



ROMEO, DOFF THY NAME

THE ASSESSMENT OF ACTIVE INQUIRY
OUTCOMES WITHIN GENERAL EDUCATION
PATHWAYS AT CHICO STATE, 2014-2015

This document summarizes the activities and findings of the Active Inquiry Assessment Committee of the Curriculum Advisory Board for the General Education Program at California State University, Chico, for the 2014-2015 academic year.

ROMEO, DOFF THY NAME

THE ASSESSMENT OF ACTIVE INQUIRY OUTCOMES WITHIN GENERAL EDUCATION PATHWAYS AT CHICO STATE, 2014-2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
ANTECEDENTS	2
DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS.....	4
ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS: SPRING 2015	6
Performance-based Score Totals.....	6
Perceptual Analysis.....	7
IMPLICATIONS and CONCLUSIONS	7
Survey Results	7
Process	9

Attachment A information literacy rubric

Attachment B assessment instrument

Attachment C letters to faculty

Attachment D for SPSS results

ACTIVE
INQUIRY
ASSESSMENT
COMMITTEE
MEMBERS

Kate Transchel

Jacquelyn Chase

Kent Sandoe

Kevin Klipfel





INTRODUCTION

At California State University, Chico, over 100 courses, from a multitude of disciplines—from Anthropology to Philosophy to Agriculture-- target Active Inquiry as a SLO. Each course has approached the development and testing of Active Inquiry in its own way.

In 2014-15 the General Education Curricular Advisory Board (CAB) began assessing how well our GE program instills key abilities associated with Active Inquiry in our students.

This document summarizes the findings of the committee assigned to implement assessment of the Active Inquiry SLO for general education in 2014-15.

ANTECEDENTS

The present committee (Chase, Transchel, Sandoe and Klipfel) was formed after a year of meetings and discussions by a previous Faculty Learning Community (FLC) that was originally assigned to develop and implement the assessment of this SLO in 2013-14. (A description of the objectives of the former FLC for Active Inquiry can be found at this link:

http://www.csuchico.edu/celt/Faculty_Learning_Communities%20/active_inquiry/index.shtml).

As our committee considered what approach to take, we thoroughly reviewed the information provided by the FLC that defined Active Inquiry and made suggestions for assessing it. The FLC tackled the very complex job of defining Active Inquiry and it provided the results of a survey that faculty teaching Active Inquiry completed.

The FLC made a number of recommendations on how best to assess the SLO. Sometime in the middle of this process during 2013-14, it agreed that ideally the committee would assess and compare “signature assignments” and it created a rubric to assess these. However, according to the FLC faculty survey, 38% of faculty teaching AI were not clear on what AI was and stated that they needed more guidance in understanding AI. Further, when asked “how do you know if students are acquiring AI skills” the majority of faculty identified participation in class activities as the answer. Not surprisingly, the signature assignments described by the surveyed faculty were incredibly diverse. They included, for example, a pedometer activity, an audition position paper, a research paper, a community activity, a group quiz, and listing questions and researching answers. The FLC gave no recommendation on how to norm such a wide variety of activities to assess one learning outcome. The next best strategy, according to the FLC, was a self-assessment survey by students.

DEMONSTRATES KNOWLEDGE OF AND APPLIES RESEARCH TECHNIQUES AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY APPROPRIATE TO THE INTELLECTUAL AND DISCIPLINARY CONTEXT.

Student Learning Outcome for Active Inquiry/Information Literacy

Given that (1) the faculty teaching the SLO were not clear on what they were trying to impart; (2) that there was little basis of comparison in the signature assignments; and (3) that we have not enough people to observe class room discussion activities, we decided that administering a student survey on Information Literacy would yield informative results. This shift from Active Inquiry to Information Literacy coincided with increasing clarity from WASC on its recommendation that campuses conduct active inquiry assessments with a focus on students’ ability to use and understand sources of information. Conversations with Bill Loker and other members of CAB who had attended WASC seminars on GE SLOs revealed that Active Inquiry was more closely aligned with Information Literacy than the FLC had originally thought. An information literacy rubric presented at a WASC workshop where members of the team were in attendance included specifically (1) Communication of Evidence; (2) Evaluation of Sources; and (3) Attribution. (See Attachment A)

The FLC worked for one year, after which time members of CAB who were in the FLC were no longer on CAB. Thus, in early fall of 2014, a new committee was formed from CAB members to finalize assessment of this SLO. Members included two Pathway Coordinators, the library representative to CAB, and one college representative to CAB. The goal of the Committee was to develop an assessment instrument and coordinate assessment with faculty teaching courses in which Active Inquiry was a SLO. This coordination was aimed at maximizing student participation in the survey instrument that was eventually developed by the committee.



DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS

The committee decided to use an Information Literacy instrument (with some modifications) developed by Kevin Klipfel and Zach Justus in their work with 541 first year students in CMST 131 and UNIV 101.

This instrument is a blend of performance-based and perceptual measures of students' use of information sources (see Attachment B). Given the existence of data for first year students, we were free to focus on upper-division students whose outcomes can be contrasted to first year data for developmental comparison.

In the interest of continuity with the previous survey with first year students, this team chose to minimally modify the survey instrument. In hindsight and in comparison to the emerging clarity on information literacy by WASC and others, there are certainly ways that this survey could have honed an emphasis on the three skills mentioned above in the context of WASC's workshops: (1) Communication of Evidence; (2) Evaluation of Sources; and (3) Attribution. The survey covers a range of characteristics that we believe are associated with good teaching practices where these encourage and allow students to explore material.

Thirty-seven upper division course sections were identified as having this SLO, representing fifteen separate departments or programs. In mid-November, all faculty teaching upper-division general education courses where Active Inquiry was a Student Learning Outcome were asked to encourage and, if possible, incentivize student participation in completing the assessment. Two faculty members declined to participate in light of disagreement with the definition of Active Inquiry as this is reflected in the survey. The summary of departments or programs contacted for the assessment is in Table 1. (Hereafter in this report the SLO will be referred to as Information Literacy.)

Table 1—Departments with Courses that have Active Inquiry as a SLO

Department/Program	Number of Faculty Teaching Courses
Anthropology	1
Biological Sciences	2
Communication Design	1
English	4
Geography	2
Geosciences	5
Health and Community Services	4
Humanities	1
Natural Sciences	1
Nursing	2
Philosophy	3
Political Science	1
Plant and Soil Science	3
Psychology	3
Religious Studies	1
Sociology	1
Total Sections	35

Faculty were emailed a copy of the survey and an explanation of the assessment process (see letters to faculty in Attachment C). Faculty from fourteen sections responded (some of these were the same individuals) and of these, seven sections were offered extra credit.

The survey was delivered directly to students by hyperlink, based on data from Institutional Research. Faculty were asked to remind students of the survey and its purpose, and if they desired, to offer extra credit for completing the survey. The team was able to keep track of which students responded to the survey although this information was not distributed to all members. One team member reported names of students who had completed the survey to faculty so extra credit could be assigned. No individual or aggregate survey results were made available to faculty.

Time, timing and skepticism that such data would be available or accurate did not allow the team to confirm with individual faculty members if they did or did not offer extra credit, but we can assume that very low response rates in certain classes could be attributed to the fact those professors did not offer extra credit.

In total, enrollment in these courses was 2,466 students, of whom 364 provided valid responses (15%)—See Table 2.

Table 2—Summary of Response to Survey

AI sections 2014 F	37
Sections after two declined	35
Faculty who responded to email from team	14
Faculty who said they would offer extra credit	7
Enrolled students	2,466
Valid responses	346

ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS: SPRING 2015

The survey included questions on evaluating secondary sources for reliability; on the quality of evidence; on knowing what kinds of sources to use for specific kinds of questions; and on knowing when and how to use the university library, internet and search engines such as Google.

There was a high degree of variability in response rate across course sections (ranging from 3.6% to 78.3%). We felt it necessary to therefore divide the survey results in this analysis into two groups (incentivized and un-incentivized) based upon response rates for these course sections. The survey was applied to lower division students at an earlier date and we have used results from that previous survey with the current one to make comparisons between students at different points in their academic careers. Results of the performance-based survey are average correct answers out of sixteen questions.

We also scored responses to a series of perceptual questions that were answered using a five point scale where 5=strongly agree.

Performance-based Score Totals

The performance using this survey of upper division students could be considered as a whole as well below average. Students who were incentivized among the upper division students achieved a slightly higher mean score than those who were not, but only by less than a point. For the incentivized group, the average correct answers out of sixteen was 7.8 (48%), whereas for the unincentivized group this score was 7.28 (46%).

Upper division students do appear to develop more Information Literacy skills, as suggested by the higher scores in the latter courses. Students in the two lower division GE classes scored at around one point below those in the upper division courses represented in the current survey (see Table 3). Averaging the lower division and upper division courses produced a score of 6.73 out of 16 questions, which is about 45% correct. See Attachment D for SPSS results.

Table 3—Performance-based Score Summary

Group	Mean Correct Answers out of 16	N	Standard Deviation
1—Incentivized UD	7.8	197	2.28
2—Unincentivized UD	7.28	167	2.529
3--CMST 131	6.16	461	2.621
4—UNIV 101	6.15	80	2.743
Total	6.73	905	2.640

Perceptual Analysis

This set of questions focused on students' perception of how much certain dimensions of Active Inquiry were a part of courses at Chico State (see Table 4). This question was not about the particular course they were enrolled in at the time of the survey. With scores distributed on a scale of 1-5, where 5 meant "strongly agree," the average of individual responses ranged from 3.6 to 3.9. Expressed another way, the percent stating "Agree," or "Strongly Agree" ranged from 59% ("I approach school research as an occasion to further investigate something I am personally curious about") to 77.3% ("My course instructors help me make connections between the course material and issues outside of the classroom").

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Survey Results

Chico State students' information literacy skills, at least as measured by the performance-based part of the survey, are well below average, if average performance were considered 70-75% correct answers.

- 1) Students' Information Literacy performance as approximated by the first sixteen questions of the survey was unimpressive. A more deliberate approach to teaching about the reliability and adequacy of different kinds of sources for specific tasks might be encouraged for a wide range of activities (writing, presenting, and researching for civic engagement). With exciting and interesting sources a few taps away on their devices, students are more and more drawn to what is quickly available and fun to read/see, and less inclined to consider whether sources are reliable or trustworthy. Knowing how to navigate the library's resources is almost a proxy for having engaged with reliable sources, although increasingly library searches are online.
- 2) However low they may have scored overall on performance in Information Literacy, students do appear to develop more of these skills as they move from lower to upper division courses, as suggested by the slightly higher scores in upper division courses. It makes sense to assume that as students accumulate writing experience by way of taking writing intensive courses and eventually a capstone course and a writing proficiency course in their majors, that some of the practices of good scholarship would be imparted to students.

Table 4-- Results of Perceptual Questions (*)

17. Rate your answer on the scale below.							
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Rating Count
I approach school research as an occasion to further investigate something I am personally curious about.	3.6% (13)	7.1% (26)	31.2% (114)	42.5% (155)	15.6% (57)	3.59	365
School research is primarily about doing what my teacher or professor wants me to do.	1.1% (4)	10.7% (39)	24.7% (90)	46.6% (170)	17.0% (62)	3.68	365
My courses make me want to learn more about the issues presented.	1.9% (7)	4.1% (15)	20.9% (76)	50.1% (182)	22.9% (83)	3.88	363
The material in my courses relates to my personal interests outside the classroom.	1.9% (7)	5.5% (20)	25.1% (91)	47.4% (172)	20.1% (73)	3.78	363
My courses give me the freedom to explore questions that authentically interested me.	2.5% (9)	8.0% (29)	23.7% (86)	47.1% (171)	18.7% (68)	3.72	363
My course instructors help me make connections between the course material and issues outside the classroom.	1.6% (6)	3.8% (14)	17.0% (62)	51.6% (188)	25.8% (94)	3.96	364
My course instructors satisfactorily explain the pupose and value of the assignments in their courses.	2.2% (8)	6.1% (22)	24.6% (89)	50.3% (182)	16.9% (61)	3.73	362
I was able to use the information available to me in library resources to supplement the information I learned in my courses when necessary.	2.2% (8)	3.6% (13)	23.0% (84)	49.0% (179)	22.2% (81)	3.85	365
					answered question		365
					skipped question		33

(*)Question #17 of Survey, using scale where 5=Strongly Agree

- 3) Perceptions by students about the extent to which Information Literacy is part of their education at Chico State averaged in the mid-threes on a scale of 1-5. In other words, students were lukewarm in recognizing the integration of these skills in their university experience. Interestingly, perceptions of the importance, pervasiveness, and student understanding of Information Literacy exceeded actual performance. Still, perceptions scored only about average on a five-point scale.

Process

The more than year-long Active Inquiry assessment effort included the addition of a completely new team and emerging guidelines from WASC that came too late for consistent application throughout the process. Faculty skepticism, desire to be finished with the semester, and lack of agreement on the meaning of the SLO they were including in their courses reduced the number of responses by faculty and as a result (due to lack of incentivizing) by students.

For students, faculty and the academic community more broadly (including WASC), the meaning of “active inquiry” and its morphing into “information literacy” has been confusing. This lack of clarity has muddled the assessment process. While we were in the second year of trying to complete this assessment, WASC came forward with ways to distinguish Active Inquiry from Critical Thinking (indeed, offering workshops on these SLOs). In the process WASC has provided more guidance to align future assessment with Information Literacy and to develop corresponding course pedagogies.

Information Literacy in Student Work Rubric – Claremont Colleges Library (Version 2013/14)

Learning Outcome	Level of Achievement			
	Highly Developed 4	Developed 3	Emerging 2	Initial 1
Attribution	<p><i>Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents sources consistently and completely Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently Cites non-textual sources consistently Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. 	<p><i>Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies. Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. 	<p><i>Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations. Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes Does not consistently cite non-textual sources Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently. 	<p><i>Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displays fundamental and consistent errors in source documentation Does not include or contains significant inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes Does not name, title, or cite non-textual sources Does not name or label figures and/or graphs.
Evaluation of Sources	<p><i>Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) Demonstrates a thorough critical exploration and knowledge of evidence, theories, and sources selected 	<p><i>Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) Demonstrates a preliminary critical exploration and knowledge of evidence, theories, and sources selected 	<p><i>Source materials used are inadequate.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s) Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources Does not consistently distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) Clearly selected sources out of convenience Demonstrates little critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected 	<p><i>Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s) When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate No distinction between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) Does not explore outside sources or present evidence when called for No evidence of critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected
Communication of Evidence	<p><i>Evidence is integrated and synthesized expertly to support claims.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently presents evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s) Synthesizes and contextualizes evidence appropriately for audience Uses evidence instrumentally towards rhetorical goals Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is consistently clear Identifies gaps in the literature and contributes creatively and/or significantly to a scholarly conversation Does not over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author 	<p><i>Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally employs evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s) May present some evidence without context Frequently demonstrates using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is usually clear Begins to identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation May over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author 	<p><i>Weak attempts at synthesis or integration.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sporadically uses evidence to support claim(s) or argument(s) Frequently fails to put sources into context (e.g. "The World Bank says...") Usually does not demonstrate using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals Consistently blurs distinction between own ideas and ideas of others Does not identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation 	<p><i>No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claim(s) or argument(s) lack necessary evidence Fails to contextualize quotes and evidence No demonstration of using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals No distinction between own ideas and ideas of others

Information Literacy in Student Work Rubric Scoring Sheet - Claremont Colleges Library

Identification

ID Code _____ Reader Name _____ Term/Year _____ Faculty _____

Could not evaluate information literacy (IL) in this work? Check the box and you're done.

Assignment

A. Does the assignment ask students to use evidence outside of assigned course content? (*check one*)

Required Allowed Discouraged No explicit mention Assignment not available N/A

B. This work is a: _____ (e.g., research paper, thesis, report, summary, argument, analysis, reflection, media project, other)

Quality of attribution, evaluation, and communication of IL (see rubric for details):

	Highly Developed (4)	Developed (3)	Emerging (2)	Initial (1)	Comments	Totals
Attribution						
Evaluation of Sources						
Communication of Evidence						

Sum:

OPTIONAL

This work is a particularly representative example of the following (*check any that apply*):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very robust bibliography | <input type="checkbox"/> Egregious errors in bibliography, in-text citations, notes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and consistent citations | <input type="checkbox"/> Little or no attribution of non-textual elements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chose appropriate sources to support claims | <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate source(s) used to support claim |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sources are well-integrated and synthesized | <input type="checkbox"/> Sources not integrated or synthesized (e.g., "patch writing" or excessive block quoting) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shows awareness of depth of scholarship in area | <input type="checkbox"/> Sources lack breadth or depth |
| Other _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Over/Undercited claims |

Elaboration (optional):

Information Literacy in Student Work Rubric/Scoring Sheet Codebook - Claremont Colleges Library

Identification

Fill out any available details regarding student work.

Can we evaluate information literacy in this work?

Even if no sources are cited or the assignment does not call for outside sources, student work may exhibit information literacy if the student is placing their ideas in a broader context using ideas or information from other sources.

Assignment

- A. Expectations about use of evidence outside of assigned course reading or other materials provided by professor (use N/A in the case of thesis or other work without defined assignment parameters).
- B. Assignment type allows us to determine how to evaluate works that fall outside the “standard” research paper (e.g. a report, thesis, summary, argument, analysis, reflection, media project, or other type of work)

Quality of attribution, evaluation, and communication of Information Literacy

For each category, check the appropriate box. (Highly Developed, Developed, Emerging, Initial)

- **Attribution** refers to how well and how consistently the student acknowledges sources of evidence, including non-traditional formats such as lectures, emails, DVD commentaries, and images/figures as well as non-textual, embodied, reflective, and experiential materials.
- **Evaluation** refers to the appropriateness or quality of source materials the student chooses to use to support their rhetorical goals (claims or arguments). This includes materials and sources in their bibliography (if available) as well as those used throughout the work. Do the sources, examples, and evidence selected match the purpose of the type of work and argument the student is creating? Is the student aware of the differences between primary and secondary sources, popular and scholarly sources, or fact and opinion? Have they selected the variety and quality of sources appropriate for their argument and work type?
- **Communication** refers to the use and integration of sources as well as the quality of composition, e.g., whether the student has integrated the evidence they’re using and has done so in a way instrumental to their claim(s) and argument(s). Does the student paraphrase, summarize, synthesize, use quotes appropriately? Does the student frame quotations using authoritative sources? How are they using sources to ground their claims? This category also addresses how a student integrates their own ideas with those of others.

OPTIONAL - This work is a particularly rich example of the following (check any that apply):

Check an item when the noted characteristics are present and should be flagged as interesting or rich examples for future analysis or conversation. If you see other rich examples, note them as “Other.”

Information Literacy Assessment

The following assessment is broken into four parts. Answer all questions from each part of the assessment.

Your username (**ksandoe@mail.csuchico.edu**) will be recorded when you submit this form. Not **ksandoe**? [Sign out](#)

* Required

Select your section for UNIV 101 *

Informed Consent Statement: Please Read *

Hello Chico State Student: In addition to a course assignment, your answers to the following questions are part of an important larger university study on how to improve students' learning experiences. These questions will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Taking part in this research is completely voluntary, and all your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Your student ID is being collected so we can match your responses to other university programs and demographic information. Again, your answers are strictly confidential, and we are bound by rules of this University to maintain this confidentiality. Your information collected as part of this research will be stored on a password protected server at the University Office for Institutional Research, and this server is located behind a secure firewall. Participating in this research is voluntary and if you would like to have your responses excluded from the study please notify us through the email address listed below. Thank you for participating in this important research. We are asking you to do this because we value your experience and ideas about how to improve students' experiences here at Chico State. If you'd like more information about this project or do not wish to have your answers to the questions included as part of the larger university study, please contact the First Year Experience Program office at fye@csuchico.edu or 898-3705.

- I consent to my answers being included in this survey.
- I do not consent to my answers being included in this survey.

Part One: Evaluating Information

1. Which of the following statements regarding the difference between fact and opinion are true?

Check all answers that apply.

- A fact can be traced back to a reliable source.
- An opinion may not be based in good evidence.
- An opinion is justified if it is based in good evidence.
- None of the above.

2. Which article would be best to use if you were trying to understand why people take selfies?

Choose one of the following answers.

- This internet article called "Why Selfies Sometimes Look Weird to Their Subjects" from The Atlantic Magazine: <http://tinyurl.com/mcrxwdx>
- This internet article on "The Meanings of the Selfie" from the New York Times: <http://tinyurl.com/khg8cpz>

3. Check the MOST reliable source among the following three articles.

Choose one of the following answers.

- "Open Hearts Build Lives": <http://tinyurl.com/mwsz8ux>
- "Living in the Moment Really Does Make People Happier": <http://tinyurl.com/l7xhk7c>
- "Things You Don't Know About Mindfulness": <http://tinyurl.com/kxw5qtg>

4. Check the LEAST reliable source among the following three articles.

Choose one of the following answers.

- "Open Hearts Build Lives": <http://tinyurl.com/mwsz8ux>
- "Living in the Moment Really Does Make People Happier": <http://tinyurl.com/l7xhk7c>
- "Things You Don't Know About Mindfulness": <http://tinyurl.com/kxw5qtg>

5. For which of the following claims could you use this Gale Encyclopedia Entry on "Bullying" as evidence?: <http://tinyurl.com/pg8avmq>

Check all answers that apply.

- "Research indicates that children who are bullies tend to remain bullies as adults."
- "Bullies usually have low self-esteem; that is why they are bullies."
- "Girls are at least as likely to be bullies as boys."
- None of the above.

6. Look at the following scholarly article: <http://tinyurl.com/pcrceqm> Suppose you want to make the point in your inquiry paper that, according to scholarly research, the way the media depicts models with "perfect" bodies causes unrealistic ideas of what beauty is, and makes people who view these media images unhappy. Type into the space below a quote from this article that you could use in your paper to support your point. Include the page number article where you found your quote.

The quote can be from ANY page of the article.

7. Look at the following National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism fact sheet: <http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/CollegeFactSheet/CollegeFactSheet.pdf> Write down

two claims that this article would allow you to make about factors that affect student drinking in college.

Be sure to number each claim.

Part Two: Searching for Information

1. If you used the Chico State Library to search for information on a research topic, you would NOT find:

Check all answers that apply.

- Information that is based on opinion rather than evidence.
- "Popular" magazine articles.
- Newspaper articles.
- Articles that the Chico State library does not have access to.
- Research that has been disproven by scientists.
- None of the above.

2. If you used Google to search for information on a research topic, you would NOT find:

Check all answers that apply.

- Articles based in credible research.
- The books available in the Chico State library catalog.
- Popular articles linking to scholarly sources.
- As many scholarly articles as you would have access to through the Chico State library.
- Any scholarly articles.
- None of the above.

3. Suppose you read this article online claiming that science has proven that "haters gonna hate": <http://tinyurl.com/o8or4zv> and you notice that it mentions the scholarly work this conclusion is based on. Write down two pieces of information this article gives you that you could then use to search for the scholarly article on which it is based using the library website.

4. On which floor of the library is the book written by Zack O'Malley Greenberg, called: Empire State of Mind: How Jay Z Went from Street Corner to Corner Office?

- First Floor
- Second Floor

- Third Floor
- Fourth Floor

5. What is the Library of Congress call number for the book written by Zack O'Malley Greenberg, called *Empire State of Mind: How Jay-Z went from Street Corner to Corner Office*?

Enter your answer in the field below.

Part Three: Understanding Source Types

1. The citation below is which type of source?

Check one of the boxes below.

- Book
- Journal Article
- Chapter or Essay from a Book

Easton Ellis, B. (2010). *Imperial Bedrooms*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

2. The citation below is which type of source?

Check one of the boxes below.

- Book
- Journal Article
- Chapter or Essay from a Book

Bell, B., & Dittmar, H. (2011). Does Media Type Matter? The Role of Identification in Adolescent Girls' Media Consumption and the Impact of Different Thin-Ideal Media on Body Image. *Sex Roles*, 65(7), 478–490.

3. The citation below is which type of source?

Check one of the boxes below.

- Book
- Journal Article
- Chapter or Essay from a Book

Didion, J. (1968). *Some Dreamers of the Golden Dream. Slouching Towards Bethlehem* (pp. 3–28). New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

4. The citation below is which type of source?

Check one of the boxes below.

- Book
- Journal Article
- Chapter or Essay from a Book

Gonzales, A. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). Mirror, Mirror on my Facebook Wall: Effects of Exposure to Facebook on Self-Esteem. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking*, 14(1/2), 79-83.

5. Which information type is the most general?

Choose the single best answer that applies.

- Scholarly Journal Articles.
- A particular encyclopedia entry in a general encyclopedia.
- A scholarly book.

6. Which information type is the most specific?

Choose the single best answer that applies.

- Scholarly Journal Articles.
- A particular encyclopedia entry in a general encyclopedia.
- A scholarly book.

7. Suppose you need to build your background knowledge on an area of inquiry you don't know too much about, like Immanuel Kant's moral philosophy. Which would be the best source to use to begin your research?

Choose the single best answer that applies.

- A peer reviewed scholarly journal article like "The Problem of Agency and the Problem of Accountability in Kant's Moral Philosophy": <http://tinyurl.com/mz6ywvs>
- An entry on "Kant's Moral Philosophy" from a peer-reviewed encyclopedia, such as the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/>
- This book in the Meriam Library edited by Mark Timmons called "Kant's Metaphysics of Morals: Interpretive Essays": <http://opac.csuchico.edu/record=b1656228~S13>
- This Wikipedia entry on Immanuel Kant, which includes a section on Kant's moral philosophy: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanuel_Kant

8. If you want to know whether the book "The Anthology of Rap" mentions the rapper Drake,

which would be the best place for you to look?

Choose the single best answer.

- The table of contents near the front of the book?
- The index near the back of the book
- The introduction of the book
- The summary on the back cover of the book

Part Four: The Process of Research

1. I approach school research as an occasion to further investigate something I am personally curious about.

Rate your answer on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

2. School research is primarily about doing what my teacher or professor wants me to do.

Rate your answer on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree.

3. This course made me want to learn more about the issues presented.

Rate your answer on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

4. The course material related to my personal interests outside the classroom.

Rate your answer on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

5. This course gave me the freedom to explore questions that authentically interested me.

Rate your answer on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

6. The instructor helped me make connections between the course material and issues outside the classroom.

Rate your answer on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

7. The instructor satisfactorily explained the pupose and value of the assignments in the course.

Rate your answer on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

8. I was able to use the information available to me in library resources to supplement the information I learned in this course.

Rate your answer on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

Send me a copy of my responses.

100%: You made it.

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

Powered by

This form was created inside of CSU, Chico.
[Report Abuse](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Additional Terms](#)

ATTACHMENT C—Letters to Faculty

1) Original Outreach Letter

Dear ?????,

I am writing because your course ____ is listed as addressing the GE student learning outcome (SLO) of Active Inquiry. As you may know, the GE Curriculum Advisory Board (CAB) is assessing Active Inquiry in designated courses this semester. **We are NOT assessing your course.** Rather, we are assessing the GE program's effectiveness at teaching students Active Inquiry as part of their learning experience at CSUC.

Our team has been tasked with administering a survey to assess this SLO. As part of your GE Pathway commitment, **we ask you to encourage students to complete this 30-minute survey related to Active Inquiry by Monday, December 1.** One way to encourage them would be to offer students extra credit for completing the survey. We can supply you at the latest by December 10th the ID numbers of your students that have completed the survey, should you choose to offer them extra credit.

The survey will be e- mailed directly to the students and their responses will go directly to the assessment team. This survey, therefore, requires nothing on your part beyond strongly encouraging students to take it.

Please reply to this e-mail and let us know if you will encourage students to take the survey. We will also need to know if you will be assigning extra credit.

Thank you in advance for helping us with this assessment.

Best,

Jacque Chase,

Kate Transchel

2) Follow-up Letter with Names of Students who Completed Survey

Dear _____,

Thank you for asking your students to participate in the assessment of Active Inquiry for General Education. Below is a list of the students who completed the assessment task:

On behalf of the Active Inquiry Assessment Team, I wish to extend our appreciation for your participation in this important work. We hope you have a restful and rewarding winter break!

Kent Sandoe, Jacque Chase, Kate Transchel, Kevin Klipfel

ATTACHMENT D—SPSS Results (T-Tests)

T-TEST GROUPS=group(1 2)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS

/VARIABLES=score

/CRITERIA=CI(.95).

T-Test

Group Statistics

group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
score 1	197	7.83	2.285	.163
2	167	7.28	2.529	.196

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
score	Equal variances assumed	2.160	.142	2.153	362
	Equal variances not assumed			2.135	338.073

Independent Samples Test

t-test for Equality of Means			
Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference

				Lower
score	Equal variances assumed	.032	.543	.252
	Equal variances not assumed	.033	.543	.255

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
score	Equal variances assumed	1.040
	Equal variances not assumed	1.044

T-TEST GROUPS=group(2,5)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS

/VARIABLES=score

/CRITERIA=CI(.95).

T-Test

Group Statistics

group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
score >= 3	541	6.16	2.637	.113
< 3	364	7.58	2.412	.126

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
score	Equal variances assumed	2.408	.121	-8.178	903
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.321	823.550

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means			
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
					Lower
score	Equal variances assumed	.000	-1.413	.173	-1.752
	Equal variances not assumed	.000	-1.413	.170	-1.746

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
score	Equal variances assumed	-1.074
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.080