Inquiry ARC
Outline of Dec. 3 2012 Presentation to BOT
Lorena Russell
November 1, 2012

FA 2012 Pilot faculty:
We are currently running 16 courses with 11 pilot faculty. We will meet with pilot faculty the week of Nov. 5th for feedback and to plan events for next semester. Plan to schedule a roundtable for the campus community about teaching Inquiry ARC as well as asking pilot faculty to offer less formal departmental presentations in SP 2013.

Three of the current (FA 2012) pilot group plan to use Inquiry ARC in their classes next semester. This makes a total of 15 courses for spring 2013. Our total for AY 2012-13 will be 31 Inquiry ARC classes, well above our stated target of 10 pilot classes for the year (Inquiry ARC p. 35).

Note that implementation plan called for targeting LSIC 179 and 379 courses (p. 36), but this has not been the pattern for faculty volunteers. The majority of classes are located in the majors. Will intentionally target LSIC 179 and LANG 120 through a series of workshops next spring on “Teaching Writing and Critical Thinking,” but will also rethink Inquiry ARC placement as we move forward (see “Spring 2013” below).

SP 2013 Pilot Faculty:
Nine faculty and staff applied and eight were accepted into program following Oct. 3 meeting of selection committee. Participants include: Lyndi Hewitt (Soc), Melanie Fox (RA training), Nancy Ruppert (Education), Keya Maitra (Phil), Judith Beck (Physics), James Perkins (Physics), Ameena Batada (HPW), Deaver Traywick (LANG/UWC).

The group has just completed 4 hours of training via Thurs. learning circles (thanks to Melissa Himmelein and CTL). We have further workshops scheduled for Dec. 14 and the morning of Jan. 11th. Training will follow protocols from last summer, with some modification based on faculty feedback.

Assessment Update:
Our assessment work includes both institutional level assessments and class assessments. For classroom assessment, the assessment team has updated materials and distributed a packet to the current (FA 2012) pilot faculty group on Oct. 15. We simplified the rubric and added a checklist format along with some open-ended questions for input. Faculty will return some of the data on Nov. 15 and completed work on Dec. 15.

Our other point of focus has been on compiling baseline data which tell us about our students prior to introducing the Inquiry ARC pedagogy. One aspect of this data has been the CCTDI (administered to incoming freshmen in August 2012), which is specifically designed to assess students’ understanding of and inclination to use critical thinking processes. The CCTDI measures the following dispositions: truth-
seeking, open-mindedness, analyticity, systematicity, critical thinking self-confidence, inquisitiveness and maturity of judgment. According to documentation provided by the organization, high scores on the overall number indicate “the valuation of critical thinking as an approach to analyzing and resolving complex, novel, high stakes problems is a dominant habit of mind” while low scores “indicate that the test taker probably has none of the attitudes and attributes associated with the strong critical thinker.” They go on to note that scores under 210 are rare, and overall scores above 350 are also relatively rare. If all seven scores are 40 or above, then “the test taker has demonstrated significant and generalized strength in critical thinking disposition.”

Our August first-year student scores are well within the norm (with an average total of 302). In general, they scored high in terms of their self-confidence, but were less impressive in terms of truth-seeking or systematicity (see attached).

**Inquiry ARC committee structure:**
I met with FWDC on Oct. 11 2012 to share my concern regarding committee structure. They advised submitting requests for committee structure revision to them in the spring. Ideas included using ILSOC as model for committee structure to ensure continuity between oversight committee and teams (prof. development team and assessment team), requesting continuity of leadership so director will continue to have role for 1-2 years, rethinking the leadership of CTL in Inquiry ARC. We also discussed the current language of teams vs. committee. Membership in committees is what is tracked by FWDC, but team members in current structure tend to carry the burden of the work. Will review these options with the Inquiry ARC advisory committee during our Nov. 14 meeting and plan to present proposal to FWDC and senate in SP 2013.

**Misc. News:**
Sophi Link is serving Inquiry ARC as a student assistant through the Laurel's Scholarship program. She'll be interviewing current students in the program to get their input on their perceptions of the effectiveness of Inquiry ARC.

**Spring 2013:**
- Plan to recruit an additional 15-20 faculty for “roll-out” year, AY 2013-14, so this will be an active semester in terms of visibility and outreach.
- Hire student worker to serve as Inquiry ARC website manager.
- Plan programs, workshops and speakers to enhance interest on campus.
- Seek external professional development opportunities for staff, faculty and student program participants
- Continue to tool and refine assessment tools with pilot faculty.
- Rethink the placement of Inquiry ARC in LSIC 179 & 379.
- Rethink the committee organizational structure for Inquiry ARC