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Introduction

Students and Faculty in the Archive (SAFA) is a FIPSE–funded project led by Brooklyn Historical Society. In the project, 18 faculty in three Brooklyn colleges are collaborating with BHS staff to create archival research experiences that enhance engagement and learning for 1st and 2nd year undergraduates. Participating campuses are St. Francis College, Long Island University, and New York City Technical College (City Tech). Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC) is the project evaluator. The three–year project began in January 2011.

Table 1 shows the project’s key goals, as stated in the proposal and in the revised Evaluation Plan submitted to FIPSE in April 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Improve student retention and academic success for 1st and 2nd year college students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Build collaborative network of three Brooklyn campuses and the Brooklyn Historical Society aimed at enhancing student engagement and learning through archival research projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Develop and implement college humanities, art, and technology courses for 1st &amp; 2nd year students enriched by significant archival research projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Improve faculty ability to integrate archival research into 1st &amp; 2nd year humanities courses in support deeper and more engaged student learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Improve student learning of key inquiry and archival literacy skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evaluation report, written six months into Year 1, summarizes progress toward these key project goals and objectives. The evaluation has not gathered outcome data — that is, data on institutional, faculty or student change tied to program activities. Instead the report presents evidence that activity has occurred in each of the key program areas, identifies indicators of progress toward the goals, and suggests areas for possible improvement of project activities.

As evaluator, EDC has three primary questions at the six–month point:

1. Have project activities occurred in each of the major program areas?
2. Is there evidence from documents, surveys and observations that the activities are helping participants make progress in the direction of key project goals and objectives?
3. What if any changes in program structure might help the project achieve its early goals more effectively?
The report is based on the following activities and data:

- Meetings with assessment staff on the three partner campuses
- Review of project documents – agendas for workshops and Institutes, faculty course plans, assessment rubrics;
- Results of faculty questionnaires;
- Observations of group meetings – including a kick off meeting in February, and the Summer Institute June 13–17
- Meetings with BHS program staff

The goals in Table 1 serve as the basis for this evaluation report. In each section, we will provide the methodology utilized for gathering evidence of progress toward the goal, and provide evaluative recommendations for subsequent program activities as needed.

**Goal 1: Improve student retention and academic success for 1st and 2nd year college students.**

**Evaluation Activities**

In response to program officer feedback, EDC has produced a revised Evaluation Plan (attached, dated 7/15/11) focused on student retention as the overarching project goal.

In June and July EDC met with assessment and IR staff at LIU, St. Francis College and City Tech to a) introduce the project and its goals and timeframe; b) create a plan for sharing data on student retention rates, course pass rates, and grades; and c) identify key personnel who will work on the data sharing going forward.

**Summary of Progress**

Campus assessment and IR staff have agreed in principle to share data that will help answer three questions:

A. Do students in SAFA courses show higher retention rates than comparison students?

To answer this question, campus staff have agreed to share the following data:

- The 1-year retention rate for first-time, full-time students in course sections taught by SAFA faculty.
- The 1-year retention rate for students in a) alternative sections of the same course (i.e., taught by non-SAFA faculty); or b) the smallest proximal unit (e.g., department).

Campuses will report these data for the ‘census days’ in 2011 (non-SAFA baseline), 2012 and 2013. (Census days are the day when campuses count the number of ‘full-time, first-time’ students for federal reporting purposes.)
will enable EDC to compare student retention rates for two project years in across multiple course sections, and also aggregate across campuses. For LIU and City Tech, which have a higher proportion of non-full-time students than St. Francis, we will work with assessment to analyze data on part-time students as well. For the minority of course sections that include 2nd year students, we will work with assessment staff to examine retention from years 2–3, another common drop-out point. Where colleges collect and report it, we will include data about whether students are retained within CUNY, or transfer to a known college.

B. Do students in SAFA courses show higher raters of course completion, and higher course grades, than non-SAFA students?

To examine this question, we are asking campus staff to report two data points in September of 2012 and 2013:

- The grade distribution in course sections taught by SAFA faculty (number of As, Bs, Cs, Ds, Fs, Inc, and W)
- The grade distribution in alternative sections taught by non-SAFA faculty

This will enable us to calculate and compare a) course completion rates; b) course pass rates; and c) grades across the two cohorts, in order to see if students’ participation in SAFA is associated with higher rates on these variables.

C. For students who are active SAFA participants, how does participation influence course-taking choices, choice of major, and career plans?

To examine this question we will follow an intentional sample of 15 year 1 students – 5 from each campus – and interview them in each of the three years to understand the extent to which their SAFA experiences influence subsequent course-taking patterns, choice of major, and academic & job interests. This cohort may consist of those students who participate in the BHS curatorial internships that are offered.

Goal 2: Build a collaborative network of three Brooklyn campuses and the Brooklyn Historical Society aimed at deepening student engagement and learning through archival research projects.

Evaluation Activities & Data
Data gathered on this goal include: meeting notes from design meetings with BHS program staff at the FIPSE program workshop in Washington DC in January, 2011; observations and notes from the February kick-off meeting at BHS with participating faculty; notes of three meetings with BHS program staff on project, web, and assessment design; and observations and faculty survey responses from the Summer Institute, June 13–17.

Summary of Progress

SAFA has made substantial progress on in building a faculty network committed to enriching their courses through archival research projects with BHS. During this period project staff:

a. met with campus leadership and recruited and selected 18 faculty participants on the three campuses;

b. gathered the participants from each campus in a kick-off meeting at BHS in February 2011 that began to engage them in the intellectual and pedagogical design issues in the project;

c. held individual follow-up meetings with each faculty member to begin shaping a course plan and the roles that BHS collections could best might play; and

d. held a 5-day Summer Institute for faculty to develop and refine their course plans, identify the roles archival materials would play and the skills students would need to work with them; and work with each other collaboratively

Indicators of progress

The following are indicators that the project has enlisted the commitment of faculty participants to this challenging work, and has also begun to build a sense of community among them.

- At the conclusion of the Summer Institute, every participant made an appointment return to the BHS during their summer break to continue research in preparation for their course assignments. This indicates substantial commitment to the project.

- In interviews and questionnaires during and after the Institute, nearly all of the faculty (16 of 17) said they greatly valued the working relationships they had developed so far, with BHS staff, and their colleagues. Some of their comments include:
  - “I feel very supported by the BHS. Hopefully we can instill that in students, too.”
  - “I’ve never had so much help in planning a course – both input from BHS, and other faculty.”
  - “It really helped to have introductory meetings [with Julie and Robin] before the summer institute – that was great preparation.”
“The sense of collegiality is great – it’s more fun to work in a group.”
“I wouldn’t have had the same result if I hadn’t been talking and sharing with [the other faculty] in my group.”

- Faculty overwhelmingly agreed that the group should meet at least once during the coming school year (between semesters), to share what they are learning about what works and what does not. Several expressed a wish for more informal brown bag forums in between, where they could share and talk through syllabi and assignments in person.

- Participants were also very positive about the idea of bringing students together during the school year -- also between semesters -- to present their work to each other.

Recommendations
BHS staff should simply continue to support the faculty in the many ways they have been. Here are the types of support participants said in the end-of-Institute questionnaire that they wanted:
- 15 of 17 want 1-on-1 follow-up planning meetings (an average of 1–2)
- 14 of 17 say they would like a mid-year gathering of the group, to learn from the first term;
- 14 of 17 wanted BHS staff to be available for coaching of students in their research projects
- 12 of 17 said to keep reminding them of project benchmarks, mostly via email
- Most faculty were interested in a student meeting or conference where student work would be shared, but they wanted BHS to organize this; this can likely wait until year 2.

Goal 3: Develop and implement college humanities, art, and technology courses for 1st & 2nd year students enriched by significant archival research projects.

Evaluation Activities & Data
Data gathered on this goal include: notes from design meetings with BHS program staff; observations and notes from the February kick-off meeting at BHS with participating faculty; interviews with faculty about their evolving
projects at the beginning and end of the Summer Institute, and review of faculty Course Plans.

Summary of Progress

The project has made demonstrable progress toward this goal. Faculty have produced detailed Course Plans for 20 courses to be taught in the upcoming Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 terms. In total, BHS anticipates having 800 students in these courses come to the Historical Society to do archival research during this period. These numbers exceed the targets set in the SAFA Evaluation Plan.

In support of faculty course planning, BHS staff Julie Golia, Robin Katz, Chela Weber and Deborah Schwartz undertook a remarkable set of scaffolding activities, which included in part:

a. A February 2011 kick-off meeting that helped faculty brainstorm initial ideas, based on the intersection of their interests, course content and goals, and BHS collections.
b. Individual meetings with each faculty member to further define targets of opportunity for course plans, and identify the likely BHS collections;
c. A thorough review of BHS collections to identify particular materials that might be most relevant for each faculty member;
d. Hiring of an Educational Technologist and the building of web templates for the Course Websites on which faculty and students will publish their work.
e. A 5-day Summer Institute at which faculty had time to do significant research with the archival sources their students would use, create detailed course plans, and share and revise their thinking.

Indicators of progress

The following are indicators that the 20 courses designed for the coming year are on track to include significant archival research with a likelihood of student impact.

• Greater specificity & boundaries around student projects. EDC noted that, between the initial February meeting and the end of the Institute, faculty members’ project ideas improved in three ways: a) they became much more focused, b) they were more grounded in specific archival materials as evidence, and c) they began to include specific supports for students in reading and making sense of sources. For example, a project idea by a City Tech faculty member that began as an exploration of ‘Brooklyn culture in different time periods’ became one in which students are researching four Brooklyn vaudeville theaters, analyzing specific materials and guided by a set of questions.
• Wide variety in student projects. Some faculty have designed student research projects that are relatively small in scope and short in duration, while others are making student work in the BHS archives far more central to the entire course. This variety reflects the BHS staff’s sensitivity to the specific needs and contexts each faculty member has; rather than create a ‘one-size-fits-all’ template for the project, BHS has helped faculty create project designs that have a strong likelihood of working for them.

• Detailed course plans. Faculty have produced detailed course plans following a template that BHS gave them at the beginning of the week. The template asks them to think through many different components of the archival research project students will do, from broad course goals, to plans for specific student experiences in their BHS visit. The template includes: Course Objectives, goals for Class Visits to the BHS, plans for Individual Student Visits, description and sequence of Assignments, plans for Student Interactions with Primary Sources, plans for the Course Website and the products students will put on it, and plans for Assessment of student learning.

Recommendations
Going forward in the planning and delivery of courses, BHS staff and faculty should attend to the following concerns that some faculty expressed in interviews and questionnaires:

a. Student reading levels. A number of faculty expressed concern that their students – many of whom are immigrants or have arrived poorly prepared by NYC high schools -- would find the literacy demands of the archival material challenging. Project members should share strategies for supporting readers in reading and making sense of sources – transcriptions of handwriting, pre-reading in class before going to the archive, reading aloud in a group, ‘jig-sawing’ large or long documents, using prompts & questions to guide reading, providing glossaries, etc.

b. Motivating students when work is difficult. Some faculty also worried that when the novelty of a visit to the BHS wore off, their students might resist the new or extra effort required to deal with challenging sources. Giving students early opportunities to become authors (e.g., writing blog posts), and experiences of success in interpreting sources (perhaps photos or images, initially) may help here.

c. Skills required for web authoring. Most faculty are excited about the web authoring component of the project (particularly those teaching English and humanities courses). About half of faculty (8 of 17) expressed some concern as well, mainly due to their lack of experience guiding students
in web authoring, and their uncertainty about the particular tool, WordPress. Ways to address this include: 1) Having the instructional technologist Aaron meet with faculty before the course begins or early in the term to clarify the site layout/design and the steps through which students will add their contributions; 2) helping faculty identify people who can teach & coach students about how to use the web tools; and 3) sharing concrete models for web products (blogs and workspaces) that faculty and students can choose among.

Goal 4: Improve faculty ability to integrate archival research into 1st & 2nd year humanities courses in support deeper and more engaged student learning experiences.

Evaluation Activities and Data
EDC used an online exercise called a ‘Critical Incident Survey’ to collect baseline data on faculty skills in integrating archival research into their courses. Faculty took the online survey on the second day of the Summer Institute. We also interviewed faculty during the week about their projects, and kept track of the kinds of struggles they were having as they designed their projects.

Summary of Progress
BHS staff gave faculty explicit instruction in ‘archival literacy’ throughout the spring term and the Summer Institute, and helped them think about how to build these skills with students:
• During the April kick-off meeting they had faculty tackle an archival research task (with documents about Brooklyn’s incorporation into NYC in 1898), and then debrief it.
• On the first day of the Summer Institute staff broke faculty into cross-campus groups and had them work on detailed inquiry tasks that they had created around collections/materials that faculty were interested in using; these got faculty talking in depth about the resources, and the challenges of creating realistic questions and themes that students can explore using them.
• Throughout the week-long Institute, SAFA staff and BHS archivists provided coaching to faculty in finding, reading, and contextualizing primary materials, and shaping their course designs around them.

Indicators of progress
The following are indicators that these activities have improved faculty’s knowledge and ability in integrating archival research into their courses. EDC gathered baseline data on these skills at the start of the institute but will not
have comparison data until the end of the year. Supporting quotes and the data in Table 2 were gathered via online survey at the end of the Summer Institute (N=15).

- Faculty knowledge of BHS collections, as resources for research & teaching [self-report]
  As Table 2 suggests, faculty overwhelmingly valued the BHS staff’s help and said that research time with the collections led to much greater understanding of BHS resources:
  - “I have a much better idea of the BHS holdings. Only by looking at the physical holdings was I able to craft an assignment that (I hope) will be effective.”
  - “I come away with the rich resources that are available through the staff and their depth of knowledge of the archival material as well as the history & connections to be made with people, places, etc. in Brooklyn.”
  - “The key aspect of the [Institute] for me was the time we actually spent in the archive. We were able to get a good sense of the history itself and the archival materials that will shape the courses.”

Table 2: Greatest Opportunities for Learning; Challenges going Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival research-teaching students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival research-course planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival research-faculty learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS staff as a resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives as a resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Faculty knowledge about integrating archival materials into courses [self-report]
  Faculty also said they had learned more about integrating archival materials into coursework:
  - “It has been helpful to have a structured introduction to archive materials and how to integrate them into teaching. I’ve done very
little archival research and have never taught with them, so the Institute was a useful foundation.”
- “[I gained]... a concrete understanding of the ways in which I can incorporate archival materials into my syllabus & assignments.”
- “I have a much clearer sense of my course, but I still have so much to do to figure out what work to collect, how to guide students…”

• Strategies for supporting students in learning with primary sources [self-report]

Seven faculty members (half of those responding) said they appreciated learning how to teach students to do research with archival materials:
- “I appreciated the learning activities on the first day because they made me think through the process of getting students to approach archival texts.”
- “[I will assistance] in helping students familiarize themselves with methods for archival research, especially on first visit to BHS or when doing individual searches.”

• Faculty skill in teaching with archival materials: Scan of baseline data

EDC has not completely analyzed the baseline data we collected on faculty skills in teaching with archival materials; however a preliminary scan suggests that the level of faculty skill is quite high – not surprising since many of these faculty are historians, American studies teachers and/or English faculty. Teachers’ baseline descriptions of how they deployed primary sources in their courses was nuanced and detailed. However, their level of skill and experience in teaching with materials not directly in their field – like the materials they will probably teach with in SAFA -- likely varies a great deal.

As one indication of the varying skill in teaching with visual documents, EDC has analyzed the sample questions faculty posed for their students (hypothetically) around the photograph in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Stimulus photograph for faculty question-writing task
15 faculty were asked in the baseline survey: “Write a question that you think students could realistically use this photo to answer (perhaps along with other documents, contextual info, etc).”

In preliminary analyses, EDC found that faculty questions fell into five categories (below). Each category is more or less explicit about asking students to clarify the relationship between their inferences and the evidence they see. The first category (Inference / Evidence) might be seen as most explicit, and the last (Judgment-oriented) may be viewed as least explicit. The variations likely reflect faculty’s different disciplinary frames, as well as their experience teaching with visual sources. The analysis begins to suggest the varied levels of skill and approaches that faculty will bring to crafting questions and supports for students, in their research, and in the web authoring environment.
Writing a Document–Based Question for Students: Different Faculty Approaches

A. Inference / Evidence
Three faculty asked students to make an inference about a broad theme (race relations during this time), using the photo as evidence:
• Can this photo tell us anything about class/racial relations in \( x \) neighborhood at \( y \) time?
• What does the photograph tell us about race relations in mid–twentieth century Brooklyn?
• What does this photo suggest about the relationships between different cultures during this time period?

B. Formal / Aesthetic
Two faculty asked students to consider how the photographer used formal and/or compositional elements to convey meaning:
• What formal choices has the photographer made to accentuate a narrative of ethnic and racial tensions?
• Find a place where you see two New Yorks overlapping: what is the juxtaposition, and what do you make of it?

C. Observation / Description
Three faculty questions asked students to describe specific aspects of what they observed in the photo:
• What are the living circumstances of these two families? How do they perceive one another? When did they live?
• Who lives in this neighborhood? How would you describe race relations in this neighborhood?

D. General Description
Two faculty questions asked students to describe generally what the photo demonstrates:
• What does this photograph capture about life in New York City?
• How does this photo demonstrate the historical events that were taking place during this time period?

E. Judgment–oriented
Two asked students to make judgments based on the photo:
• Was this neighborhood racially segregated? Does diversity in this neighborhood seem to be a healthy diversity?
• Do you think that these two sets of families are happy to be neighbors? If not, why do you think that might be?
Recommendations
Because faculty vary widely in the skill-sets and comfort levels they bring to teaching students to analyze archival sources, BHS should:

- Give faculty as many concrete examples as possible of how they can elicit, guide, and give feedback on student’s readings and contextualization of source materials. Sharing student handouts and guiding questions from other faculty (those with more experience) is a good idea.
- Making these processes explicit in templates for authoring the course webpages, is a good idea as well.

Goal 5: Improve student learning of key inquiry and archival literacy skills

Evaluation Data
EDC and BHS have not yet gathered data on student learning, since the courses have not begun. Progress toward this goal is listed below, however.

Summary of Progress
BHS staff, has undertaken the following in preparation for gathering pre/post data on student learning this coming school year:

- Identified the core components of the projects’ definition of archival literacy (combining elements from published research, NARA and LOC archives, etc).
- Drafted a pre/post student exercise on archival literacy, and attitudes / experiences toward research and research skill
- Explained expectations for faculty assistance in data collection, and solicited ways to make the process easier (two faculty will have paper versions of the exercise)
- Initiated IRB application for approval of data collection, through EDC

Information on Evaluator and Evaluation Methods

The project evaluation is being conducted by Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC), led by William Tally, Ph.D., as principal investigator. Evaluation questions and methods for data collection are shown in Table 3 below. As the
table shows, evaluation activities are collaborative, and distributed across the project partners.

Brooklyn Historical Society will a) gather and coordinate data on the implementation of the project – meetings and professional development activities held, attendance at summer institutes, etc. b) collect course syllabi and assignments from faculty, and archive them; c) collaborate with EDC on scoring of faculty assignments and student work.

EDC will: a) design measures and metrics for faculty development and student learning, b) work with BHS staff to analyze data on faculty and student learning; c) meet with assessment staff at the 3 partner colleges to develop strategies for analyzing student engagement in project and non-project cohorts; d) report formative findings to BHS to guide program improvements year to year; and e) report progress on outcome measure to BHS and FIPSE in annual and final reports.

Staff on partner campuses will: a) meet with EDC to create a plan for gathering and analyzing data on student engagement; b) address IRB issues around assessing student learning (eg, via online assessment tasks, and print or digital student work); c) collect and report baseline and comparison data on student engagement for project and non-project cohorts (using eg, the National Survey of Student Engagement, other student surveys, or data on course completion or passing rates).

Participating faculty will: a) gather and share revised course syllabi and assignments at the beginning of five semesters – Fall, 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, Spring 2013, Fall 2013; b) make student work available (anonymous work) for analysis by BHS and evaluators at the end of each semester; c) ask students to complete a questionnaire as one of the course assignments; and d) respond to evaluator questionnaires once per year, in June/July.

Table 3: SAFE Evaluation Objectives, Performance Measures and Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Data gathered</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>By Who</th>
<th>Criteria / Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Build collaborative network of 3 Bklyn campuses and BHS</td>
<td>In years 1-3, Campus faculty teams and BHS staff will meet at least 3 times to plan joint activities, including teaching &amp; assessment schedules.</td>
<td>Documentation of joint meetings</td>
<td>Monthly logs</td>
<td>BHS staff</td>
<td>Are partners collaborating in ways that are moving the work forward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop college humanities, art, and technology courses for 1st &amp; 2nd year students enriched by significant archival research projects.</td>
<td>In Year 1, 12 faculty will develop and teach courses that include significant use of archival materials, reaching at least 600 entering students. (Increases to 15 faculty / 750 students in Year 2, and 18 faculty / 860 students in Year 3).</td>
<td>Course syllabi from participating faculty</td>
<td>Sept &amp; Jan, Yrs 1-3</td>
<td>Faculty submit syllabi to BHS staff;</td>
<td>Syllabi show evidence of: • Significant role for BHS materials (&gt; 2 wks of work) • Student introductory experiences at BHS • Student composition experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve faculty ability to integrate archival research into 1st &amp; 2nd year humanities courses in support deeper and more engaged student learning experiences.</td>
<td>Each year, 18 faculty will participate in the BHS professional development activities offered, including workshops on archival learning and summer institutes.</td>
<td>Attendance logs at meetings and Institute Reflective prompts and evaluations at the end of the summer Institute</td>
<td>June/July, Yrs 1-3 Last day of summer Institute</td>
<td>BHS staff</td>
<td>Are PD activities reaching intended targets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve student learning of key inquiry and archival literacy skills</td>
<td>In Years 2 and 3, 80% of faculty will demonstrate improved knowledge of the BHS archive and how it can and cannot serve their teaching goals, as compared with a Year 1 baseline.</td>
<td>Faculty Course Plans &amp; assignments Faculty answers to reflective prompts in online questionnaire</td>
<td>Baseline: Sept 2011 Jan 2012 Comparison: Sept 2012 Jan 2013 Sept 2013</td>
<td>Faculty submit assignments to BHS staff; BHS and EDC staff analyze</td>
<td>Assignments show evidence of: • A significant question that students will investigate; • Iterative student encounters with primary &amp; secondary sources; • Creation of a digital exhibit that shares and reflects on their learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Year 1, 50% of students assessed will demonstrate greater archival literacy in a pre/post online assessment task (increasing to 60% in Year 2; and 75% in Year 3)</td>
<td>Student pre/post online questionnaire; Primary source analysis task</td>
<td>Sept/Dec 11 Jan/May 12 Sept/Dec 12 Jan/May 13</td>
<td>EDC, with help from BHS</td>
<td>Increases in: • Familiarity with the nature, value &amp; limits of archives (How is the BHS similar to &amp; different from a regular library?) • Skills of sourcing, contextualization, evaluation of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Year 1, 50% of student final exhibits assessed will achieve Level 3 or higher on a rubric for Inquiry and Analysis Skills (increasing to 60% in Year 2, and 75% in Year 3)</td>
<td>Faculty make student work available via paper / online; BHS and EDC analyze</td>
<td>Dec 2011 May 2012 Dec 2012 May 2013 Dec 2013</td>
<td>Faculty make student work available via paper / online; BHS and EDC analyze</td>
<td>See skill dimension for “Analysis” in AACU VALUE Rubric for ‘Inquiry and Analysis’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Data gathered</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>By Who</td>
<td>Criteria / Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improve student engagement for 1st year college students</td>
<td>5.a In Year 1, assessment staff on each campus will select a metric for student engagement, and collect baseline data for project and non-project cohorts. In Years 2 and 3, data for project cohorts will be collected and analyzed against the baseline.</td>
<td>Possible metrics: • National Survey of Student Engagement; • Course completion rates; • Course passing rates.</td>
<td>Sep 2011 Sep 2012 Sep 2013</td>
<td>Campus assessment staff</td>
<td>Are data available by course? Are they available for comparable cohorts of 1st year students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5b. In Years 2 and 3, students in project courses will score 10% higher on measures of student engagement than comparable students in non-project courses.</td>
<td>• National Survey of Student Engagement; • Course completion rates; • Course passing rates.</td>
<td>Sep 2012 Sep 2013</td>
<td>Campus assessment staff collect and report data to EDC; EDC summarizes</td>
<td>Do students in SAFA courses show evidence of greater engagement, course completion, and/or course passing, than students in non-project courses?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>