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1. **General Education Program Overview**

a) **Describe the general education program, including all required courses and the first year experience. Describe the unique or distinctive elements of the program.**

Castleton’s General Education Program (GEP) consists of three parts: (1) a course sequence that provides a structured introduction to the college and college study; (2) a set of courses and assessment requirements emphasizing the development of essential skills and capacities; and (3) a distribution requirement of liberal arts and sciences organized into four “Frames of Reference.” The program comprises a significant part of the both the Baccalaureate and Associate’s Degrees at Castleton.

The GEP course sequence begins with *First-Year Seminar* (FYS). The course is required for all incoming students who have not matriculated elsewhere or who have earned less than twelve credits at another institution. This small seminar consists of no more than 18 students, and the course is combined with a weekly Common Hour that features special presentations and activities designed to facilitate a successful transition to college.

For Baccalaureate students, a modest sequence of courses thereafter emphasizes the intellectual and creative possibilities of the liberal arts tradition. In their first and second semesters, students enroll in Castleton’s premier Soundings Program, a one-credit *Introduction to the Liberal Arts* (“Soundings”). *Soundings* offers students a wide array of events such as plays, lectures, concerts, dance performances, and debates. Baccalaureate students continue in their second year with *Touchstones of Western Literature*, a course in the literary tradition that provides an in-depth exploration of Western ideals and values. In their Junior year, Baccalaureate students enroll in a final semester of *Junior Soundings*.

The overall general education requirements emphasize academic skills in the first semesters. The College Writing Standards require students to enroll in *English Composition*, to complete two Writing Intensive (WI) courses in the following semesters, and to sit for a Culminating Essay Exam. To meet the Oral Communication Graduation Standard, students enroll in *Effective Speaking* and then take another Speaking Intensive (SI) course. All students must also complete a Computing Intensive (CI) course. Finally, students complete two additional skills-based assessments to meet the other VSC Graduation Standards.

After the first year, the general education requirements focus on the four Frames of Reference. The four Frames are: (1) Aesthetic Understanding and Activities (AU); (2) Scientific and Mathematical Understanding (SM); (3) Social and Behavioral Understanding (SB); and (4) Worldviews: Cultural, Historical, Philosophical (WV). Students are required to take two courses (6 credits) from different disciplines in each Frame, with the exception of the Scientific and Mathematical Understanding Frame, from which they are required to select three courses, one of which will be a science course with a lab component (10 credits total).

For Associate’s degree students, the general education requirements are similarly structured. In addition to FYS and *First-Year Soundings*, they complete *English Composition*, a WI course, *Effective Speaking*, and the other VSC Graduation Standards. They are also required to take one course in each Frame.

Castleton offers an Associates of Arts (AA) degree in General Studies, but most students who complete this program are doing so because, for any number of reasons, they are unable to reach
their original goal of a Bachelor’s degree. We are not aware of any students having elected to pursue this degree from the outset of their careers, but its existence at Castleton helps to convey the value of a college degree over miscellaneous credits or an attempted degree. We do not actively market the AA degree but our academic advisors and staff working with high-risk students are aware of the role this degree can play as a viable and feasible way to obtain academic credentials and ensure value for those who are not able to realize their original aspirations.

b) Explain the rationale and/or philosophy behind program design; include the overall goals of the general education program.

The basic framework of the GEP can be traced to two major curricular revisions in Castleton’s recent history. In 1979, Castleton developed a Core Curriculum in response to rapid growth in the number of majors and programs as well as student demographic changes accompanying a policy of open enrollment. The Core codified an emphasis on skills-based courses in writing and speaking and established course requirements surveying the Western tradition of liberal arts and sciences. The current structure, established in 2000, struck a balance between retaining a core based in the liberal tradition and building the Frames in a way that would encourage students to make connections and transfer learning across disciplines. The Frames objectives were clarified in 2007. Taken together, these two broad imperatives of the program inform the overarching goals of the GEP: 1) “to prepare the student to search for the meaning of a good life; 2) to develop an awareness of the interaction between personal and societal values; 3) to foster an appreciation of the interconnectedness of all things; 4) to stimulate intellectual curiosity and promote life-long learning” (Undergraduate Catalog).

Although some form of first-year experience has been in place since the 1960s, the current FYS Program was added to the framework in 1997, and it is one of several “high-impact practices” promoted by the American Association of Colleges and Universities. The Soundings Program was added in 1985 as a way to provide a multi-faceted introduction to the liberal tradition, and Junior Soundings was created in 2010, in part, as a capstone for the program that would further promote reflective connection-making across the students’ coursework. The remaining requirements emphasize important skills and competencies. The College Writing Standards was established in 2000, and the Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, and Information Literacy graduation standards were added in 2008. The Computing Intensive requirement was adopted by the college in 1986 and then revised in 2014.

In recent years, Castleton’s GEP figured prominently in a series of community meetings that culminated in the Castleton on the Move strategic plan (2013). The plan’s vision for undergraduate education emphasized connection-making and other forms of “integrative learning” across the GEP, majors, and co-curricular experiences. As an initial step in the implementation of this section of the plan, the chair of the General Education Committee collaborated with the Dean of Arts, Sciences, and Community Engagement to pursue a grant from the Davis Educational Foundation to develop an “Integrative Learning Program” (ILP) at Castleton. As the grant application describes, the particular form of the ILP will be developed collaboratively among numerous stakeholders at the college in a 3-year process from development to implementation. It is important to note that the grant imagines an ILP separate from the GEP, though the GEP would play an important curricular role in this overall program. Further plans in this direction are described in section 5(c).
c) Describe the process for regular curricular review of the general education program.

The GEP incorporates the work of a number of different programs and departments, each of which has its own procedures for oversight and processes of curricular review. The responsible faculty committees, administrators, and staff members implement policies established by the Faculty Assembly and approved by the President of the college. The GEP is overseen by the Faculty Assembly’s General Education Committee, which works with the Chief Academic Officer and deans as well as the departments and programs providing courses to the GEP.

The Dean of Arts, Sciences, and Community Engagement oversees the FYS Program. She plans the course offerings, recruits and trains faculty members to offer FYS sections, supervises the administration of the program, and works with the faculty to review its effectiveness. The Faculty Assembly’s Cultural Affairs Committee shares responsibilities with this dean and Soundings staff for establishing each year’s schedule of events and addressing issues of common concern.

Oversight of many of the basic skills courses is shared across the college. The English Department oversees English Composition, Effective Speaking, as well as Touchstones of Western Literature; the Business Administration and Communications Departments share oversight of the CI courses taken by most first-year students. The joint faculty-administrative Writing Committee oversees the implementation of the College Writing Standards in English Composition and WI courses. The General Education Committee reviews and approves courses for SI and CI designation. An Academic Dean collaborates with the members of the Mathematics faculty to align the expectations for incoming student placements in mathematics courses, and to conduct the Quantitative Reasoning graduation standard. An Academic Dean works with library staff to conduct Information Literacy Exam preparation sessions and administration of the exam.

The academic departments oversee the courses in the Frames of Reference taught by their faculty. Prior to a course’s inclusion in the Frames of Reference, faculty members and departments must submit the course for review by the General Education Committee which then assesses its alignment with the goals of the program as well as the specific learning outcomes of the proposed Frame of Reference. Upon recommendation by the committee, the Faculty Assembly votes on these courses before they are included in the college Catalog. The General Education Committee coordinates further cross-disciplinary meetings of faculty and conducts overall program assessment.

d) Describe any significant changes made to the program in the last five years; provide a rationale for the changes.

In 2011, in an effort to bring cohesion to the FYS experiences, the FYS Academic Dean and faculty members teaching the courses established a set of four broad course goals emphasizing 1) intellectual curiosity, 2) responsibility, 3) academic skills, and 4) citizenship. It also designed a yearly assessment of the program to begin measuring student progress in these areas. Additionally, the college piloted new Transfer Student Seminars intended to provide an experience comparable to FYS for incoming transfer students.

The Writing Committee revised procedures for assessment. In the first two courses of the writing skills sequence, students sit for a 50-Minute Exam which is now immediately scored by a team.
of readers and returned with quantitative and qualitative feedback. As in previous years, the
students are invited to sit for a 90-minute Culminating Essay Exam during their second WI
course.

The General Education Committee developed a new competency-based approach to Computing
Intensive requirement and clarified the curricular distinction between “Foundational CI Courses”
taken in the first year and “Advanced CI Courses” taken for CI credit in the major. A separate
Faculty Assembly task force is developing an assessment tool to use before further curricular
changes are undertaken.

The college took major strides in its Civic Engagement Certificate Program, which was being
instituted in the GEP at the time of the last Policy 101 report. In the last year, the steering
committee established a competency-based framework for the program; ironically, this approach
has built the potential for it to flourish much more among professional students than students
taking it as a part of their GEP coursework. This development is welcome, however, as it might help
to develop much stronger integration of the GEP CE-designated courses and students’ major
areas of study. These developments were featured in an application to the Carnegie Foundation
for designation for Civic Engagement, which was awarded in 2014.

The Junior Soundings capstone was instituted, and has been offered for eight student cohorts.

2. **Teaching and Delivery Strategies**

a) Describe the roles of full-time and part-time faculty in delivering the general education
program.

Castleton’s GEP is delivered almost exclusively through in-person, on-campus courses.

Full-time faculty teach almost all of the FYS sections, and all but one of the current Soundings
faculty are also full-time. FYS faculty play a significant role in socialization of new students,
both by offering stimulating introductory courses and by acting as advisors and mentors to
incoming students.

There is a larger structural reliance on part-time faculty for the skills courses offered to students
in their first year, particularly in *English Composition* and *Effective Speaking*. While it is not
ideal to have new students enrolled in many courses taught by part-time faculty members, we are
fortunate to have highly capable and extraordinarily committed part-time faculty members
teaching GEP courses, and the English Department has been well-represented among recipients
of the annual Endowed Outstanding Part-Time Faculty Award since the award’s inception in
2008.

Full-time faculty teach most of the courses in the Frames of Reference. In some specific cases,
additional sections of introductory-level courses are sometimes staffed with part-time faculty.
This is particularly the case for the Mathematics Department, which offer numerous sections of
math courses at several levels to incoming students in their first semester. In other cases, the
purposeful use of full-time faculty in these courses has caused concern among some departments,
especially the Natural Sciences Department, about the need to cover introductory-level courses at
the cost of teaching advanced courses in the major.
b) Describe 2-3 examples of “best practice” found in the general education program.

The institutional self-study, Castleton on the Move, affirmed that the college cultivates an approach of concern and caring, and the college is dedicated to transformation of the whole student. A variety of institutional assessments, including the National Assessment of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), have indicated tremendous gains made by students who persist to graduation, and we credit The GEP for much of this progress, especially in the students’ early years.

FYS provides a place for dedicated faculty members from across the college to talk about teaching and to develop tactics to promote student success. Since the development of goals for the FYS Program, the faculty have chosen one goal as a yearly focus for instruction and collaborative development. In AY 2014-2015, the faculty focused on the goal of “academic responsibility” and launched an initiative intended to promote effective goal setting and time management among students. This project also inspired a college-wide conversation about academic expectations. Faculty members have created innovative FYS sections as a way to promote these success skills and to introduce college inquiry to incoming students. Some examples include The History of Coffee offered by Adam Chill, Assistant Professor of History, and Education, Inequality, and Social Change offered by Emily Gleason, Assistant Professor of Education.

The Frames of Reference has also provided a significant opportunity for experimental course offerings and new programming in the disciplines. Examples such as The Science of Food offered by Livia Vastag, Assistant Professor of Biology, or the upcoming Statistics and Health created by Abbess Rajia, Professor of Mathematics, highlight the productive possibilities when the interesting questions of a discipline are presented for the general education student. The Frames have also contained a number of innovative cross-curricular study abroad programs. In the last several years, the college expanded its Honors Program to include a variety of interdisciplinary courses that share some content and pedagogy while representing multiple Frames of Reference.

c) Describe any concerns about the program.

Given the size and complexity of the program, the perennial concern is cohesion: to what extent have the component parts been incorporated into a cohesive program?

To prepare for this report, the General Education Committee conducted a poll of full-time faculty during the spring 2015 term. Sixty of 103 full-time faculty members responded to the survey (58 percent). Every academic department at the college was represented in the response. In general, faculty members are satisfied with the goals of the GEP but a pattern of responses suggest that they view the program as a “loose set of requirements” rather than as a “cohesive program.” Further, it was noted that students may not recognize the value of the GEP, and that taking steps to increase its cohesion may help to convey its value. As one respondent wrote, what the program needs “is a means to get the students to see the value…. Most of the faculty can see it, but it seems as though the unity we see and the value we ascribe [are] not easily grasped by many students.” In the past several years, the General Education Committee has identified program perception among stakeholders at the college as an important question informing
d) **Describe the professional development offered to new and continuing faculty to support the goals of the general education program.**

New faculty, both full-time faculty as well as new part-time faculty, undergo a comprehensive two-day orientation prior to the start of classes in August which includes an introduction to Castleton’s history and curriculum. The themes of this presentation are woven throughout the orientation, as is the general ethos of Castleton that encourages faculty to promote active learning in the classroom, both in the GEP and the majors. Ongoing mentoring of new faculty emphasizes these themes as well as the expectation that teaching excellence will be the most important part of a faculty member’s professional profile for retention, promotion and tenure.

The college provides limited support for collaborative work in general education teaching and curricular development. As part of the teaching load for FYS, faculty members receive a 3-credit course release, in part, to attend a retreat and then regular meetings on FYS instruction. Faculty teaching WI courses for the first time undergo a training workshop, and WI and General Education assessment activities, conducted six times a semester, also include significant opportunities for discussion of teaching and desired outcomes. Groups of faculty also undertake ad hoc projects. Faculty in the Physical Education Department, for example, applied in 2012 for a special grant offered occasionally by the Faculty Assembly Faculty Affairs Committee; this group studied applications of instructional technology, which resulted in the creation of a new Foundational CI course for the GEP. The college also supports regular team travel to conferences in the region.

The General Education Committee has also offered a variety of open meetings and forums where faculty can discuss issues and matters of common concern.

3. **General Education Program Assessment**

a) **List the student learning outcomes of the general education program.**

Each individual component program has its own goals, objectives, and learning outcomes. Some components involving cross-disciplinary collaboration have their own learning outcomes. Key examples include the FYS Program, the College Writing Standards, and the Frames of Reference. Faculty members offering courses in one of these areas are tasked with aligning their course goals with both the disciplinary content area in which they are teaching as well as the broader cross-curricular goals, objectives, and learning outcomes of those areas.

The aspirational goals of the program are listed in section 1(b). While the program leadership has recognized the desirability of delineating specific learning outcomes for the program based on these aspirations, the General Education Committee has worked to achieve a broad consensus among faculty and administrators to focus on one learning outcome for the purposes of
promoting cohesion in the program and assessing its effectiveness. Specifically, the committee has recently explored the learning outcome of “the ability to make connections between areas of college study (e.g. Gen Ed courses, college activities, study in the major) and future plans,” which is aligned with the goal of “fostering an appreciation for the interrelatedness of all things.” The Castleton on the Move strategic plan outlines the intention to move beyond these general aspirations and has proposed the creation of Baccalaureate Learning Outcomes of which a more integrative GEP would be a contributor.

b) Describe how the desired outcomes are assessed in the general education program.

In general, the learning outcomes of individual courses are assessed as part of the assessment activities of those departments and cross-disciplinary programs offering them. VSC Graduation Standard Assessments, which overlap with most of the skills courses, are discussed in section 3(d). A Faculty Assembly task force is designing an assessment for the CI requirement. Assessment of the Frames of Reference is addressed in section 4.

The FYS program uses a survey to assess first year students’ perceptions of their learning and experiences within the program. Survey questions align with the four program goals (e.g., Intellectual curiosity: I talk with professors outside of class about topics that interest me; Responsibility: I complete reading assignments for class; Academic Skills: I know how to use the library and its resources; Citizenship: I am more interested in state, national, or global issues or events). Since 2012, we have collected longitudinal data from each cohort twice per term. Data on self-responsibility from the survey concerning time spent on coursework outside of class prompted the dean and faculty steering committee to introduce the campaign to promote minimal expectations in this area. Following implementation of this plan in fall of 2014, findings suggest the campaign was effective in raising students’ awareness about this expectation and the value of their efforts. Specifically, the 2014 cohort was more likely to report studying for at least 3-5 hours for both time 1 and time 2 than the 2013 cohort. Furthermore, the 2014 cohort was more likely to demonstrate an increase in reporting 3-5 hours of studying per day from September to December than the 2013 cohort. In addition to continuing this work on responsibility, the current program leadership has used the assessment data and goals of the program to clarify the citizenship goal as a focus for work in AY 2015-2016.

In the last five years, the General Education Committee has collaborated with the Chief Academic Officer to design and implement the first stage of overall program assessments to gather information on two broad questions: (1) how do the students make connections between their coursework in the program, activities, majors and future plans? and (2) how do they describe the value of the program? The assessment uses two instruments:

1. Students writing the Culminating Essay Exam for the College Writing Standards are invited to reflect on their general education experience. A number of exam sittings take place during the examination week. All students taking the exam are presented with three prompts that are different for each sitting; students are asked to select one of the prompts and to discuss the extent to which they agree or disagree with it. For each exam, the Writing Committee includes one of two prompts for which the students would be reasonably expected to discuss their experiences in the GEP:
• “To be truly educated, a student must step outside the narrow confines of a college major and undertake a wide variety of courses and activities.”

• “Courses taken outside of one’s major are a waste of time and money.”

In a given term, about 100 students, roughly half of those taking the exam, select the general education prompt. After the essays have been evaluated by the Writing Committee, the General Education Committee then conducts a day-long content analysis using a rubric that measures (a) the number of general courses mentioned, (b) the kind of value statements made about the program, and (c) the kinds of synthetic connections made between general education courses and other areas of study. To date, the committee has conducted this assessment over 10 terms and has read and evaluated 869 essays.

2. Students enrolled in Junior Soundings are required to submit a reflective essay in which they are instructed to describe connections between their experiences in Junior Soundings and their general education coursework, studies in their major, and their future career. The committee randomly selects half of these essays and performs a day-long content analysis using a rubric that measures (a) the number of courses mentioned in the essay, and (b) the kind of reflective connections made between general education coursework and wider studies at the college. To date, the committee has conducted this assessment over six terms and has read 506 essays.

These assessments produce a variety of interesting data that extend beyond the scope of the present discussion. For the purposes of this report, it is worth examining two interrelated findings that describe the relationship between these two instruments.

The culminating essay data demonstrate that the students who make arguments affirming the value of General Education also refer to more courses in their essays and make more sophisticated, synthetic connections among courses than those who argue strongly against its value. Interestingly, these findings contrast with those from the Junior Soundings assessment, in which students are explicitly instructed to discuss their general education experiences and to make a minimum number of connections. For this assessment measure, the vast majority of students seem to calibrate their responses to the minimal expectations, mentioning one general education course, the Soundings course, and two instances of connections, offered in a summative way as opposed to a synthetically reflective way. Albeit a summary of a complicated data set, taken together, these data present a broad picture of student efforts and abilities. In general, the students seem disposed to respond to the assessments to meet the minimal requirements. Among those students who are not directly prompted but who choose to argue about the value of their study, however, we can measure increased inclination and ability to make synthetic connections. This assessment suggests a positive correlation between their internalization of the value of general education and their demonstration of capacities for analytical reasoning associated with argumentative essay writing. This assessment work is ongoing, but it directly informed the creation of a new assessment for the Frames of Reference described below in section 4.

c) Describe student perceptions of the general education program, including how these perceptions were measured.
As one might predict, there is much anecdotal discussion, among students, faculty, and staff, about the GEP and the value of its respective components. At the beginning of this assessment process, the General Education Committee identified that the collective discussion of general education at the college could bear some improvement. Members began by doing a general survey of campus conversations about the GEP and noticed some negative habits, such as the tendency for students plan to “get their Gen Ed requirements out of the way” before pursuing their majors in earnest. Committee members also noted messaging that promoted major study in ways that might lead students to de-value their study in general education courses. We were eager to perform the content analysis of student work that would help us to better understand student perceptions of the program.

For the purposes of this report, we offer one broad summary of the Culminating Essay data. The assessment anticipates that students responding to the Culminating Essay prompts will present a range of possible categorical responses about the value of their study that are consistent with the structure of the program and with the descriptions in the Catalog: 1) Education is a means of vocational preparation and hence general education has little value (“Voc.”); 2) Courses in academic skills enable meaningful or productive study (“Skills”); 3) Students benefit from developing diverse ways of knowing (“Frames”); 4) Students benefit from achieving one of the overall goals of the program (e. g. establishing capacities for lifelong learning) (“Goals”); and, unfortunately, 5) either no reference to the student’s education or a vague and undeveloped reference (“none”). The following chart organizes these responses:

The first set of data (“to Spring 2013”) represent the percentage of students (N = 434) who offered value statements in each of the five categories. A preliminary report of these findings was presented to the Faculty Assembly on March 5, 2013, to the Student Life Staff on March 20, 2013, and within a college-wide open forum on general education on March 27, 2013. The faculty present at that meeting discussed the data and the communications about general education in official and unofficial forms. While the faculty were generally pleased that more students (34%) argued about the value of the Frames, for example, they discussed as a goal
making incremental shifts in the lower ranges such as the number of students (19%) who argued that vocational preparation and general education were not compatible. The second set of data ("to Spring 2015"; N = 435) presents modest changes in each area; fewer students (15%) argue, for example, that vocational preparation and general education are incompatible.

The diminishing value in the “Goals” category may come as a result of work in Junior Soundings focused on making connections between general education coursework (presumably in the Frames). It may also come as a result of more aggressive norming among assessment readers to correct for a pattern observed in student responses. Throughout the study, we discovered a marked distinction between students who could express a goal of the program (e.g. to be “well-rounded”) and those who could cogently elaborate on the meaning of the goal. Scorers favored the latter explanation with the “goals” categorization, and then selected a more appropriate categorization for the less elaborated statement.

As a way to understand these student responses better, in April 2014, we conducted two focus groups with Castleton students, one among first-year students and another among juniors and seniors. The focus groups were intended to probe students and explore their perception and understanding of the GEP. The focus groups gave us the opportunity to prod students to flesh out what they mean and how they feel about the program. The focus group participants generally understood the idea of the liberal arts, but many had objections to taking courses outside of their major, despite understanding the notion of a liberal arts education. Often, these students chose a major early—sometimes choosing to come to Castleton because of that major—and felt that courses outside of the major were less important, or completely irrelevant. Students in the arts and sciences—as opposed to professional programs—were less likely to feel that the liberal arts requirements were wasteful.

d) Describe how the general education program integrates VSC graduation standards into curriculum, instruction and assessment. Identify any areas in need of improvement.

The Writing Standard is met through a three-course sequence in the College Writing Standards, moving from English Composition to two WI courses offered throughout the GEP and the majors. These courses follow the method and instructional terminology outlined in the 65-page Guide to the Castleton State College Writing Standards distributed to all faculty and incoming students. Following the changes to the procedures for writing assessment, (see section 1(d)) the Writing Committee observed an increase in the “No-Pass” rate which has averaged about 15% per term. Prior to 2011, students who initially failed upon a first reading we still able to pass based on an assessment of earlier 50-minute essays which were collected for this purpose. Now, 50-minute essays are scored and returned to students. Failing students now receive qualitative feedback about their performance and are urged to seek help from the Writing Specialist and/or to enroll in another WI course. The Writing committee is pleased with the progress of these procedures as they provide greater feedback to students and encourage them to sit for the exam earlier in their coursework when they will be able to improve their writing performance, if necessary.

The Oral Communication standard is met through a two-course sequence similar to the College Writing Standards with SI courses distributed throughout the GEP and the majors. The General Education Committee has published standards for these courses as part of the submission.
materials for new courses; in AY 2014-2015, it clarified the expectations of SI courses based on these submission standards in a new explanation that will be distributed to faculty.

The Quantitative Reasoning standard is measured primarily through an exam that tests minimal math proficiency in algebra and geometry. Students may be exempted from the exam based on demonstrations of proficiency such as their SAT scores or scores on an Accuplacer exam used for math placement. Although the college does not enforce a minimal math requirement, most students are informally advised to select an appropriate math course from the Scientific and Mathematical Understanding Frame of Reference during their first semester. The college offers QR exams weekly throughout most of the term. During the period covered by this report, the average pass rate per examination has been 71%, though we are tracking a decline in the rates.

The Information Literacy Standard, like the QR standard, is assessed using an exam created by James Madison University. The pass rates on this exam are very high, an average of 93% during the period of the report. These scores reflect the extent to which academic research is embedded throughout the curriculum. Research librarians have informed the faculty about widespread changes in the Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education published in 2014 by the American Library Association. Meetings with leadership in key programs, FYS, the English Department and Writing Committee, in addition to the GEP, have produced a broad, if informal action plan to even more intentionally scaffold information literacy in the curriculum.

4. Progress on Policy 101 Program Improvement Recommendations from 2010

The 2010 Policy 101 review of general education programs resulted in the following recommended areas of improvement for this college’s program:

1. Continue analyzing proposed “Frames” courses in the context of the newly developed educational objectives for them.
2. Design methodologies for assessing the Frames of Reference.

For each recommendation, describe progress to date; if insignificant or no progress has been made, provide an explanation.

The objectives for the Frames of Reference codified in 2007 have worked well in guiding the development of the program. The objectives have been used in the review of every new course included in the Frames. Beginning in 2010, as part of the “Assessment Roadmap” (discussed below) the General Education Committee began reviewing syllabi and eventually focused on two Frames of Reference: the Worldviews and Science and Mathematical Understanding Frames. The review was to determine how well they align with the objectives, and the committee discussed the question of alignment in meetings with faculty members. There was general agreement that the existing courses align with the objectives of the Frames, and this consensus was confirmed during the faculty meetings.

This two-year study of Frames syllabi and the meetings were part of the “General Education Assessment Roadmap” which was designed as a way to conduct assessment in the Frames. Under the plan, during each year, the committee would select an individual Frame and conduct three assessment activities: 1) Committee members would review all syllabi of courses offered in the Frame; 2) regular instructors of the Frame would be invited to a meeting to discuss the
Frame; 3) faculty members would be invited to submit student work that the committee could use to assess learning in the Frames.

After pursuing the roadmap for two years, the committee, in consultation with the Chief Academic Officer, determined to repurpose its energies toward overall program assessment [described above, question 3 (b) and (c)]. Although there were numerous reasons for this decision, the chief reasons had to do with the limited time and resources of the committee for conducting wide faculty meetings, dissatisfaction with the outcomes of voluntary course-based assessment as a mechanism for assessing the Frames, and the desire to report and take action on the overall program assessment described above.

This shift in priorities led to a number of initiatives, including changes to the college’s open-houses, and orientation sessions, all to raise awareness of the program and its goals. The college-wide forum held in 2013, for example, prompted the Faculty Assembly to charge the committee to work more actively to promote the program to students. Noting, for example, that the college did not include a description of the program anywhere among the academic programs of its website, the committee created a new website showcasing the major themes of the program.

While focusing during recent years on this comprehensive program assessment, the General Education Committee has recognized the need to revisit Frames assessment. While every component of the program, with the exception of CI, currently has some form of assessment, the Frames do not. As noted above, assessment of learning in these courses is conducted mainly by the departments offering them. With the exception of the English Department, however, academic departments tend not to assess the learning of general education students, favoring majors instead. Thus, learning in the Frames courses among non-majors remains a blind spot.

In AY 2014-2015, the committee piloted a new and promising assessment for the Frames. Working in the spring and summer of 2014, a team of faculty members who teach in the Frames along with the Dean of Arts, Science, and Community Engagement developed a problem-based assessment based on the Collegiate Learning Assessment model. The intention in this assessment is to reimagine the Frames’ learning outcomes as competencies and to measure student proficiencies in these areas. In this assessment, students are presented with a problem that requires specific skills such as the ability to read and interpret a scientific study or to understand data plotted in a graph. In addition to measuring students’ proficiencies in the Frames’ objectives, the assessment also measures analytical reasoning and problem solving. The first problem drew from objectives of all of the Frames, but the committee is also exploring the idea of developing problem-based assessments for the individual Frames. A pilot of the program was conducted in the fall. Further work on the pilot will be associated with the development of integrative learning in the GEP.

5. **Program Strengths and Weaknesses**

a) **List the primary strengths of the program.**

As described throughout this report, the GEP is an integral part of the Castleton education, one which, we believe, transforms the lives of students who persist to graduation. It impacts every student at the college, and courses such as FYS, *Soundings* and *Touchstones of Western Literature* provide for the common institutional identity and shared experiences of students.
The skills courses, by all indications, meet the ambition stated in the college Catalog to “enable meaningful and productive study” at the college. The College Writing Standards offer a shared vocabulary and coherent design for the other skills-related areas. Recent work on competency-based instruction for CI suggests a promising model for intentionally embedding other skills, competencies, and dispositions in the GEP and major curricula.

Although there is more work to be done with the Frames of Reference [discussed below] the structure and shared objectives of the Frames do seem to offer a foundation for promoting connections and transfer across disciplines. The Frames also remain a locus for a set of experimental course offerings [discussed in question 2(b)], many of which are innovative and promise to bring greater vitality to the curriculum.

The assessment of the GEP as a whole through the Culminating Essay and Junior Soundings Essay is a growing strength. Attempting to assess the program through analysis of multiple measures is a significant achievement and is informing our conversations about the program.

b) List specific areas for program improvement.

The various means of assessing the GEP, as described above, present a program that seems to be achieving its goals and that is making progress toward a more confident assessment of its success. One theme that runs throughout the discussion, feedback, and assessment of the program among stakeholders concerns how students make connections between the various components of the program, their major program and other studies at the college, as well as their future plans. As this is a complicated problem, we have identified two broad areas that would bear further development.

Many of the improvements described above, such as the work in FYS and the College Writing Standards, demonstrate the effectiveness of academic planning that helps students to approach their studies with greater confidence. We could develop new mechanisms to assist in academic planning in the program as a whole and helping students to envision how their work in the program is relevant for their broader college study. While the General Education Committee has made some progress in presenting the GEP as a cohesive program, more remains to be done in promoting the program to students (as well as advisors and newer faculty members who were not involved in creating or revising it). We have begun a very fruitful discussion of perhaps renaming the program and presenting its goals differently.

There is also a wide consensus among faculty that promoting connections across courses and program areas is an important goal, and this aspiration aligns well with our ongoing assessments. The program could do more to promote teaching that enables connection-making and transfer of learning across courses. This goal is not easily accomplished, as these program courses, especially those in the Frames of Reference, serve not only the GEP, but major programs, as well. As noted above in the discussion of “best practices,” however [question 2(b)], some innovative courses demonstrate the value of this kind of “integrative” approach for studies in individual academic programs. It may be that some minor changes to the program structure might facilitate this learning. It will probably also require support for new approaches to courses and teaching, which would likely be welcomed by many faculty members; the faculty members responding to the survey expressed a strong desire for more faculty development in the area of general education teaching.
While this work in academic planning and more integrative teaching will help to achieve this goal of making connections, more work remains to be done [see question 3(a)] on the other goals. We could clarify the other goals and learning outcomes of the program in a way that will contribute to discussions of program requirements, teaching practices, and assessment as the “making connections” goal has done. As the Castleton on the Move plan describes, however, Castleton has imagined that the GEP will contribute to broader institutional learning outcomes. We believe that the increased emphasis on the GEP to meet the first two points above will contribute to this broader discussion about our hopes for student learning and the program structures to achieve them.

e) Provide a three-year program improvement plan. List specific and prioritized action steps, who is responsible, and a recommended timeline for completion.

To facilitate the work outlined above, the chair of the General Education Committee collaborated with the Dean of Arts, Sciences, and Community Engagement to apply for a grant from the Davis Educational Foundation, as outlined in Section 1 (b). The grant application, endorsed by the General Education Committee, was submitted in March of 2013. Although the grant was declined, the Davis Foundation, in an unprecedented move, did provide funding for the first stage of this work, attendance of a faculty team at the AAC+U Integrative Learning Institute in July of 2015. We believe that this is an optimistic anticipation of our re-application once the team has returned to campus with a plan for the faculty and administration to consider and endorse.

The grant proposal outlined a three-year project to create an Integrative Learning Program (ILP) of which the GEP would be an important component part. Crucially, the plan imagined a way to fund and implement a process of faculty development that would in its initial phases meet the need for collaborative work among faculty teaching in the program. Below, we describe our Proposed Three-Year Phased Plan:

**STAGE ONE: PROGRAM PLANNING**

**June 2015-December 2016**

Beginning in June 2015, we have formed the initial Integrative Learning Team which includes the current chair of the General Education Committee and the Dean of Arts, Sciences, and Community Engagement. This team will attend the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ Integrative Learning Institute in July of 2015. Over the course of a week of intensive programming and workshops, our team will learn practices and principles of integrative learning and articulate a vision for a program and timeline for this work on our campus.

Following the AACU workshop, the team will return to campus to clarify a proposal and present it to campus stakeholders, including the Faculty Assembly, for endorsement. We anticipate recommending modest changes to the GEP, such as changes to the FYS or ideas for restructuring to improve the student experience, but these changes would be informed by research and the evidence of our ongoing assessments. The overall ILP plan would then be resubmitted to the Davis Foundation in October 2015, if possible, or March 2016. Upon approval, hopefully for a commencement in January of 2016, three additional faculty members will join our team for a total of six faculty. The faculty members would each be supported by a single course release for...
both semesters during a year of service. During this first year, this team would work to flesh out the program framework logistics, gain support from colleagues, and present it to the necessary overseeing bodies, including the Faculty Assembly, for final approval.

In the meantime, the General Education Committee will continue promoting the program for student academic planning, and it will continue its current plan of overall program assessment, including reporting the results of this year’s review of the data. It will seek resources to continue development of the pilot Frames assessment. Should the plan not be funded, it would also consider petitioning the Faculty Assembly to appoint a task force to review the program goals and structures and suggest revisions; any proposed changes would be presented to the Faculty Assembly in May of 2016 at the earliest.

STAGE TWO: PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION
January 2017-December 2017

During this year, the ILP program would be launched and coordinated by the joint faculty-administrative team. The main work of the year would be three-fold: 1) to plan and support faculty and staff development with the aim of infusing integrative learning and assessment of its effectiveness in current courses/programs and Student Life programming; 2) to institute any modest curricular changes to the GEP and other programs; 3) to design and implement new resources for students’ academic planning and reflection with the aim of promoting cohesiveness for students.

STAGE THREE: PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND MAINTENANCE
September 2017-August 2018

In this last year, our main priorities will be establishing the program and launching new campus-wide assessments of student learning. These data will help to develop plans for adjusting and sustaining the program. Specifically, our team would continue to support faculty in their efforts to assess integrative learning at the course level but the emphasis would now focus largely on learning across the curriculum. The Integrative Learning Team would continue to work together to plan for and support mechanisms for infusing integrative learning throughout the core curriculum, students’ majors, student activities, etc. This would involve faculty development and new forms of messaging to communicate about the program. During this year, Castleton would begin to transition from full support from the Davis Educational Foundation and begin to independently fund the professional development and other resources necessary to sustain the program.
Appendix 1: FYS Assessment (Expanded discussion of material in text above)

Since the writing of our last Policy 101 report in 2010, the Dean of our First Year Seminar Program and its Steering Committee members identified the following goals for our FYS Program: a) **Responsibility** for oneself and educational success via “life skills”; b) **Academic skills** of critical thinking, reading, writing, and research; c) **Intellectual curiosity** and independent engagement with ideas; and d) **Citizenship**, beginning with respect for a diversity of perspectives and involvement on campus.

In the Fall of 2012, the FYS faculty developed a survey to assess first year students’ perceptions of their learning and experiences within the program, with items that reflected these four goals (e.g., **Responsibility**: I complete reading assignments for class; **Academic Skills**: I know how to use the library and its resources; **Intellectual curiosity**: I talk with professors outside of class about topics that interest me; **Citizenship**: I am more interested in state, national, or global issues or events). Since 2012, we have collected longitudinal data from each cohort, once in late September and once in early December. September and December data for the first semester are difficult to compare as the items were revised significantly and the scale was changed from 3 anchors to four. Of interest is the finding that there were no significant differences in the students’ responses in all four categories of hours of studying per day across the course of the semester.

In 2013, there was growth in the following three areas: **Academic Skills** (use library, cite sources); **Curiosity** (discuss Soundings, talk with professors); and **Citizenship** (perform community service). Areas showing a decrease from September to December in 2013: self-responsibility **(schedule myself ahead of time to stay on track and come prepared for class)**. This evidence of a slight drop-off in students’ academic efforts led the FYS Dean and Steering Committee to introduce a campaign to emphasize the minimum expectation that students spend five hours per day on coursework, for five days a week, by week five of the semester (5 by 5 in 5). The FYS faculty endorsed this idea and the campaign was launched at the start of the 2014 fall semester. The students received messages about this minimum expectation from multiple sources (faculty, SOS, professional staff) and at multiple times during the semester (orientation, during the semester-leading up to 5th week progress reports, advising).

Our findings suggest the campaign was effective in raising students’ awareness about this expectation and the value of their efforts. Specifically, the 2014 cohort was more likely to report studying for at least 3-5 hours for both time 1 and time 2 than the 2013 cohort. Furthermore, the 2014 cohort was more likely to demonstrate an increase in reporting 3-5 hours of studying per day from September to December than the 2013 cohort. We plan to continue to message this (with a focus on the quality of study time in addition to quantity) and other expectations for students’ self-responsibility in the future. Aside from the study hours data reported above, our pattern of findings for the 2014 Self-Assessment are similar to those of 2013 (evidence of growth in some academic skills and curiosity). In 2014, however, students did not appear to be more likely to perform community service toward the end of their first year, nor were they more interested in state, national, or global issues and events. Furthermore, there was only an increase of 5% in the numbers of students who indicated that they had registered to vote over the course of the fall semester. Given these disappointing findings, we have decided to focus on the goal of **Citizenship** for the 2015-2016 academic year.
Appendix 2: College Writing Standards Assessment

The following data present an overview of the findings for students taking the Culminating Exam of the College Writing Standards. Since all of the students’ exam results (including placement essays, 50-Minute Essays, and Culminating Essays) are collected in folders, the results are referred to as “folders.”

Fall 2010 (201 folders)
1. folders that passed: 183
2. folders that passed with distinction: 6
3. folders that failed: 12
4. percentage of folders that failed: 6%

Spring 2011 (237 folders)
1. folders that passed: 218
2. folders that passed with distinction: 4
3. folders that failed: 15
4. percentage of folders that failed: 6.4%

Fall 2011 (274 folders)
1. folders that passed: 219
2. folders that passed with distinction: 1
3. folders that failed: 54
4. percentage of folders that failed: 19.8%

Spring 2012 (267 folders)
1. folders that passed: 238
2. folders that passed with distinction: 1
3. folders that failed: 28
4. percentage of folders that failed: 10.5%

Fall 2012 (206 folders)
1. folders that passed: 167
2. folders that passed with distinction: 3
3. folders that failed: 36
4. percentage of folders that failed: 17.5%

Spring 2013 (276 folders)
1. folders that passed: 235
2. folders that passed with distinction: 2
3. folders that failed: 39
4. percentage of folders that failed: 14.2%

Fall 2013 (238 folders)
1. folders that passed: 189
2. folders that passed with distinction: 2
3. folders that failed: 49
4. percentage of folders that failed: 20.6%

Spring 2014 (219 folders)
1. folders that passed: 186
2. folders that passed with distinction: 5
3. folders that failed: 28
4. percentage of folders that failed: 12.8%

Fall 2014 (227 folders)
1. folders that passed: 197
2. folders that passed with distinction: 6
3. folders that failed: 24
4. percentage of folders that failed: 10.6%

Spring 2015 (194 folders)
1. folders that passed: 168
2. folders that passed with distinction: 2
3. folders that failed: 24
4. percentage of folders that failed: 12.4%
Appendix 3: Quantitative Reasoning Assessment

The following table presents the outcomes of the college’s Quantitative Reasoning Exam.

### Analysis of Quantitative Reasoning Assessment
#### Academic Years 2010-2011 through 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>No Pass</th>
<th>Average Pass Rate Per Examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14-'15</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13-'14</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12-'13</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'11-'12</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'10-'11</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Information Literacy Assessment

The following table presents the outcomes of the college’s Information Literacy Exam.

### Analysis of Information Literacy Assessment

#### Academic Years 2010-2011 through 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>No Pass</th>
<th>Average Pass Rate Per Examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14-'15</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13-'14</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12-'13</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'11-'12</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'10-'11</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: General Education Program Assessment

Progress report and provisional findings to Spring 2015

Introduction and Overview:

Beginning in the Fall 2010, the General Education Committee, working with Tony Peffer, Chief Academic Officer, began work to assess the effectiveness of the General Education Program. This process began as part of the NEASC reaccreditation process, and it was to be conducted in three phases:

- **Phase One**: Development of a general assessment for the program using the Culminating Essays produced for the College Writing Standards.
- **Phase Two**: Development of a general assessment for the program using essays written for Junior Soundings.
- **Phase Three**: Development of a “roadmap” for study of the Frames of Reference in the hopes of working collaboratively toward cohesiveness and assessment of the Frames.

The first two instruments were intended to accompany the third assessment project for the Frames of Reference called the “General Assessment Roadmap.” After two years of implementing the roadmap, the General Education Committee, in consultation with Dean Peffer, elected to focus its resources primarily on program-level assessment and to discontinue some provisions of the roadmap. Since then, the committee has piloted a new problem-based assessment for the Frames and has pursued a large-scale grant in support of developing “integrative learning.” Further development of assessment instruments for the Frames would be conducted through this integrative learning work.

The following report surveys some findings from Phase One and Phase Two.

For Phase One, it represents a mature application of the instrument. Data has been collected every term since its commencement in Fall 2010. The first overall data set was studied in Spring 2013. A preliminary report of findings was presented to the Faculty Assembly on March 5, 2013, to the Student Life Staff on March 20, 2013, and within a college-wide open forum on general education on March 27, 2013. The faculty present at that meeting discussed the data and set general priorities which were then pursued by the General Education Committee. The committee also refined its techniques and has collected a roughly equivalent data set for this report.

For Phase Two, this report represents provisional findings. After piloting the instrument with transfer students enrolled in Junior Soundings, a full data set was collected from two student cohorts. Following a review of the data with the Soundings Faculty, the prompt for the instrument was changed. Data has been collected from three student cohorts responding to the new prompt to Fall 2014. This report offers preliminary findings on both prompts.
Phase One General Procedure:

Members of the General Education Committee, joined by other faculty members and administrators, meet periodically to evaluate the responses of students who wrote about their General Education experience for the Culminating Essay of the College Writing Standards. The committee has pursued two objectives:

1. To learn more about how the students describe the value of General Education.
2. To learn about how the students draw on their General Education experience to make this description. We are particularly interested in the specific examples they use to describe their General Education experience and the ways in which they make connections between their coursework.

For the Culminating Essay, students are presented with three prompts; they are asked to choose a prompt and then to write an essay explaining the extent to which they agree or disagree with the prompt. In each sitting, one of these prompts has invited the students to reflect on their General Education experience. One of two prompts appeared on the exams:

**Prompt 1:** “In order to become truly educated, a student must step beyond the limitations of an academic major and explore a wide variety of college courses and activities.”

**Prompt 2:** “Course requirements outside a student’s major are a waste of time and money.”

In a given semester, roughly 45-50% of students responded to one of these two prompts. For the purposes of assessment, the readers read essays responding to these two prompts. To date, the committee has read 869 essays, 398 responses to Prompt #1 and 471 responses to Prompt #2. [For the preliminary report of Spring 2013, the readers had read 434 essays, 240 responses to Prompt #1 and 194 responses to Prompt #2. In the intervening semesters, the readers read 435 essays, 158 responses to Prompt #1 and 277 responses to Prompt #2.]

The readers performed a content analysis of these essays using a scoring rubric; each essay was read by two readers and the scores were averaged. Readers assessed three questions:

**Assessment Question 1:** (AQ1) When addressing this prompt, for which it is reasonable to expect that a student would draw upon her/his General Education experience for evidence, to what extent does this student, in fact, make use of such evidence in building support for the argument presented?

**Assessment Question 2:** (AQ2) When referencing the General Education experience, to what extent does this student move beyond vocational preparation and/or skills development to consider issues reflecting the learning objectives of the Frames of Reference in a manner consistent with the goals of Castleton’s Gen. Ed. program?

**Assessment Question 3:** (AQ3) When referencing the General Education experience and activities made possible by membership in the Castleton State College community, to what extent does this student engage in the kind of synthetic reflection upon the connections between Gen. Ed., community participation, and one’s major that our program expects?
For each question, readers selected one of five possible categorical descriptions. Each category was assigned a numerical value. These numerical values were collected, sorted, and counted. This data was then used to produce the following findings:

1. Percentages of response in each category for each rubric question.
2. A comparison of these categorical percentages for the two prompts.
3. A study of AQ1 and AQ3 for each category of AQ2.
4. A calculation of numerical averages for each question.
Assessment Question 1: (AQ1) When addressing this prompt, for which it is reasonable to expect that a student would draw upon her/his General Education experience for evidence, to what extent does this student, in fact, make use of such evidence in building support for the argument presented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of References</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No reference to the student’s general education experience. (6.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reference to the student’s overall general education experience, but no specific course examples offered. (14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reference to the student’s overall general education experience, and one specific course example offered. (23%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reference to the student’s overall general education experience, and two specific course examples offered. (29%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reference to the student’s overall general education experience, and more than two specific course examples offered. (27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of References to Specific General Education Experiences

N = 869

AQ 1 Comparison of Totals Spring 2013 (N434) Spring 2015 (N435)

To Spring 2013
To Spring 2015
Assessment Question 2: (AQ2) When referencing the General Education experience, to what extent does this student move beyond vocational preparation and/or skills development to consider issues reflecting the learning objectives of the Frames of Reference in a manner consistent with the goals of Castleton’s Gen. Ed. program?

0 Either no reference at all or a vague and undeveloped reference to the student’s education (7%)

1 Description of the student’s education only as a means of vocational preparation, referencing neither specific skills (e.g. speaking, writing, or math skills) nor diverse ways of knowing (i.e. reflecting one or more Frames of Reference objectives) (17%)

2 Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation, description of the student’s education references skills that enable meaningful and/or productive study (e.g. speaking, writing, or math skills) (19.5%)

3 Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation or skills, description of the student’s education references diverse ways of knowing (i.e. reflecting one of the objectives of the Frames of Reference) that enable meaningful and productive study (40%)

4 Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation or skills, description of the student’s education references diverse ways of knowing in a manner that is consistent with one or more of the goals of Castleton’s General Education Program (16.5%)

Description of the Value of General Education

AQ 2 Comparison of Totals Spring 2013 (N434) Spring 2015 (N435)
Assessment Question 3: (AQ3) When referencing the General Education experience and activities made possible by membership in the Castleton State College community, to what extent does this student engage in the kind of synthetic reflection upon the connections between Gen. Ed., community participation, and one’s major that our program expects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No discussion of either the General Education experience or activities made possible by membership in the college community (9%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of either the General Education experience or activities made possible by membership in the college community, but no synthetic reflection on the connections between them and one’s major (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of both the General Education experience and activities made possible by membership in the college community, but no synthetic reflection on the connections between them and one’s major (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of either the General Education experience or activities made possible by membership in the college community, leading to synthetic reflection on the connections between them and one’s major (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of both the General Education experience and activities made possible by membership in the college community, leading to synthetic reflection on the connections between them and one’s major (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 869

AQ 3 Comparison of Totals Spring 2013 (N434) Spring 2015 (N435)
AQ 1 Comparison P1 (N 398) and P2 (N 471)

Assessment Question 1: (AQ1) When addressing this prompt, for which it is reasonable to expect that a student would draw upon her/his General Education experience for evidence, to what extent does this student, in fact, make use of such evidence in building support for the argument presented?

Number of References to Specific General Education Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of References</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Ref.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref; no Ex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ex.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ex.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ Ex.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt 1</th>
<th>No Ref.</th>
<th>Ref; no Ex</th>
<th>1 Ex.</th>
<th>2 Ex.</th>
<th>2+ Ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQ1 Comparison P1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ1 Comparison P2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt 2</th>
<th>No Ref.</th>
<th>Ref; no Ex</th>
<th>1 Ex.</th>
<th>2 Ex.</th>
<th>2+ Ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQ1 Comparison P1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ1 Comparison P2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AQ1 Comparison P1 S13 (N 240), P1 S15 (N 158), P2 S13 (N 194), P2 S15 (N 277)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No Ref.</th>
<th>Ref; no Ex</th>
<th>1 Ex.</th>
<th>2 Ex.</th>
<th>2+ Ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQ1 Comparison P1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ1 Comparison P2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ1 Comparison P1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ1 Comparison P2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Question 2: (AQ) When referencing the General Education experience, to what extent does this student move beyond vocational preparation and/or skills development to consider issues reflecting the learning objectives of the Frames of Reference in a manner consistent with the goals of Castleton’s Gen. Ed. program?

Description of the Value of General Education

0. Either no reference at all or a vague and undeveloped reference to the student’s education.

1. Description of the student’s education only as a means of vocational preparation, referencing neither specific skills (e.g., speaking, writing, or math skills) nor diverse ways of knowing (i.e., reflecting one or more Frames of Reference objectives).

2. Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation, description of the student’s education references skills that enable meaningful and/or productive study (e.g., speaking, writing, or math skills).

3. Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation or skills, description of the student’s education references diverse ways of knowing (i.e., reflecting one of the objectives of the Frames of Reference) that enable meaningful and productive study.

4. Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation or skills, description of the student’s education references diverse ways of knowing in a manner that is consistent with one or more of the goals of Castleton’s General Education Program.

AQ2 Comparison P1 (N 398) and P2 (N 471)

AQ2 Comparison P1 S13 (N 240), P1 S15 (N 158), P2 S13 (N 194), P2 S15 (N 277)
AQ 3 Comparison P1 (N 398) and P2 (N 471)

Assessment Question 3: (AQ3) When referencing the General Education experience and activities made possible by membership in the Castleton State College community, to what extent does this student engage in the kind of synthetic reflection upon the connections between Gen. Ed., community participation, and one’s major that our program expects?

| 0 No discussion of either the General Education experience or activities made possible by membership in the college community |
| 1 Discussion of either the General Education experience or activities made possible by membership in the college community, but no synthetic reflection on the connections between them and one’s major |
| 2 Discussion of both the General Education experience and activities made possible by membership in the college community, but no synthetic reflection on the connections between them and one’s major |
| 3 Discussion of either the General Education experience or activities made possible by membership in the college community, leading to synthetic reflection on the connections between them and one’s major |
| 4 Discussion of both the General Education experience and activities made possible by membership in the college community, leading to synthetic reflection on the connections between them and one’s major |

Synthetic Reflection on the General Education Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0 No Discuss</th>
<th>1 GE or Acts</th>
<th>2 Both</th>
<th>3 Synth. Ref.</th>
<th>4 Both/SR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prompt 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt 2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AQ3 Comparison P1 S13 (N 240), P1 S15 (N 158), P2 S13 (N 194), P2 S15 (N 277)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0 No Discuss</th>
<th>1 GE or Acts</th>
<th>2 Both</th>
<th>3 Synth. Ref.</th>
<th>4 Both/SR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 to S13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 to S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 to S13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 to S15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following charts graph data associated with Assessment Question 2 in which students describe their sense of the value of General Education. Each page shows the associated data from AQ, the number of references made to General Education coursework, and AQ3, the kinds of connection-making demonstrated by students who ascribed each value category. The charts below, for example, describe the essays written by students who made no reference to General Education in their responses.

**Value Type: (AQ2-0)** Either no reference at all or a vague and undeveloped reference to the student’s education.

### AQ 1 References to Gen Ed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No Ref.</th>
<th>Ref; no Ex</th>
<th>1 Ex.</th>
<th>2 Ex.</th>
<th>2+ Ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1 N=37</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2 N=25</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AQ3 Synthetic Reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>0 No Discuss</th>
<th>1 GE or Acts</th>
<th>2 Both</th>
<th>3 Synth. Ref.</th>
<th>4 Both/SR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1 N=37</strong></td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2 N=25</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value Type: (AQ2-1) Description of the student’s education only as a means of vocational preparation, referencing neither specific skills (e.g. speaking, writing, or math skills) nor diverse ways of knowing (i.e. reflecting one or more Frames of Reference objectives)

---

**AQ1 References to Gen Ed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Ref.</th>
<th>Ref; no Ex</th>
<th>1 Ex.</th>
<th>2 Ex.</th>
<th>2+ Ex.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AQ 3 Synthetic Reflection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 No Discuss</th>
<th>1 GE or Acts</th>
<th>2 Both</th>
<th>3 Synth. Ref.</th>
<th>4 Both/SR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 N=64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 N=82</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value Type: (AQ2-2) Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation, description of the student’s education references skills that enable meaningful and/or productive study (e.g. speaking, writing, or math skills)

AQ1 References to Gen Ed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 No Ref.</th>
<th>Ref; no Ex</th>
<th>1 Ex.</th>
<th>2 Ex.</th>
<th>2+ Ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 N=66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 N=103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AQ3 Synthetic Reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 No Discuss</th>
<th>1 GE or Acts</th>
<th>2 Both</th>
<th>3 Synth. Ref.</th>
<th>4 Both/SR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 N=66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 N=103</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Value Type: (AQ2-3)** Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation or skills, description of the student’s education references diverse ways of knowing (i.e. reflecting one of the objectives of the *Frames of Reference*) that enable meaningful and productive study.

![AQ1 References to Gen Ed](chart1)

![AQ3 Synthetic Reflection](chart2)
**Value Type: (AQ2-4)** Notwithstanding references made or not made to vocational preparation or skills, description of the student’s education references diverse ways of knowing in a manner that is consistent with one or more of the **goals** of Castleton’s General Education Program.
Finally, the following chart converts the numerical values for each rubric category into average values.

![Average Values Chart](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Prompt 1</th>
<th>Prompt 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQ1</td>
<td>2.832147209</td>
<td>2.461055276</td>
<td>2.921443737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ2</td>
<td>2.650824938</td>
<td>2.586683417</td>
<td>2.623142251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ3</td>
<td>2.370059353</td>
<td>2.368090452</td>
<td>2.152866242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase Two General Procedure:

Members of the General Education Committee, joined by other faculty members and administrators, meet periodically to evaluate the responses of students who wrote about their General Education experience in their final essay for Junior Soundings. As in the previous Culminating Essay assessment, the committee has pursued two objectives:

1. To learn about how the students draw on their General Education experience to reflect upon their experiences in Junior Soundings.
2. To learn about how they use their experiences to make connections between their General Education coursework and broader studies.

For the Junior Soundings essay, students are presented with a prompt in which they are explicitly asked to reflect upon their experiences in the General Education Program.

To date, 8 student cohorts have completed Junior Soundings. Two of these cohorts consisted of transfer students. Readings of these essays were used to test the instrument. Two additional cohorts wrote on the following prompt:

Write an essay in which you reflect on what your General Education experience has meant to your intellectual growth, to your study in your major, and to your future plans. (Note: additional instructions indicated a requirement to use at least one Soundings event in the discussion.)

Following the reading and scoring of responses to this prompt, the leadership of the Soundings Program and the chair of the General Education Committee met to discuss the results. Following the meeting, the Soundings Faculty revised the prompt as part of broader changes to the course to emphasize the place of Soundings in the General Education Program. For the purposes of this assessment, three cohorts have written on the following prompt (one has not yet been scored):

(Considering Soundings as an integral part of the General Education Program,) write an essay in which you reflect on what your Soundings experience has meant to your intellectual growth, to your study in your major, and to your future plans. (Note: additional instructions indicated a requirement to use at least two Soundings events in the discussion.)

As in the Culminating Essay, the essays are first read and evaluated for a grade by the Soundings Faculty. The General Education Committee randomly selects half of these essays; to date, the committee has read 504 essays from the 7 student cohorts. The readers performed a content analysis of these essays using a scoring rubric; each essay was read by two readers and the scores were averaged. Readers assessed two questions:

Assessment Question 1 (AQ1): When addressing this prompt, to what extent does the student move beyond fulfilling the assignment in a way that affirms the ongoing contributions of General Education? (Note: for this question, “Soundings” and individual Soundings events count as “one discreet instance.”)
Assessment Question 2 (AQ2): When required to use at least two Soundings events in reflecting on the educational experience, to what extent does the student move beyond this obligation to explore the broader educational value of Soundings?

For the last two cohorts, the committee has also used an experimental question intended to better understand the kinds of connections made by students. (The findings are not included in this report but will be used to refine future rubrics.):

Assessment Question 3 (AQ3): When addressing this prompt, how does the student connect Soundings to her/his educational experience?

For each question, readers selected one of five possible categorical descriptions. Each category was assigned a numerical value. These numerical values were collected, sorted, and counted. This data was then used to produce the following findings:

1. Percentages of response for AQ1.
3. Percentages of Response for AQ2
4. A calculation of numerical averages for each question by prompt.
Totals AQ1

**Assessment Question 1 (AQ1):** When addressing this prompt, to what extent does the student move beyond fulfilling the assignment in a way that affirms the ongoing contributions of General Education? (Note: for this question, “Soundings” and individual Soundings events count as “one discreet instance.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection on the General Education Experience</th>
<th>0% 9% No connections</th>
<th>1% 46.5% sum; &lt;2 connections</th>
<th>2% 219% sum; 2 connections</th>
<th>3% 21.5% soph. or &gt;2 connections</th>
<th>4% 4% soph; &gt;2 connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Reflection on the Gen Ed experience’s influence on intellectual growth, major, and future plans, but <strong>no effort to make connections</strong> between these required areas of focus.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Reflection on the Gen Ed experience’s influence on intellectual growth, major, and future plans, with a <strong>summative effort</strong> to connect these areas but <strong>fewer than two instances</strong> of Gen Ed experience offered.</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reflection on the Gen Ed experience’s influence on intellectual growth, major, and future plans, with a <strong>summative effort</strong> to connect these areas and <strong>two instances</strong> of Gen Ed experience offered.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Reflection on the Gen Ed experience’s influence on intellectual growth, major, and future plans, with <strong>either a sophisticated effort</strong> to connect these areas and <strong>two instances</strong> offered or <strong>more than two instances</strong> offered.</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Reflection on the Gen Ed experience’s influence on intellectual growth, major, and future plans, with both a <strong>sophisticated effort</strong> to connect these areas and <strong>more than two instances</strong> offered.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=504
**AQ 1 Comparison of Prompt 1 and Prompt 2**

**Assessment Question 1 (AQ1):** When addressing this prompt, to what extent does the student move beyond fulfilling the assignment in a way that affirms the ongoing contributions of General Education? (Note: for this question, “Soundings” and individual Soundings events count as “one discreet instance.”)

**Prompt 2** (Completed by F13, S14, F14 cohorts):
Considering Soundings as an integral part of the General Education Program, write an essay in which you reflect on what your Soundings experience has meant to your intellectual growth, to your study in your major, and to your future plans. (Note: additional instructions indicated a requirement to use at least two Soundings events in the discussion.)

**Prompt 1** (Completed by Transfers (F11 and S12), F12 and S13 cohorts):
Write an essay in which you reflect on what your General Education experience has meant to your intellectual growth, to your study in your major, and to your future plans. (Note: additional instructions indicated a requirement to use at least one Soundings event in the discussion.)
AQ2 Totals (Prompt 2)

The change in prompt necessitated a slight change in Assessment Question 2. For the purposes of clarity, the results for the two prompts are presented separately.

**Assessment Question 2 (Prompt 2):** When required to use at least two Soundings events in reflecting on the educational experience, to what extent does the student move beyond this obligation to explore the broader educational value of Soundings?

| Description of only one Soundings event and either no reflection at all or a vague and undeveloped reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience | 2% |
| Description of more than one Soundings event, but with either no reflection at all or a vague and undeveloped reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience | 27% |
| Description of only the required Soundings events but with undeveloped reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience | 42% |
| Either description of three or more Soundings events with undeveloped reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience or description of two Soundings events with a sophisticated reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience | 26% |
| Description of three or more Soundings events and sophisticated reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience | 2% |

Number of References to Soundings Events and Reflection On Them

N=280
AQ2 Totals (Prompt 1)

The change in prompt necessitated a slight change in Assessment Question 2. For the purposes of clarity, the results for the two prompts are presented separately.

Assessment Question 2 (Prompt 1): When required to use at least one Soundings event in reflecting on the General Education experience, to what extent does the student move beyond this obligation to explore the broader educational value of Soundings?

Number of References to Soundings Events and Reflection On Them

- 0 Description of only one Soundings event and either no reflection at all or a vague and undeveloped reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience 2%
- 1 Description of more than one Soundings event, but with either no reflection at all or a vague and undeveloped reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience 27%
- 2 Description of only the required Soundings event but with reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience 42%
- 3 Description of two or more Soundings events with sophisticated reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience or description of three or more soundings events
- 4 Description of three or more soundings events and sophisticated reflection on the contributions of Soundings to the student’s overall educational experience

N=156
Average Values

Finally, the following charts convert the numerical values for each rubric category into average values for each prompt.

![Prompt 2 Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQ1</th>
<th>AQ2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prompt 2</td>
<td>1.299389324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Prompt 1 Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQ1</th>
<th>AQ2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prompt 1</td>
<td>2.654395604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Prompt 1(Transfers) Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQ1</th>
<th>AQ2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prompt 1(Transfer)</td>
<td>2.338235294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>