2014-2015 Disciplinary Lens Assessment Reporting: Literature & Humanities and Visual & Performing Arts

Phase 1 of the ULO Assessment Plan for Boise State was launched in 2014-15 with a pilot assessment of ULOs 9 (Visual & Performing Arts) and 10 (Literature & Humanities). Faculty submitting data in the fall were told that they would not have to resubmit data in the spring. Small adjustments were made to the submission form between the fall and spring semesters based on the feedback of the pilot group. Table 1 indicates the number of courses that were represented in the response (faculty were encouraged to combine multiple course sections on one report). In Spring 2015, 112 course reports were requested and 78 were completed for a 68% response rate. Our percentage of participation for all disciplinary lens (DL) courses for the year is calculated with the assumption of one report being generated per class. Therefore, the rate shown above may appear lower than it actually is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FA 14</th>
<th>SP 15</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Reports per department

Faculty were asked to report on the average course proficiency after directly assessing learning artifacts collected during the semester. For courses with 50 or fewer enrollees, 5 random samples were chosen, in those with 51-101 10 randomly selected artifacts were reviewed and those with more than 101 enrolled were asked to review 15 artifacts. Possible score range for proficiency is 1 (unsatisfactory) to 4 (exemplary).
Disciplinary Lens in Literature and Humanities (DLL)

During the Fall 2014 DLL Assessment Pilot, 39 course reports were submitted by DLL faculty, and in the Spring term 71 more were submitted. Since multiple sections of a course can be submitted on one report, we cannot conclude the percentage of participation. Changes between the fall and spring semester to the assessment survey based on pilot feedback seemed to reduce confusion and result in more complete information being submitted.

Phase II of the Assessment Plan:

Boise State’s Assessment Plan calls for “phase II” to include a “sense making” process conducted by departments and/or areas of the curriculum. Based on the reported data by DLL faculty, students’ reasoning (ULO 10.3) and communication skills (ULO 10.2) are the lowest rated criteria. These results suggest that DLL faculty may want to consider approaches and assignments to support these criteria.

Faculty were asked to describe the ways in which the conclusions they had drawn during the assessment process have implications for future course planning or instructional methods. The sample comments have been organized into loose categories for your consideration. The raw data (with faculty and course section identification redacted) from all questions on the submitted assessment surveys is available upon request.

Implications for Change: Faculty Commentary

Category: Classroom Teaching Strategies

- In my case, I am working [to] create more time in class to engage the students in communicative activities. For example, role playing, class discussions, an additional oral presentation.
- I will continue to include non-writing activities and modes of assessment to maintain student engagement and bring out the best in their thinking.
- I will continue to try to incorporate a wide variety of activities in my classroom to help meet varied learners' needs.
- I want to try new ways of having students view more of each others' work. Perhaps a group 'peer review' of midterms or even a new mode of handling the discussion board so that it's not just a mechanical initial post plus two responses.
- Definitively, I will be doing the group/pair activities in order to create a safe environment for them. I will create situational activities guiding them to write/read to their peers their ideas, after they feel comfortable, I will encouraging them to use the language in the real life situations but not in front of the class.
- Students recognize the value of the reading responses in prompting them to read the material and preparing them to discuss it. Students responded more comprehensively to assignments that asked for a first person response, rather than an academic one. I will look for ways to let students connect personally to all material while introducing academic conventions.
- I have added more opportunity for students to immerse themselves in the target language. Those students who attend events and serve in the community outside of class have stronger skills and develop language faster than students who choose not to attend. I am requiring more time in the community.
Category: Course Design

- I will probably re-arrange the (chronological) order in which I had organized readings and chapters so that we tackle easier texts at first. We will go against the grain of history and several literary schools, but will ease into the texts more gradually.
- I need to use more target language in each class to improve my students’ oral and listening skills.
- Clearly, more time must be spent on cultural connections. I plan to do this by restructuring the historical lectures to promote thinking across time and culture.
- I anticipated that some students may be new to ‘writing and talking about literature’ so I had created a few lectures for the beginning of the course on topics like ‘detecting theme’ etc. I think I may have to do more of this.
- I think I might teach the course in a split rather than cover all of human history so that we spend more time on particular ideas, though the downfall would be not having the historical context needed if only the second split was taught or not seeing how the origins of culture inform later periods if only the first split is taught.


During the Spring 2014 DLV Assessment, seven course reports were submitted by DLV faculty. Since multiple sections of a course can be submitted on one report, we cannot conclude the percentage of participation. While DLL faculty were included in the fall “pilot” for the assessment process, DLV faculty were not. Lack of familiarity with the process might have impacted DLV faculty response to the assessment data collection request.

Phase II of the Assessment Plan:

Boise State’s Assessment Plan calls for “phase II” to include a “sense making” process conducted by departments and/or areas of the curriculum. FSP and Institutional Research will be working with the DLV faculty to review the assessment process, to discuss their DL courses and to generate assessment reports during the 2015-16 academic year.