who also served as empathetic discussants, facilitated imagining the adept “burling” frequently needed when moving “logjams”
associated with effecting institutional change. TAS also heard issues and ideas teams were discussing with regard to their CLA, WNS, and NSSE data and how to act on it, and they served as “vectors” for what they heard as they moved from one team to another. TAS can continue disseminating issues, ideas, and useful techniques as they work with other institutional teams in the future. Teams also learned directly from each other, and expressed desire to continue collaborating, through video-conferencing and campus visits, in the future. Thus, an outcome of the workshop is new areas of intersection among expanding circles of engagement with what’s known about factors affecting student learning in college.

Insights

Growing synergy between institutional engagement in improving student learning and clear and consistent findings from national studies on what makes a difference in student learning suggests that we are gaining traction in using assessment data to enhance what colleges and universities can do to improve undergraduate education. Great strides have been made in the willingness of institutions to share data – manifested at the workshop by teams needing no cajoling to “go naked” with data about their own institutions and apparently feeling comfortable having candid conversations about what was revealed – indicating that a major culture shift, at least at some institutions, has occurred over the past few years. Having readily available results from national-level projects – such as the SSRC-CLA study, the WNS, and NSSE studies – can give institutions new insights into their own data that cannot be gleaned from examining individual institutional data sets, which are frequently limited by sample size and homogeneity. Investigations of intra-institutional data sets are catalyzed by knowing that different national-level projects have repeatedly revealed similar correlations between learning gains and an undergraduate education that incorporates the following features: high faculty expectations for performance in writing (and speaking?) that is linked with challenging assignments, which require significant reading and reflecting on what is read; effective studying, individually or in structured and focused collaborations; good mentoring that includes clarity, organization, noticeable interest in teaching and student development, prompt and thorough feedback to students on their performance, and meaningful out-of-class student/faculty interactions; meaningful student interactions with diverse peers, mentors, ideas, and experiences both in and outside of class; and learning experiences that frequently require synthesis, judgment, integration, and reflection.

Institutions can use this information emerging from national-level studies to guide investigations into the extent to which these empirically identified effective practices are present on their campuses and help them make inferences about correlations between their own CLA and NSSE data. National-level studies have also revealed differences among institutions in learning outcomes and in prevalence of student encounters with best practices that enhance those outcomes. And, on more than a few occasions during the workshop, we were reminded that intra-institutional variation in student encounters with best practices and in learning outcomes engendered by those encounters exceeds variation among institutions. So, institutions sorting out causes of variation in their own NSSE and CLA results, while remaining cognizant of national trends, remains paramount. Once again, the importance of institutions having a collective “positive restlessness,” with regard to improving learning outcomes while enhancing the lived experience of undergraduates came to the fore.

Although most institutions had both CLA and NSSE data, and a few had data from the WNS, discussions and plans for improvement tended to focus mainly on results from the NSSE. Institutions still seem to be figuring out how to use CLA data for improvement of student learning and many are turning to NSSE data as a tool for interpreting CLA results. Therefore, recent collaborations between the CLA and NSSE organizations, such as the CIC NSSE-CLA project, are likely to yield many helpful insights for institutions. Such studies might also model for institutions how CLA and NSSE data can be used in concert. For example, examining individual items on the NSSE, or grouping them as “scalelets,” instead of simply examining Benchmark
scores, might yield more useful insights into student engagement with their education. Similarly, disaggregating CLA results into individual scores and then probing the scatter in those scores for discernable patterns might be more productive than simply making inter-institutional comparisons. One of the elegant attributes of the WNS is the combination of learning outcome measures and student reports about learning experiences. Results from this labor-intensive and relatively “short-term” study are encouraging, and point to the need for long-term collaboration between projects that separately measure what WNS is accomplishing in one project. Because CLA provides a direct measure of learning and NSSE provides student reports of experiences in college that have been shown to correlate with learning gains, when considered together they provide a richer and more complete picture of institutional effectiveness than when considered separately. We look forward to ongoing and enhanced synergy between these important endeavors and the institutions that they both investigate and serve.

During our discussions about national studies and institutional projects, several other insights emerged:

- When trying to reverse downward trends, or to induce upward trends, in multifarious forms of institutional data, focusing on what contributes to making conditions at an institution better rather than on what's wrong seems more fruitful.
- Students need explicit guidance when learning what it means to be a college student (e.g., at Kalamazoo, students would benefit from learning how to interact more effectively with faculty and administrative personnel; at Earlham and IWU students would benefit from developing a greater understanding of the rationale for general education courses; students at many institutions would benefit from learning what “studying” means and what it requires of the engaged individual).
- Sometimes fostering change might require altering perceptions of what's “normal” on a campus (e.g., focusing eight hours a week outside of class on course-related material might be considered working hard on one campus but not on another; assigning a 15-page end-of-term paper might be considered sufficient focus on developing writing skills in some courses, whereas in other courses assigning and providing timely feedback on three five-page papers might be considered more effective in helping students develop their ability to construct and defend cogent arguments). What do national-level studies reveal about global patterns in what's most effective, and how can institutions adapt what's known to improve student learning locally?
- Faculty, staff, and students (and trustees?) at our institutions need to learn how to act in accord with what is known about student learning, in general and on each of our campuses, and then collaboratively put what is learned to effective use. Addressing the issues before us is not within the exclusive prevue of any one group; we're all in this together.
- One way to achieve consensus about an issue is to engage the campus community in looking at data and asking whether the data are consistent with people's perceptions and experiences. Frequent and judicious use of focus groups, particularly student-led focus groups for students, can help generate a common narrative about an institution and a shared resolve to move that narrative in a direction that improve student learning outcomes.

Based on the tenor of our discussions and our focus on using evidence to improve what we do, we all felt that there has been tremendous growth in how well people at our institutions understand and work with data. We have become much more adept at gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence. The challenge before us now is to DO something with what we know, and that's where the hard work begins. Perseverance in sustainable, revisable, and incrementally successful projects, informed by evidence garnered from a variety of sources, will yield enduring yet responsive enhancements to student learning.
### APPENDIX ONE – TRIANGULATING WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustana</td>
<td>Allen Bertsche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Schermer (TAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Nate Bower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Kuerbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham</td>
<td>Kari Kalve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andy Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>Anne Dueweke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Sotherland (TAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Scott VanderStoep (TAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Frank Boyd (TAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zahia Drici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christina Isabelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T</td>
<td>Karen Hornsby (TAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cassandra Pickett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Simkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wofford</td>
<td>Ellen Goldey (TAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Wiseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Womick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teagle Assessment Scholars (TAS)</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich (TAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Ottenhoff (TAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>Bob Gonyea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jillian Kinzie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Heather Kugelmass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Nemeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRC</td>
<td>Josipa Roksa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TWO – TRIANGULATING WORKSHOP AGENDA

Friday, 11 December

Noon to 5 p.m. Arrive and Check-In at Trippet Hall, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana

5:00 – 5:30 Reception at Trippet Hall, First Floor

5:30 – 6:45 Dinner, Trippet Hall Dining Room

7:00 – 8:30 p.m. Opening session – Trippet Hall, Second Floor – Poster Session
Data-sharing and data-discussing session, fueled by after-dinner refreshments

Saturday, 12 December

8:00 – 9:00 a.m. Breakfast, Trippet Hall Dining Room

9:00 – 10:00 Panel Presentation
- Overview of large-scale patterns in student performance, as seen through the CLA, and what we know so far about what might affect that performance. Heather Kugelmass (CLA), Alex Nemeth (CLA), Josipa Roksa (SSRC)

10:00 – 10:15 Coffee Break

10:15 – 12:00 Institutional teams work individually, with help from Teagle Assessment Scholars (TAS), on back-home goals and actions in light of what was learned during the poster session and panel presentation

12:00 – 12:45 p.m. Lunch, Trippet Hall Dining Room

1:00 – 1:45 Panel Presentation
- Agents of change in student performance: what the WNS and NSSE can tell us about factors that affect student learning during college? Charlie Blaich (WNS), Jillian Kinzie (NSSE), and Bob Gonyea (NSSE)

2:00 – 3:30 Institutional teams work collaboratively with other teams, and with help from TAS, on back-home goals and actions in light of what has been learned so far.

3:45 – 5:00 Reports on collaborative efforts - including, where appropriate, reflections from CLA, SSRC, WNS, and NSSE folks on what has transpired

6:00 – 7:30 Dinner, Trippet Hall Dining Room

Sunday, 13 December

8:15 – 9:15 a.m. Breakfast, Trippet Hall Dining Room
Institutional teams put finishing touches on back-home goals and action plans

9:15 – 10:45 Institutional teams give reports on plans and goals

10:45 – 11:30 Re-cap/Summary – TAS “observers” give report on what they observed taking place during the workshop

11:30 Lunch, Trippet Hall Dining Room (box lunches provided)

12:30 p.m. Departures and TAS debriefing of workshop for those who can stay
APPENDIX THREE – GUIDELINES FOR SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF CHANGE AND TEAM PROJECTS FOR EFFECTING CHANGE

Guidelines for Social Construction of Change

What do you want to improve? What is your overall goal?

Is there consensus on this goal?

Have you worked with appropriate campus governance structures to develop this goal?

What sources of evidence can inform your improvement efforts?

This is not just about survey/outcome measures – also consider grade data, course enrollment patterns, insights from student focus groups, conversations with alumni and with employers of recent graduates, etc.

What is the basic storyline, or narrative, about your institution that emerges from these multiple sources?

Is there consensus on campus about the storyline?

What is your short term objective (to accomplish by the end of January 2010) on the way to reaching your overall goal?

What is your bridge objective (to accomplish by the end of spring term 2010)?

What will be measurable outcomes from these two objectives?

If you effect a change in your institution, how will you then improve the second and third versions of your new program?

Team Projects for Effecting Change

What follows are goals and short-term objectives (aka desired outcomes) for institutional projects:

Augustana ~ Focus on improving interactions among first-year students and between first-year students and faculty. Build consensus around what the problem(s) might be and how to address the problem(s) by sharing NSSE and other relevant data with the campus community. Use student-led focus groups for students to engage students in the conversation about patterns in the data.

Colorado ~ Focus on improving student writing. Continue unpacking CLA data by comparing student performance across academic divisions. Discern best to convey CLA and other data on campus. Could it be shared through faculty development activities? Share data and then use it as a catalyst to develop writing programs further.

Earlham ~ Focus on improving student retention. Attempt to figure out what was working well when retention was higher in 2002-03. Go door-to-door to engage faculty in the conversation.
**Illinois Wesleyan** – Focus on improving general education by increasing student engagement in the program. Will start by analyzing existing data, followed by faculty workshops to develop surveys for additional data collection, and hold student-led focus groups.

**Kalamazoo** – Focus on improving the lived experience of students while maintaining strong learning gains. Engage the campus community in considering recent CLA and NSSE data to build consensus around the data-based narrative. By the end of the academic year, have a plan in place for guiding and supporting students more effectively through college life.

**North Carolina A&T** – Focus on improving first-year student academic success (understanding student use of time, reducing aspirational gap, successful completion of credit hours) by analyzing Early Alert and SI data, collecting time diaries from students (students report spending almost no time on homework), and engaging students as co-researchers by training them to lead focus groups and analyze data.

**Wofford** – Focus on NSSE data regarding academic rigor and time on task. Hold workshops with faculty to engage them in examining NSSE data and moving toward consensus on the storyline. Helping faculty notice what is happening with regard to Level of Academic Challenge may lead to change.
What do you want to improve at your institution? What is your overall goal?
(What campus governance structures have you worked with to develop this goal? Is there shared ownership of this goal? If not, what will you do to develop broader ownership?)

Our goal is to enhance the learning environment of our students while sustaining the students' noteworthy learning outcomes. Learning outcomes, measured by the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), proportion of students who go on to earn a Ph.D., and participation rates in such post-graduation programs such as Teach for America, Peace Corps, and Fulbright all suggest that Kalamazoo College does an effective job of helping its students become better educated and of fostering a zeal for life-long learning. And yet, trends in our data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) reveal that the learning environment at 'K' may not be as effective, or as enjoyable, as it might otherwise be. Specifically, results for the Student-Faculty Interactions (SFI) NSSE benchmark show a statistically significant downward trend over the past five years when SFI scores at other institutions like 'K' have held steady. These trends are particularly alarming in light of observations that “finding ways to encourage greater student involvement with faculty…could be a highly productive activity on most college campuses (Astin 1984,1999). Moreover, “relationship” components of the Supportive Campus Environment (SCE) NSSE benchmark, which have been uncomfortably low at 'K' and alarmingly lower than at peer institutions, also suggest that interactions with faculty could be much better. Thus, we appear to have a problem in need of a solution.

While there is some shared ownership of our goal, the thrust of our project is to develop a greater awareness of the problem(s) we face, explore possible reasons for the problem(s), and engender ownership of the problem(s) and its solution(s).

What sources of evidence do you anticipate using to inform your improvement efforts?
(This is not just about survey/outcome measures – also consider grade data, course enrollment patterns, insights from student focus groups, conversations with alumni and with employers of recent graduates, etc.)

We will employ Astin’s Input-Environment-Outcome (I-E-O) model while developing a better understanding of factors contributing to our noteworthy learning outcomes and while striving to reach our stated goal. Accordingly, to date we have used the CLA and NSSE to “measure” O and E, respectively, and the Cooperative Institutional Research Program – The Freshman Survey (CIRP-TFS) to a certain extent to understand I. With funds provided by a mini-grant we will make greater use of CIRP surveys, including Your First College Year (YFCY) and College Senior Survey (CSS), as well as TFS to gain a clearer understanding of I, E, and O. We will also gather narratives through focus groups with students, faculty, and staff to flesh out survey data.

What is the basic storyline, or narrative, about your institution that has emerged from these multiple sources to date?

(Is there consensus on campus about the storyline? If not, what will you do to build consensus?)

The basic narrative about our institution, shared more or less by many at ‘K’, is that our learning outcomes are strong but our affective environment is weak. We will endeavor to build a palpable consensus for this narrative and then work diligently to improve the learning environment.

What is your short-term objective (to accomplish by the end of March 2010) on the way to reaching your overall goal?

Our short-term objective is to set up focus groups for spring term and register for the CIRP-CSS, which we will administer in spring term to seniors. We intend to have student-run focus groups for students (as per recommendations made by colleagues at North Carolina A&T) as well as faculty-run focus groups for faculty and staff-run focus groups for staff. We will need to identify and train a facilitator and scribe for each focus group and then recruit focus group participants.

What is your first bridge-objective (to accomplish by the end of spring term 2010) on your way to reaching your overall goal?

By the end of spring term, in mid-June, we will have administered the CIRP-CSS, run many of the focus groups, and worked with the facilitators and scribes to distill their narrative of what they learned. We will also help student facilitators and scribes prepare a presentation for our annual Symposium on Teaching and Learning, which takes place at the end of spring finals week.

What is your second bridge-objective (to accomplish by the end of fall term 2010) on your way to reaching your overall goal?

By the end of fall term 2010 we will complete all focus groups, analyze the CIRP-CSS data and compare them with CIRP-TFS data from the past (while paying close attention to relevant CIRP Constructs and Themes), use the CIRP data to triangulate past NSSE data, write a narrative about what we see in the information gathered, and continue to build consensus around the narrative by sharing what we learn at a Community Causerie.

What do you anticipate will be measurable outcomes of these three objectives?

We anticipate developing an actionable narrative and achieving consensus around that narrative. We will then use the shared ownership that emerges to develop an action plan to address identified issues.

If/when you effect an improvement in your institution, how will you then build on your improvements? That is, how do you anticipate sustaining momentum built through the project proposed here?

We will continue to collect, analyze, interpret, and act on CIRP and NSSE data as we strive to attain our goal. We will use what’s learned to guide actions through college governance structures (e.g. AAC, Student Development Office, President’s Staff, Faculty Executive Committee, and Student Commission).

Please include a brief budget for spending your mini-grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIRP-CSS</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>$1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Causerie</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return this application to Paul Sotherland (paulsoth@kzoo.edu) by 22 February 2010.
Appendix Six

2010 Community Causerie Slides for Presentation
The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) has revealed consistently outstanding learning outcomes at Kalamazoo College. Gains in CLA scores are also consistently outstanding at Kalamazoo College. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) has revealed persistent “best practices” that yield desired learning outcomes at K. NSSE has also revealed a need to improve the “lived experience” of ‘K’ students.

Kalamazoo College 2005-2006

CLA Performance at ‘K’
2005 First-Year Students and 2006 Seniors

- First-Year CLA scores were at the low end of “at expected”
- Senior CLA scores were at the high end of “above expected”

Gain on the CLA at ‘K’ was “well above expected.”

Bottom line… ‘K’ students do remarkably well on the CLA and show remarkably high gains over four years.
Kalamazoo College 2005 to 2009

Longitudinal Effect Size

Effect sizes are one way to measure change between time points, and indicate the “practical significance” of the mean (or average) difference between those time points.

In practice, an effect size of 0.2 is often considered small, 0.5 moderate, and 0.8 large.

Kalamazoo College 2005 to 2009

A thought experiment...measuring heart rate

1. Record “Resting” (R) heart rate of each person here.
2. Calculate Variation among all Resting heart rates.
3. Exercise!
4. Record Post-Exercise (PE) heart rate of each person.
5. Calculate “Effect Size” of exercising for each person...
   \[
   \text{Effect Size} = \frac{(\text{PE heart rate} - \text{R heart rate})}{\text{Variation}}
   \]
6. Calculate average Effect Size for 'K'.

Do the same “experiment” at 29 other institutions.
Longitudinal Effect Size
A real experiment...measuring CLA “gains” and an effect of a college education

In each of the five box and whisker plots on the right, the extreme left-hand vertical bar shows the 5th percentile. The “box” shows the 25th (left face), 50th (internal vertical line), and 75th (right face) percentile points. The extreme right-hand vertical line shows the 95th percentile. The horizontal x-axis shows the effect size (in standard deviation units).

Filled dots represent average effect sizes for ‘K’ seniors on each portion of the CLA. These students took the CLA at the outset of their first year (Phase 1) and again toward the end of their senior year (Phase 3). For each CLA measure, K seniors showed effect sizes (the effect of a K College education on CLA gains) beyond the 95th percentile.

What accounts for variation in “effect” of ‘K’ education?
What can we learn from disaggregating the data?
Kalamazoo College 2005 to 2009

Kalamazoo College
2005 to 2009 CLA
Change in Total CLA Score vs First-Year CLA Total Score

Kalamazoo College
2005 to 2009 CLA
Change in Total CLA Score vs Estimated Academic Ability (e.g. SAT)

Kalamazoo College 2005 to 2009 CLA
Change in Total CLA Score vs First-Year CLA Total Score

Kalamazoo College 2005 to 2009

Kalamazoo College
2005 to 2009 CLA
Change in Total CLA Score vs EAA

Kalamazoo College - 2009 Seniors
CLA Total Score vs EAA

Kalamazoo College - 2005 First-Years
CLA Total Score vs EAA

Kalamazoo College - 2009 Seniors
CLA Total Score vs First-Year (2005) Total CLA Score

Kalamazoo College - 2005 First-Years
CLA Total Score vs First-Year (2005) Total CLA Score

Kalamazoo College Adjusted CLA (mean +/- std error)
2006 and 2007 Senior Students
Sample sizes shown in parentheses

Kalamazoo College - 2009 Seniors
First-Year to Senior Change in CLA Total Score
Data shown as mean +/- sem; sample size in parentheses

Adjusted CLA (Actual-Expected)

Estimated Academic Ability (e.g. SAT)

http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-sp07/pr-p07_practice.cfm
http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR663/

CLA Standard Setting
Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
NSSE Benchmarks

What does the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) tell us about the ‘K’ environment that might yield those learning outcomes, and gains in those outcomes over four years?

A number of national studies have identified practices that correlate strongly with learning gains.

Our NSSE data show that K students experience these practices more than students at our peer institutions, perhaps explaining in part our students’ exceptionally strong performance on the CLA.

These practices include:
- Prompt feedback from faculty
- Number of written pages together with number of pages of assigned reading
- Time students report preparing for class and on academic work
- High expectations from faculty

Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
NSSE Benchmarks

Level of Academic Challenge (LAC) is high and has been that way. Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE) also remain high and are a prominent feature of the K-Plan.

Together, these make a rich and challenging learning environment. WELL DONE ‘K’!!

Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) and Student-Faculty Interactions (SFI) are waning. And... while Supportive Campus Environment (SCE) continues to be lower than desired, improvements at ‘K’ in some areas are yielding positive results.

NSSE and The CLA

Score for Seniors (mean +/- SD)

Level of Academic Challenge (LAC) is high and has been that way. Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE) also remain high and are a prominent feature of the K-Plan.

Together, these make a rich and challenging learning environment. WELL DONE ‘K’!!

Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) and Student-Faculty Interactions (SFI) are waning. And... while Supportive Campus Environment (SCE) continues to be lower than desired, improvements at ‘K’ in some areas are yielding positive results.

Nat. 2004 – Nat. 2009 data are from 36 baccalaureate arts and sciences institutions from across the country that participated in the NSSE in 2004, 2006, and 2009.
When considered together...
...and in light of our CLA results...
...does this picture convey how Kalamazoo College feels to YOU?

Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
NSSE Benchmarks

Student-Faculty Interactions (SFI)
and
Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)

Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
NSSE Benchmarks

Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
NSSE Benchmarks

First-Year Responses on SFI Questions

Senior Responses on SFI Questions
Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
Supportive Campus Environment
First-Year Responses on Support Questions
2004 - 2009

Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
Supportive Campus Environment
Senior Responses on Support Questions
2004 - 2009

Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
Supportive Campus Environment
First-Year Responses on Relationship Questions
2004 - 2009

Kalamazoo College 2004 to 2009
Supportive Campus Environment
Senior Responses on Relationship Questions
2004 - 2009
How can we best sustain these outcomes while improving the learning environment?
APPENDIX SEVEN

PROPOSAL AND HANDOUTS FOR
DUEWEKE AND SOTHERLAND PRESENTATION
2010 AAC&U ANNUAL MEETING
Creating a more vibrant learning environment through faculty and staff development

We will lead a session, using a Teagle-funded project at Kalamazoo College as a case study, to engage the audience in a discussion about nurturing curricular vitality through faculty and staff development. The case study underscores wit, will, and wallet by demonstrating means for uncovering, supporting, highlighting, and funding pockets of educational innovation on campus. Through projects funded by mini-grants, and a campus-wide Symposium on Teaching and Learning, we aim to transform the college into a more vibrant learning environment by entraining a regular pulse of query, exploration, documentation, and conversation about student learning and what promotes it best. Our annual call for teaching and learning proposals uncovers pockets of innovation by inviting faculty and staff to explore questions “that they have come to regard as important, intriguing, or beautiful” (Bain). We support Teagle Learning Fellows (faculty and staff with mini-grants) through a community of practice that provides opportunities “to try, fail, receive feedback, and try again - before anyone makes judgments of their efforts” (Bain) and to engage in structured reflection about the process. We then highlight innovations and accomplishments at our campus-wide symposium, during which Fellows give presentations on challenges and successes encountered in their projects. With external support, we are carrying out a proof of principle leading to an internally funded, sustainable program that will not only benefit Kalamazoo College but also serve as a model for other institutions. To assess effectiveness of our project, we created a list of attributes of a vibrant learning environment, used that list as part of a baseline “culture audit,” and will employ the list again to gauge the extent of the college's transformation at the end of the project. After briefly describing our project, we will engage session participants in discussions about applicability of our attribute list to their home institutions, effectiveness of using this sort of faculty and staff development to transform an institution, and roles of structured reflection in improving teaching and learning. Through these discussions, session participants will gain concrete ideas about implementing a similar program.

Proposal for a presentation at the 2010 AAC&U Annual Meeting
Anne Dueweke and Paul Sotherland
Kalamazoo College
Structured Reflection catalyzes transformative learning by employing intentionally designed exercises, activities, or assignments that help students (and others) make connections between (a) assumptions held and experiences encountered, (b) assumptions held and theories/concepts known, and (c) experiences encountered and theories/concepts known.

# Learning-Centered Teachers and Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Steven Farr (Teach for America)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pat Hutchings (2008)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Kay McLenney</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>An “engaged” campus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning-Centered Institution</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Constantly re-evaluate what they are doing</strong></th>
<th><strong>Educators actively involved in asking questions about students’ experiences</strong></th>
<th><strong>Institution systematically assesses and documents student learning; these data prompt and support institution and individuals to reflect and act</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avidly recruit students and parents into the process</strong></td>
<td><strong>Faculty (and others) seek out student perspectives on their learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Institution emphasizes student learning in its processes for recruiting, hiring, orienting, deploying, evaluating, and developing personnel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain focus on student learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Talk together about impacts of students’ experiences on what students know and can do</strong></td>
<td><strong>Institution has clearly defined outcomes for student learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set big goals for students; plan exhaustively and purposefully by working backward from goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Key institutional documents and policies, collegial effort, and leadership behavior consistently reflect a focus on student learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work relentlessly, refusing to surrender to “external” obstacles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Everyone embraces the challenge of continually doing better for students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Structured Reflection Questions

Do concepts about “Great Teachers and Great Colleges” seem sufficient to you? What would you add?

Which “attributes” seem most appropriate and attainable? What’s missing from the list?

Do you think the SoTL mini-grant program would help achieve the attributes of a vibrant teaching and learning environment at your institution?
Perceptible Attributes of a Vibrant Teaching and Learning Environment
[In which a “positive restlessness” (Kuh) abounds]

- The institution has high expectations for student learning.

- There is consensus on learning outcomes at several levels throughout the institution that is evident through an audit of course syllabi and department/program assessment plans, course catalogues, and through conversations with students.

- Evidence of students attaining learning outcomes is regularly gathered, discussed, and acted upon.

- Faculty and staff gather frequently (both regularly and spontaneously) for evidential (as well as anecdotal) conversations about learning. Highly visible and highly regarded gatherings are held at least annually. “How do you know?” questions are frequently heard (and expected) during the discourse occurring at these gatherings.

- There is a critical mass (e.g. 10-20%) of faculty involved in SoTL projects at any one time, even though membership of this group will ideally change from year to year. However, the vast majority of faculty regularly engage in structured reflection about their teaching and continually work to improve student learning.

- Institutional data (including data from SoTL projects) informs what is transpiring in the classroom and in other learning experiences for students.

- The institution (faculty, administration, staff, students, alumni, and trustees) carefully examines data from sources such as the NSSE or the Wabash National Study, chooses high impact practices on which to focus, and then engages in action research (without being too fussy about methods – always triangulating, always acting) systematically (Bok, 2006) to improve the educational experiences of students.

- Students are routinely employed as sources of meaningful information about the educational environment. Students provide this information by completing surveys or other instruments to measure whether learning outcomes are attained. They can also help gather information by interviewing other students or participating in focus groups used to generate narrative data.

- SoTL activities matter when hiring new faculty, helping faculty develop, and making promotion and tenure decisions. A manifestation of this is department chairs encouraging faculty to engage in SoTL endeavors.

- A point person (or office), whose professional self-worth derives from the institution being a vibrant teaching and learning environment, has an administration-level appointment at the institution. While broadly shared ownership of improving student learning is essential, the point person coordinates and organizes the multifarious activities involved in this endeavor.
CREATING A MORE VIBRANT LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
THROUGH FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT
A project supported by a grant from The Teagle Foundation

Goal: To transform Kalamazoo College into a more vibrant learning environment by entraining a regular pulse of query, exploration, documentation, conversation, and action to improve student learning.

Means:

- Uncover pockets of innovation by inviting faculty and staff to explore questions “that they have come to regard as important, intriguing, or beautiful” (Bain).

- Fund projects with mini-grants.

- Support Teagle Learning Fellows (faculty and staff with mini-grants) through a community of practice that provides opportunities “to try, fail, receive feedback, and try again – before anyone makes judgments of their efforts” (Bain) and to engage in structured reflection about what they're learning through their projects.

- Highlight innovations and accomplishments at a campus-wide Symposium on Teaching and Learning, during which Fellows give presentations on insights into student learning gained through challenges and successes encountered in their projects.

- With external support, carry out a proof of principle leading to an internally funded, sustainable program that will improve Kalamazoo College while also possibly serving as a model for other institutions.

- Assess effectiveness of our project using a list of attributes of a vibrant learning environment as part of a baseline “culture audit,” and employing the list again to gauge the extent of the college’s transformation at the end of the project.
Appendix Eight

Program for 2010
Kalamazoo College
Symposium on Teaching and Learning
Third Annual

Symposium on Teaching and Learning

Thursday, 10 June 2010

KALAMAZOO COLLEGE

1:00  
ZAIDE PIXLEY, JOE BROCKINGTON, ALISON GEIST, JOAN HAWXHURST, BREIGH MONTGOMERY, AND MARGARET WIEDENHOEFT

First-Year Experience, Center for International Programs, MJUS Institute for Service Learning, and Center for Career and Professional Development

A Replicable Model for Structured Reflection in First-Year Seminars

1:30  
REGINA STEVENS-TRUSS

Department of Chemistry

Peer-Pb Teaching and Learning: To Do or Not To Do?

2:00  
CLAIRE AMSLER, SIMONA GRAUR, SAMANTHA LEWIS, CLARISSA LINDLEY, AND EMILY ROHN

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, SENIOR MAJORS

Student-Faculty Interactions: Insights from Student-Led Student Focus Groups

2:30  
COFFEE BREAK AND CONVERSATIONS

3:00  
KARYN BOATWRIGHT

Department of Psychology

Learning Preferences of Students in Introductory Psychology Courses

3:30  
MARGARET WIEDENHOEFT AND KATIE MACLEAN

Center for International Programs and Department of Romance Languages

Near(-)native speakers: Expectations for language learning on Study Abroad

Lunch (12:30) and Presentations in Hicks Center Banquet Room

We are grateful for continuing support from The Teagle Foundation.
Kalamazoo College
Application to Participate in
Wabash National Study 2010-2013
1. **What are the two or three most important things that you would like to gain from having your institution participate in the Wabash Study? (Please feel free to list any ideas, ranging from help with accreditation, to assessing general education or improving retention, to examining the impact of your institution on different subpopulations of students.)**

   - Gain a clearer understanding of Inputs, Experiences, and Outcomes (IEO) at ‘K’ and how Inputs and Experiences affect (and effect) Outcomes. And, gain a better understanding of ways in which IEO at ‘K’ are similar to, and different from, IEO at other institutions in the WNS.
   - Develop, adapt, and use rubrics to assess student work. (Are there rubrics that can be used to assess leadership, interpersonal communication, conflict resolution, etc?) Develop users of rubrics as well.
   - Continue to bring more of the ‘K’ community “into the fold” of engaging in the work of using evidence to improve student learning – *i.e.* using evidence to enhance the synergy between Inputs and Experiences to improve Outcomes. This goal aligns very well with the goal of our current Teagle Learning Fellow project.

2. **Please identify the student learning outcomes that you are most interested in assessing and possibly improving.**

   - Ability to do Structured Reflection
   - Effect(s) of doing Structured Reflection (*e.g.* acting on what is learned by reflecting)
   - Make connections among facets of ‘K’ education and develop an internal locus of control over becoming better educated
   - Institution Learning Outcomes – writing, foreign language, depth in a discipline, breadth across disciplines, leadership and civic engagement, and ability to solve unscripted problems
   - Lead a balanced life

3. **What programs, departments, divisions, or components of your curriculum are you most interested in assessing and possibly improving?**

   - Shared Passages Seminars (a new sequence of First-Year, Sophomore, and Senior seminars intended to provide a general education “thread” connecting depth and breadth)
   - General education breadth – what kind of, and how much, breadth is encountered and effective?
   - Advising
   - Campus Life programs, particularly those focused on leadership development

4. **Based on what you currently know, what programs, departments, extracurricular activities, or other areas in your institution have a strong, positive impact on your students?**

   - Everything under the NSSE LAC and EEE - high expectations of faculty and of students, challenging coursework, student time-on-task, Study Abroad, Service-Learning, Internships/Externships, Senior Individualized Project (SIP) seem synergistically...somehow...to effect gains in learning outcomes (as per CLA).
   - Involvement in various campus life components seem (as per the literature) to have a positive effect on student satisfaction, retention, and learning. However, we need to collect, analyze, and act on information from ‘K’.
5. **Based on what you currently know, where do your students struggle most? (Include elements of the curriculum and the co-curricular environment.)**

- Leading a balanced life
- Engaging in activities when they are not “for credit”
- Managing (internal and external) stress/pressure to perform well
- Long-range planning

6. **What structures and processes are currently in place to handle assessment at your institution?**

   a. **What campus governance structures play a role in gathering and using assessment data?**
      - Faculty Assessment Committee, collaborating with academic departments
      - Academic Affairs and Student Development data-sharing group, co-chaired by Anne Dueweke
      - Teagle Learning Fellow project
      - Beginning 1 July 2011 – a half-time Associate Provost for Student Learning and Assessment

   b. **Do you have an institutional researcher?**
      - Yes – Anne Dueweke is Director of Institutional Research and Faculty Grants

   c. **Does your institutional researcher support assessment?**
      - Yes

   d. **Do you have the capacity to readily pull data from your student information systems?**
      - Yes

   e. **Do you have the capacity to merge data from student information systems with survey data like NSSE or HERI?**
      - Yes

   f. **Do you have a teaching and learning center? Is its work informed by campus assessment efforts?**
      - No, but we do have a faculty Committee on Teaching, which is merging with the Shared Passages Task Force that is responsible for developing our new Shared Passages Seminars, the thread running through our more “open” general education curriculum. Work of this committee is, and will become even more, informed by campus assessment efforts.

7. **What national surveys or standardized tests does your campus currently use for assessment? If you need experience or outcome data for your Wabash Study Assessment Portfolio, what survey/instrument are you considering out of the choices listed in the study description—i.e., NSSE or YFCY/CSS; CLA, CAAP or the ETS Proficiency Profile (formerly MAPP)?**

   - Currently – NSSE, CIRP-TFS, CIRP-CSS, CLA, Core Alcohol and Drug Survey, and NASPA Assessment & Knowledge Consortium Study (http://www.naspaconsortium.org/about.htm), as well as HEDS Senior Survey in the past.
   - Future – we will administer the CIRP-YFCY in spring 2011, and we will likely administer the FSSE during the 2010-2011 academic year.
8. **Have you used rubrics to assess student work? Please briefly describe this work.**

- We have very rudimentary, and limited use of, rubrics in some departments and programs. Most rubrics used tend to be lists of grading criteria rather than a grid that describes student performance at various levels of proficiency. That said, many departments have expressed, in annual assessment reports, a need and desire to develop rubrics to assess learning outcomes.
- This is clearly an area that needs development at ‘K’.

9. **What additional campus evidence do you wish to include in your Wabash Study Assessment Portfolio?**

- As mentioned above, participating in the Wabash National Study aligns well with ongoing endeavors that are part of, and have grown out of, our Teagle Learning Fellow project. Please see our implementation plan included with this application.
- A new initiative at Kalamazoo College is the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership – ACSJL ([https://reason.kzoo.edu/csjl/](https://reason.kzoo.edu/csjl/)). During the past year, a group of faculty and staff (including Brian Dietz, Anne Dueweke, and Paul Sotherland) met weekly to develop an assessment plan for the ACSJL. The engaging, enlightening, and productive process helped everyone develop a clearer notion of what it means to assess a program. We can imagine that implementing this plan, and revising it along the way, can tie in nicely with our work in the Wabash National Study.

10. **Who will be the Campus Leader for the Wabash Study at your institution? You can specify two people for this role if you wish.**

- We propose to have a three-person leadership team composed of **Brian Dietz**, Assistant Dean of Students, **Anne Dueweke**, Director of Institutional Research and Faculty Grants, and **Paul Sotherland**, Professor of Biology.