ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

The Narrative Evaluation Study Group, charged by provost Don Bantz to "provide a critical commentary on the various narrative evaluation approaches and identify some best practices," and thence to develop a guide for faculty, reached these main conclusions:

- The health of evaluation at Evergreen depends above all on exercise of both faculty and student authority. For faculty, this means commitment to making judgments about student work. For students, it means writing well-considered self-evaluations.

- The key step faculty can take to make their transcript evaluations serve students is to write succinctly. Concise evaluations and program descriptions are more readable and persuasive for graduate admissions committees and employers. Suggested limits for evaluations and program descriptions are a page each for yearlong full-time programs, 1/2-1 page for quarter-long ones. Part-time studies descriptions/evaluations must be proportionately shorter.

- Program descriptions should compactly note the inquiry's nature and content, activities involved, and materials studied, avoiding redundancy with other parts of the evaluation.

- Faculty's transcript evaluations should have a single author who integrates contributions from teammates and synthesizes (rather than strings together) multi-quarter work. Good evaluations have a narrative strategy, which typically focuses either on the student's (1) skills, or (2) development, or (3) major projects. Focused evaluations take less effort to compose and help free up conferences for in-depth discussion of student learning

- Student voice in transcripts has dwindled, weakening the documents and the climate of evaluation at the College. Faculty should require (or urge) students to cross the threshold of including self-evaluations in their transcripts. The key steps faculty can take to support student self-evaluation are to create space for reflection and to give guidance. If they do, most students can write creditable, concise accounts of their learning.

- Senior projects provide strong evidence for students to describe the culmination of their education in self-evaluations. Summative self-evaluations are worthwhile for some. Most can reflect well on their undergraduate careers as one part of their final self-evaluation.

- Credit equivalencies should use disciplinary, sub-field, and interdisciplinary terms that will be clear to graduate schools.

- Two matters call for faculty deliberation and action: deciding on a consistent policy for indicating upper-division credit in transcripts; and dropping the cover sheets for internship and independent study contracts from transcripts.

- If interest warrants, an ongoing group should be set up to further collegial discussion and innovative thinking about narrative evaluations.

I. WHY THIS GUIDE?

Narrative evaluations are both a glory and a vexation for Evergreen. A glory, because of the commitment they embody. Evergreen is a place where faculty take responsibility for assessing in writing what students accomplish in their studies, and where students are expected to do the same. These narratives shape the faculty-student conference held at the end of every quarter, with final statements becoming part of the official transcript when the class is completed. Evaluations are at the heart of our distinctive academic culture, which prizes ongoing reflection on learning rather than measurement by grades.

Still, despite the great investment the College has made in them since its founding, narrative evaluations remain fraught with difficulties. For one thing, preparing them puts a chronic strain on faculty, given the number of students they teach. For another, official transcripts, pieced together as the series of final evaluations, tend to be ungainly documents: hard to follow as a sequence, and often bewildering, even maddening, to read. What may work well in as a record from a single program frequently loses impact in a compiled transcript. The sum proves less than its parts. Some students applying for graduate school and employment are ill served.

Concerns about evaluations and transcripts led provost Barbara Smith to charge a Narrative Evaluation DTF in 1996. This committee, chaired by Matt Smith and composed of seasoned and newer faculty and staff, came to a consensus that reaffirmed the value of evaluations while calling for far greater concision in writing. The group concluded that brevity would improve the readability of transcripts, lighten the effort required of faculty, and free up end-of-quarter conferences to focus more substantively on students' actual learning.

The DTF's findings inspired a number of faculty, both individually and as teams, to change how they write evaluations. But its effects at the institutional level were muted. Some faculty objected to certain recommendations, and before final revisions reached a vote, the faculty's attention turned to a prolonged consideration of general education. Since that time, in the wake of decisions regarding Gen Ed, new pressures have arisen. For example, many more two and four credit courses offered through Evening and Weekend Studies now need to be incorporated into transcripts. Some have suggested that evaluations should show how students meet the Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate that the faculty has adopted. Meanwhile, participants in subsequent DTFs and summer institutes who have examined randomly selected transcripts have confirmed the Narrative Evaluation DTF's earlier critiques.

It is in this context that provost Don Bantz charged the Narrative Evaluation Study Group in September 2003. He told us to take a close look at approaches to evaluations. He asked us to make a taxonomy of types of narratives, to identify better and worse practices, to suggest parameters for length and proportions among parts, and to produce a guide to evaluation writing for faculty, keeping newer faculty especially in mind. He called on us

to "focus in your report on how to make narrative evaluations most useful to students, both as an integral part of their learning and as a transcript for external readers." Don, who served on the earlier Narrative Evaluation DTF, gave his own testimonial of how that experience taught him "how to prepare more concise, learning-outcome-focused evaluations while, at the same time, significantly reducing the time and energy spent in doing so."

Our Study Group, like the previous DTF, consisted of a mix of faculty at different stages in their careers and staff who work with transcripts. We were all interested in getting a better grip on the nature of narrative evaluations and passing along sound advice to the faculty. We enjoyed advantages compared to the 1996 DTF—namely, we had their analysis to build on, and a climate at the College more conducive to thoughtful reassessment. We also benefited from the concurrent efforts of the Evaluation Process Review Committee to make the mechanics of processing evaluations more efficient.

This guide, the result of our study, seeks to answer the question: What makes good narrative evaluations? Our set of answers affirms faculty members' authority to make their own judgments about student achievement in their own ways. At the same time, it anchors the act of evaluation writing in techniques that support the integrity of the transcript as a whole document. The guide offers an array of practical approaches to composing evaluations with clarity of purpose and conciseness of expression. It identifies practices that can serve students while easing life for faculty, too.

In the next section we review considerations that shape evaluation writing. Later sections take up the parts of evaluations, offering guidelines and the reasoning behind them. At the end is an appendix with examples of evaluation types. To simplify the presentation we write primarily about "programs" and "teams," but, for the most part, the points apply to all of the credit-bearing modes of teaching and leaning at Evergreen. (We do not address faculty self- and collegial evaluations, or student evaluations of faculty.) While we note two matters that we think call for formal faculty decisions—handling of upper-division credit and removal of contract cover sheets from official transcripts—the report eschews making a set of proposals that need to be debated and voted on. Our intention is to spur thinking that leads to economy of effort and the creation of better transcripts.

II. CLEARING THE GROUND

Prior to the 1996 DTF, few faculty had perused complete Evergreen transcripts. Since then, word has circulated about the shock of discovering what the College has wrought. Reading transcripts is mind-altering, faculty say. It makes them question their own practices. They recommend it to colleagues as a wake-up call.

What disturbs gimlet-eyed readers? The document's sheer bulk is daunting. The overall shape of the student's educational experience is often hard to discern. The level of detail frequently seems excessive, repetitive, or obscure. Sometimes it's interminable.

Description too often overwhelms judgment, making a student's accomplishments unclear. Browsing, one finds nuggets, of course, and one may be able to form a good impression of the student as learner. But deciphering transcripts tends to be a dispiriting exercise, with similar problems cropping up again and again.

The large gap between the herculean effort that most faculty put into evals and the cumulative resulting transcripts arises from knotty issues in Evergreen's culture of evaluation. These include tensions between writing for the student and for external readers; the felt need to translate, justify or elaborate for those unfamiliar with Evergreen; the fuzzy overlaps among faculty evaluations, student self-evaluations, and program descriptions; and the force of habitual techniques of evaluating developed over decades. The 1996 DTF concluded that underlying this jumble of considerations are key issues of audience and authority. We build on their insights below.

Reaching the Audience

Do faculty write primarily for the student or for potential admissions committees and employers? Faculty member Pete Sinclair shed light on this question for the first DTF when he pointed out an incompatibility in the interests of the two audiences. Faculty know the student's work intimately. The student benefits best when faculty assess it frankly and in depth. External readers, knowing neither the student nor the work, need a more basic picture of both. Not the gritty details, but a sense of what the student has accomplished; not the detailed process, but a summary, a result.

Many faculty, once attuned to this opposition, feel that they've tried to have it both ways. They write for a composite audience consisting of the student and imagined outsiders. The mixture can easily muddle the transcript evaluation and make it drag on. Far better, our Study Group thinks, to address the evaluation to a primary audience. To choose one audience, of course, is not to exclude others. When you direct your words externally, your student has the useful experience of reading over your shoulder, as it were, hearing how her or his performance sounds when explained to the world. The solution for most faculty has been to pitch their official evals directly to outsiders. Others, who regard the student as their true audience, put things in language that outsiders can easily understand.

The distinction between the two audiences has long been embodied in the custom of preparing interim evaluations at the end of each quarter prior to the last in multi-quarter programs. These "in-house" documents, often cast as notes or as a letter to the student, assess the study-in-progress. The student, in turn, writes an informal self-evaluation. These statements set the stage for the conference to be an honest dialogue about the student's learning. At the program's conclusion, faculty and student each write formal transcript evaluations, drawing in part on the previous writing. This sequential practice has the virtue of serving both audiences, meeting the student's need for meaty feedback and the external reader's need for succinct overview.

A common alternative practice, stringing together quarter-by-quarter evaluations to make the formal evaluation, falls short of serving either audience, our Study Group thought. It tends to be repetitive and diffuse, while lacking the candor of interim evaluations. According to David Marshall, director of Institutional Research, more than 1/3 of TESC's multi-quarter, multi-faculty programs produce transcript evaluations of this stitched-together kind.

There's always been speculation within the College about whether our transcripts help or hurt graduates. It's tempting to throw brickbats at readers who won't take the effort to give the document fair consideration. No doubt some incorrigibles will be hostile to a non-graded system. Nevertheless, we are sympathetic to reports of confusion, frustration, and skepticism, given the state of transcripts that we have encountered and the numbers of candidates for admission or employment that committees must review. Faculty member José Gómez, for instance, relayed to us the dismay expressed to him by a professor at the University of Washington Law School who is a reviewer: "She said that they find [our] evaluations so repetitive that it is difficult to make much evaluative sense out of them. She wondered if we were aware of this." While the College has not conducted research on the reception of transcripts in different contexts, the registrar, the director of the Career Development Center, and deans all regularly deal with queries and puzzlements from graduate admissions committees.

A snapshot of the external audience for transcripts: Among graduating seniors from '02-'03 and '03-'04, 40% had requested transcripts by winter quarter 2004. (The percentage will increase with time.) Half the requests were sent to graduate and professional schools, a third to the student making the request, and about a tenth to employers. Most of these employers were school districts. Few other employers require transcripts at the B.A. level, although many students who ask for their transcripts may excerpt them as part of the application process.

We are convinced that the most crucial step faculty can take to make transcripts reader-friendly is concision. Keeping evaluations modest in length respects busy readers. It creates a sense of proportionality among all evaluations in the transcript, and thus among all phases of the student's education. It distinguishes between what's worth making official and what isn't. Moreover, it requires considerably less effort than preparing long evaluations. Many faculty members find themselves trapped by conscience, habits, and college expectations into offering exhaustive accounts. Succinctness can liberate them from this self-imposed burden.

Faculty and Student Authority

Students at Evergreen are expected to actively reflect on their studies in order to clarify, for themselves, what they have learned. Self-evaluation is the embodiment, in writing, of that act. It is rooted, as is well known, in the College's founding pedagogic philosophy, which rejected grades and elevated a sharing of authority between teacher and student for

assessing the student's work. (See Appendix I for a discussion of premises underlying evaluation at Evergreen.)

In the early years, the faculty focused their responsibility for evaluation internally, not externally—that is, the emphasis was squarely on helping students gain a clearer sense of their learning and growth. Indeed, the first Faculty Handbook, in 1970, envisioned written faculty evaluations as *optional* parts of transcripts. The parts to be required were student self-evaluations, program descriptions, and credit reports. By the mid-1970s the main current components of the transcript had been codified. Over time since then, faculty have assumed increasingly more authority for evaluations, students increasingly less.

The 1996 DTF attributed this shift, in large part, to faculty's responding "with good intentions to the rational, defensible demands for accountability and legitimation." Credit equivalencies, for example, were appended to evaluations in order to translate what the program covered into more-or-less conventional course titles. There ensued pressure to make evaluations justify the specific equivalencies that were being awarded. Another practice developed whereby the members of a team wrote separate statements evaluating the student in the segment of the program that they taught. The result of such tendencies has been that many evaluations have come to function as certifications of credit for external audiences. But at a cost: they tend to be lengthy compilations, not succinct, integrated accounts of students' accomplishments. And too often they lack substance. On this score, David Marshall's findings are sobering: 38% of the evals that he reviewed in a recent study "were little more than a repetition of elements that are ordinarily part of a program's description. The narrative describing strengths of the student was typically limited to statements of the 'Johnny did a good job at experience X' variety."

There is a double loss here. As the faculty role in evaluation has expanded, it has tended to grow more bureaucratic and formulaic. At the same time, the student role has shrunk. In the Office of Institutional Research's sample of 61 transcripts of 2000-1 graduates, 42% of all programs, courses, contracts and internships lacked self-evaluations. The breakdown by planning unit of the proportion of evaluations that included self-evaluations was: Culture, Text and Language, 82%; Environmental Studies, 53%; Expressive Arts, 48%; Scientific Inquiry, 45% Society, Politics, Behavior and Change, 54%; Tacoma, 42%.

Most students still write a self-evaluation for their conference, but for a surprisingly large number the threshold of inclusion in the transcript is not being crossed. We heard two related kinds of explanations from faculty about this falling-off of student voice: one, that many students can't write good self-evaluations, so it's a disservice to put them in the transcript; the other, that there isn't enough time, given everything the class is doing, to help students create good ones. In practice, a substantial number of faculty leave it to students to decide whether or not to submit self-evals to the registrar. Absent an emphasis on self-evaluation, the end-of-quarter conference is more likely to revolve around the faculty's assessment, not the student's reflection.

The health of evaluation as part of Evergreen education depends, the Study Group concluded, on regular exercise of both faculty and student authority. For faculty, this means commitment to making judgments about student work. For students, it means writing well-considered self-evaluations. Again, David Marshall, a relative newcomer who has waded through tons of transcripts, offers useful perspective. He thinks that self-evals, done well, are more persuasive than faculty evals at demonstrating student accomplishment to external readers. "While the outside world relies on the authority of the faculty to evaluate abilities," he argues, "it should be up to the students to demonstrate synthesis of learning, and the ability to reflect on the personal and social significance of that learning." He invokes here the language of the Expectations, to which can be added the Expectation that students will "articulate and assume responsibility for their own work." Clearly, the crafting of good transcript self-evaluations requires effort by students—but their commitment to it is determined largely by the instruction and encouragement that faculty provide.

Faculty traditions and ongoing experiments with evaluation provide many productive ways to exercise authority, and this guide will describe a number of them. It's important to note that the mutual taking of responsibility for evaluation has an effect that goes far beyond the preparation of an official transcript. It also sets up the end-of-quarter conference to be an occasion for grounded, frank discussion about what the student has learned and where he or she is heading. That kind of dialogue is, after all, the *sine qua non* of student-teacher relationships at Evergreen.

III. EVALUATIONS OF STUDENTS

The transcript evaluation should be a succinct statement that makes judgments about what the student has accomplished. It should give a picture of the student and his or her work from a specific narrative angle. Suggested limits are a page for full year programs and 1/2-1 page for quarter-long ones. The evaluation should have a single author, who integrates contributions from others. Multi-quarter programs should avoid stringing together quarter-by-quarter evaluations.

Narrative Strategies

There are myriad ways for faculty to offer judgments about student learning. Each faculty member already has, or can develop or refine, his or her own reliable style and techniques for doing so. Views of what judgment consists of, and what kinds of judgment belong in official evaluations, vary a great deal. This is as it should be.

At a more general level, there appear to be a small number of *types* of narratives. Reading transcripts inductively, the Study Group found three common frameworks. One focuses on the skills the student has demonstrated across the range of content and activities in the

program. The second focuses on the character of the student and how he or she develops in the course of the program. The third focuses on major projects the student undertakes in the program. Boiling these differences down, the choice is to evaluate the student primarily in terms of (1) skills, (2) development, or (3) most important work.

You may object, "But my evaluations cover all these bases!" We don't disagree. An evaluation of one kind typically incorporates aspects of others. Still, one angle predominates. The choice of angle is a *narrative strategy*. Having a strategy for selection, we realized, is the very thing that makes an evaluation a narrative instead of a collection of information. To give a persuasive account of student learning, faculty need to depict it from a specific point of view. The strategy they follow depends on the nature of the program and on their predilections both as individuals and teams. Below are some considerations of purpose and method for each of the three types.

Skills narrative. This, the commonest kind of evaluation, addresses most or all of the main activities of the program, noting the skills demonstrated in each venue or subject. The emphasis is on judgment about what the student can now do, based on what he or she did in each area. Since programs cover a lot of ground, it's awfully easy for this kind of narrative to balloon unless what is to go in it is planned prior to the writing.

Skills-based evaluations tend to succeed best when clearly connected with the program description. If the description states what the program has done, including issues the inquiry dealt with, the evaluation can assess actual achievement in relation to the program's substance and goals. The program description might say, for example: "In winter quarter students wrote a major (15-25 page) research paper in order to deepen their understanding of a particular aspect of the French Revolution, to gain research skills, and to develop capacities to organize a complex argument." The evaluation would then briefly note the student's accomplishment with respect to those goals. Alternatively, the program description might simply say that a major paper was required, and the evaluation would enumerate the goals as aspects of the student's accomplishment. Deciding in advance how to divide what belongs in the program description and in the evaluation eliminates redundancy and simplifies the writing. Note that some student capabilities may not be predictable at the beginning of the class: they may well be emergent results of the work of the program or the particular student. (Turn to Appendix A for examples of skills evals paired with student self-evals and program descriptions.)

Developmental narrative. This kind of account centers on the student as a person learning; it's oriented to the student's character and the process of development she or he goes through in response to challenges posed by the program. Faculty member Chuck Pailthorp thinks of the approach as "a reflection, from a seasoned professional's point of view, of what the student has been up to. Hopefully, what I write helps them see what they have done in ways that help them find coherence in their lives as students." The method, as he practices it, "is to show students features of their work that they will recognize as their own: some I judge to be strengths, others weaknesses, and other simply to be characteristics." There is no obligation to cover the full range of program activities; rather, examples are chosen for the light they shed on the student.

7

Assessing development, one often considers whether and how the student's work met one's standards for whatever it is that one is teaching or the student is trying to learn. A crucial purpose for this kind of evaluation is to help the student make choices about what he or she will do next in either improving a skill or mastering a subject. In some cases, criticisms imply that the student should do something else entirely. Whether the primary intended audience is the student or others, these evals are concerned about the student's own growth. (See Appendix B.)

Project narrative. <u>This approach focuses on one or more major projects to show how the student develops his or her own work in the course of the program.</u> It recognizes that students discover their work gradually, in large part by undertaking significant projects on subjects of their own choosing—projects that call for independent initiative and that involve issues and topics germane to the inquiry. Thus, it assesses learning by documenting what students accomplish in these efforts of research, writing, performance, service, and so forth. In this sort of narrative, part stands for whole: depth gets priority over breadth of activities.

The nature of major project work in programs (and in independent contracts) is, of course, extremely varied. The evaluation can stress the culminating project in a program, or else two, even three projects. The method lends itself well to inclusion of a quotation from the best project, which the teacher glosses to exemplify the student's strengths. It also lends itself well to incorporating other faculties' assessments of projects that they supervised. The project(s) provide evidence on which faculty can characterize the student more broadly as a learner. Other program arenas (e.g., seminar, papers, labs, tests) are often briefly noted in such evaluations. Discussion of these activities can be expanded if they, rather than the major project, constitute the student's best work. (See Appendix C.)

Each of the strategies can be critiqued for what it leaves out. Bear in mind, however, that they are not pure types: project narratives usually deal selectively with development, developmental narratives with skills, and so on. Furthermore, given the great desirability of brevity and economy of effort, such tradeoffs are inevitable. Indeed, a variety of approaches enliven a transcript by portraying the student's undergraduate learning from multiple points of view.

Whatever the strategy, comprehensibility is crucial. The fact that readers of the transcript will likely be graduate school admissions committees may tempt you to write for peers in your field. Remember, though, how diverse and unpredictable students' postgraduate paths turn out to be. The challenge is to describe their learning in language that draws on specialized fields of knowledge in ways broad enough for a wide range of readers to grasp. Disciplinary dimensions of the work can be further adumbrated in program descriptions.

Length

The 1996 DTF recommended a one page limit for evaluations in full-time year-long programs, and half a page to a page for one quarter programs. Since that time, a number of faculty have adopted and thrived within these limits. Our Study Group agrees that for most faculty these lengths are adequate and highly desirable.

Why *most*, not *all*? An early member of the faculty who is a fine writer said: "It'd be a lot harder for me to write it in one page than in two." Another used to say to younger colleagues that if they couldn't tell the truth about a student in one paragraph, they couldn't do it at all. We think it would be wrong to propose a mandatory rule. The point is to make evaluation writing easier. We recognize that for some faculty accustomed to greater length, brevity could have the opposite effect. Somewhat longer evaluations can surely be effective—*if* they are skillfully written.

Still, we caution that what can seem to make perfect sense within a program can be numbing to outside readers, especially in the context of a whole transcript. Problems include internal program rhetoric, recondite disciplinary jargon, repetition of information, and minutiae of student work. Like the 1996 DTF, the Assessment Study Group and the Rubric Writing Institute before us, we found it agonizing to wade through evaluations and program descriptions that each ran three to six or more pages. As an exercise, one of us took a six page description and evaluation for a two-quarter program and boiled it down to two pages. We all found the redaction to be much more readable and informative than the original. We know that faculty who write in encyclopedic detail or string together each quarter in multi-quarter programs are diligent teachers with refined techniques for assembling evaluations. Our hope is that they will try suggestions in this guide and will support their more recently hired teaching partners to approach evaluation writing in less time-consuming ways.

Consider the value of proportionality in transcripts. This principle encourages faculty to see their particular program not in isolation, but as part of a collective enterprise manifested in each student's education *through* his or her transcript. Every program's contribution is noteworthy. None should claim priority by taking, relative to others, an inordinate amount of space.

Some Tips on Preparing

What appears in a transcript evaluation is only part (usually a small part) of what the writer actually knows about a student's learning. The final eval can be seen as a proxy for this more complex understanding. Below are various tried-and-true methods for assembling evaluations.

* Teams should develop a plan for evaluation congenial to all as part of program planning. New and newer members of the faculty must be equal partners in this discussion. The plan might cover what elements of student work will be evaluated, how

information will be exchanged, which narrative strategies teammates will use (they don't all need to use the same one), how student self-evaluation will be woven into the process.

* A single faculty member should take authority for authoring the final evaluation. Without a unifying voice, the eval tends to fracture into a series of disparate statements that make it harder to follow, repetitive and excessively long.

* Give the gist of the final eval in the opening paragraph. Readers typically start from the top and form a quick impression. They may go no further than those first lines.

* Don't recoil from offering criticism when justified. Including it is essential if students are to learn and transcripts are to be taken seriously. Faculty arrive at their own characteristic ways to note shortcomings and areas for improvement without inviting misinterpretation by external readers. Newer faculty, especially, should freely consult colleagues for examples and feedback. (Some of the evals in the appendix exhibit strategies for writing about students' academic difficulties.)

* Simplify your work by incorporating language and sentiments from other team members into the final eval. In multi-quarter programs, interim evals can be invaluable. If your teaching partner has aptly characterized the student's seminar participation, for example, you can use those words instead of, or combined with, your own. Teammates can agree in advance to formally describe certain parts of the program (e.g., a project, a series of labs) in interim evals, enabling the author to paste, quote, or paraphrase those pieces in the final eval. Citing colleagues by name, you introduce their voices. Or you can put some of their words into your own voice. It depends on what works best for your narrative.

* A similar strategy should simplify matters when one team member is responsible for all students' work in a particular workshop or module. It often takes inordinate labor and space to write a formal paragraph for each student's final eval; instead, a sentence or phrase passed on to the author is often quite sufficient. In programs composed essentially of modules, it makes the eval more readable by limiting the length of each faculty's contribution and combining accounts of sequential learning.

* Meet as a team at the end of the program (or quarter) to reflect on each student's work. As faculty member Matt Smith explains: "This takes a few minutes for each student, but usually we can quickly identify a central tendency in our mutual observations and share any exceptional circumstances, achievements, or concerns we have. We also clarify awards of credit and make sure everyone has copies of all the evals."

* If feasible, structure the program so that the faculty who authors the final eval is the one responsible for most of the student's final quarter's work. If you are both the student's research advisor and seminar leader, for instance, you are in a strong position to assess overall accomplishment.

* Take advantage of the flexibility you have in preparing "in-house" evaluations to make them less time consuming to write. While you might agonize over how to couch criticisms in the transcript, you're free to be quite candid describing strengths and weaknesses when you address the student. Whether they take the form of a letter, notes, or a statement, interim evals treat student work in detail and depth that support the dialogue you wish to have in the conference.

* When a major project is due at the end of the quarter, write about it only once, in your evaluation, rather than in an additional response to the student.

 * Have the student's draft self-evaluation in hand when preparing the final eval. Many faculty find they can affirm and connect to the student's view of his or her own work as they write their evaluation.

* Use both interim and final evaluation conferences as occasions for advising. They are a most propitious time to discuss near and long-term plans and sense of direction.

Experiments

Experiment is crucial to the vitality of the evaluation process. Some faculty are driven to innovate by discontent with dysfunctional tendencies in the system—problems of student and faculty authority, transcript readability, and faculty workload that this guide has noted. Below we discuss two such efforts that have been put into practice. We then consider the need to encourage ongoing exploration of new methods and new wrinkles.

Blended narrative. This strategy combines the student's and faculty's evaluations into a single document prepared by the student and then edited by and with the faculty. Jim Stroh introduced this procedure in some of his programs starting in the early '90s. He begins by holding a planning session to explain the method. He provides a detailed program description and model examples of evaluations. Students also receive faculty comments on their final work of the quarter in time to take them into account. Each student then writes about him- or herself in the third person and vets the draft with a small group of peers to improve its quality. Then, as Jim described it to the 1996 DTF, "During evaluation week I have an appointment with each student (about 30 to 40 minutes) during which I bring their evaluation up on screen, add the necessary boiler plate, and go over it line by line making additions, corrections and such as necessary. If I have a strong disagreement with their version and it can't be resolved or corrected I tell them I will do the re-write...In almost all cases by the time the student leaves we both agree on what their evaluation will be, right down to equivalencies. The student gets a copy on the spot and we discuss advising issues or do a little small talk as there usually is time."

Jim's rationales for taking this approach were that "students should have as thin a transcript as possible so the 'real world' will more likely read it," and that "students know their own work better than faculty." He discovered that students gain perspective on their

achievement as they take on the faculty role. The Study Group agreed about the good quality of students' contributions in Jim's co-authored evals. (See Appendix D.)

As the use of blended evaluations has spread across the College in recent years, concerns have been raised in the deanery and elsewhere. The most serious is that, in some cases, students appear to be writing the evaluation *for* the faculty. Some students have protested that they don't want (or are uncomfortable taking) that responsibility, that they're doing the faculty's job for them, that faculty are not really assessing their learning. This flies in the face of Jim Stroh's practice. In his experience, creating blended evals takes at least as much effort by faculty as writing them from scratch, since one must become thoroughly familiar with the student's work in order to co-author the document. Jim only employs the method if teammates are committed to the labor required. It's inappropriate for faculty to make students prepare a self-evaluation masquerading as a co-evaluation.

A second concern comes from the registrar, Andrea Coker-Anderson, who has been quizzed by graduate admissions committees: Is the student awarding credit to him- or herself? Our group felt that the heading "Faculty Evaluation Of Student Achievement" looks confusing when the evaluation is co-authored by the student. A new title seems needed. "Faculty and Student Co-Evaluation of Student Achievement"? We also toyed with a possible variation on the blended model: a document in which the faculty eval appears as interlinear commentary alongside the self-eval, in a separate typeface. In the end, after weighing the loss of distinct student and faculty voices in blended evaluations, we agreed that the combining of student-faculty authority offsets the loss—so long as faculty do their part.

In sum: STRENGTHS: The blended narrative is more concise than the paired faculty evaluation and student self-evaluation. Students' authority over their own learning is given significant weight. Students learn to reflect well on their work. CONCERNS: Students should not be placed in the position of writing the evaluation for the faculty. Outside readers have been confused by authorship of blended evaluations.

Response narrative. This strategy shifts the focus squarely onto the student's self-evaluation, making the faculty evaluation a response, a gloss on what the student has written. The method was common in the early years. In the way that Sarah Williams has practiced it with teammates, self-evaluation becomes an ongoing, highly structured activity within the program, so that by the end students create detailed, accurate accounts of their own learning. Sarah explains: "Because this process makes the faculty evaluation a response to the student self-evaluation rather than the primary evaluative document, the faculty evaluation can be short and focus on just the unique or distinctive qualities of the learning the faculty experienced in relationship with the student. For me, this has reduced my stress when the four foot high stack of portfolios appears outside my door at the end of week ten. In this system, faculty are not responsible for creating a comprehensive evaluation of students' work at the end of the quarter. Rather, through self-assessment documents and collaborative workshops, students articulate and assume responsibility for

their own work. Then, through workshops during each quarter students receive peer response and faculty feedback regarding their reflective and evaluative work."

Students become quite invested in this sort of evaluation process since their role is clearly consequential. Indeed, Sarah's teams award credit for the activity. Redundancy between student and faculty voices is reduced, since faculty respond very selectively to the student's narrative. And, Sarah testifies, evaluation week becomes pleasurable. Her teams meet "for several hours with good food and drink—laughter and tears—to review each student together. It is fun and instructive to share multiple perspectives on student work, especially in programs involving alternating modules, workshops, seminars, and studio components. Then, in writing the faculty evaluation for your seminar group of 25 students, individual faculty can focus on what was truly engaging about her/his experience of a student's work as well as offer an assessment for the faculty as a whole."

The Study Group offers two cautions about this approach. First, just as with blended evals, response evals require strong faculty engagement. The challenge is to design the program so that student self-evaluation is knit prominently into it. Second, the sheer amount of evaluating generated by this method can lead to overly long transcript documents. Proportionality should be kept in mind. Further details on Sarah's structured technique for self-evaluation are given in the next section of the guide. (For an example of a response eval and an end-of-quarter worksheet, see Appendix E.)

In sum: STRENGTHS: Authority for students' achievements is shifted decidedly to the students. Faculty workload in reviewing student work is considerably reduced. CONCERNS: Significant program time needs to be dedicated to the students' work of reflection. The pair of faculty evaluation and student self-evaluation tend to be lengthy.

Support for experiment. A significant number of faculty, now and in the past, have felt stymied and frustrated by constraints of the evaluation system. Yet little in the way of alternative modes of writing has emerged. We think it's important to nurture a climate at the College in which fundamental questions about the nature of evaluation are asked and faculty who want to try out new ideas get support to do so.

Consider, for example, some faculty's interest in possibilities of a grid method of evaluation. Such an approach would list, in boilerplate, the set of abilities and kinds of knowledge and skills that faculty wanted students to gain, and describe how the student fared with regard to each. It could include a paragraph summarizing the student's work overall. (Appendix F shows what a grid might cover in a specific program.) A good case can be made that grid-based evaluations would serve students well by clearly laying out their accomplishments for graduate schools in ways that might be quicker and easier to grasp than typical narrative evaluations, while requiring much less effort to write.

Grid strategies have been proposed occasionally over the years, but their use has not approved by the deans because grids have not been deemed to be narratives. Are they? And if they aren't narratives, does it matter? In our group's discussion, several concerns were raised: that grids *assert* faculty authority rather than *earn* it, as narratives

do; that the limited number of categories chosen in a grid format will capture some students' learning but overlook others; that brief comments would tend to be converted by readers into grades rather than taken as substantive judgments. These objections don't invalidate the potential of grid-based evaluations; rather, they point to the need for faculty to have an institutionalized means to air issues and explore innovative strategies regarding evaluation.

It would be inappropriate to begin including grid-style evaluations in students' transcripts without further consideration within the faculty. To support that discussion, we concluded that what is called for is a commitment at the College to controlled experimentation. Teams who want to try something new should have a group of faculty and staff to turn to for guidance and feedback. If their experiment pans out, it can develop into another tool for evaluation that becomes available to faculty at large.

IV. STUDENT SELF-EVALUATIONS

All students should write a self-evaluation at the end of each quarter. At the end of the program they should write a self-evaluation for their transcript—1/3 to 1/2 page if the program lasts a quarter, no more than a page if it's yearlong. By giving students guidance and time to compose good self-evaluations, faculty help make reflection central to their education. Seniors should write about the culmination of their undergraduate education in their self-evaluations.

Creating Space for Reflection

Students' attitudes towards self-evaluation depend on their faculty. When faculty stress its importance and make it an integral part of the program's design, most students take it seriously, too. When faculty expect them to write self-evals that are worthy of inclusion in the transcript and support them to do so, most students come through.

This determinative role of faculty is our key conclusion about self-evaluations. It is at odds with the view among a number of faculty that many students can't write good self-evals and so are better off omitting them from transcripts. That belief appears to us to be a self-fulfilling prophecy. We've seen ample evidence that in programs where emphasis is put on self-evaluation, the great majority of students prove able to write quite creditable accounts of their learning. Faculty, not students, set the terms of engagement.

But why emphasize the writing of self-evals *for the transcript*? Why not require students to submit a self-eval for the conference, but leave it up to them to decide whether to put one in the transcript at the end of the program? (The *Faculty Handbook* states: "In 1987 the faculty voted to require that all students go through a written self-evaluation process in their academic programs." It leaves it up to program faculty "to determine explicitly and notify students at the beginning of the program, regarding whether or not student

self-evaluations will be a part of the permanent student transcript.") It's a matter, we think, of the threshold of expectation about students' exercise of authority for their learning. If the stakes are real, the students' act of writing the self-evaluation becomes a more critical moment to reflect upon and integrate the work they've done. Without such stakes, the weight of authority swings more heavily to faculty, dimming prospects for reflection.

In practice, the College's policy is this: If you refer directly to the student's self-evaluation in your transcript evaluation, she or he is *required* to submit it to complete the transcript. Until that happens, the transcript won't be sent outside TESC, although the credit earned for the class will be posted. Many students don't know this policy, so if the team decides to require transcript self-evaluations you should explain it to them. (Conversely, if you *don't* refer to the self-evaluation in your evaluation, the registrar *won't* require it, regardless of what you tell students or put in your covenant.) We discovered that many students who write a draft self-evaluation for the conference do not submit a final version for inclusion in their transcript. The pattern seems caused partly by mixed messages in student culture about evaluation, and partly by the fact that when the class is over faculty don't track whether this last step is taken.

Embrace of self-evaluation shifts authority not just to the student as an individual, but also to the class as a whole. As faculty member Rita Pougalies views the connection: "As students develop the skills of reflection and a more personal and powerful relationship to their work, a different role for the learning community begins to evolve. Often peers become as important as audience and critics as the teacher is. Students look toward one another, as well as toward the faculty, for feedback and development of key concepts and support for their intellectual risk taking."[1]

Here are some suggestions for how faculty can strengthen the climate for self-evaluation:

* State in the syllabus or covenant that in-house self-evals will be required at the end of each quarter and a transcript self-eval at the end of the program. As part of the opening activities of the program discuss why self-evaluation is important for learning and how it will be approached. (It can be revealing for students to hear, for example, that as part of TESC's emphasis on reflection team members evaluate themselves and each other.)

* During the first week of the quarter, set aside class time for students to create a baseline from which to assess their learning in the program. One approach is to have them do some reflective writing about their current understanding of the program content. Another is to have them respond to a form that lists the program's goals, evaluating their current standing with respect to each. (See the last part of Appendix F.) These exercises give students a solid point of reference for comparison at the end of the quarter or program, and can be updated partway through.

---

[1] Marie Eaton and Rita Pougiales, "Work, Reflection, and Community: Conditions that Support Writing Self-Evaluations," in Jean MacGregor, ed., *Student Self-Evaluation,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993, p.62.

* If you have a get-to-know-you meeting with each student close to the start of the quarter, ask for previous self- and faculty evals to read in advance. This underscores the significance of self-evaluation in TESC education.

* Check in with each student at mid-quarter about his or her learning so far. This can be done through a brief oral conference or a short written paragraph. (The contact can be especially important for students who may lose credit: it goes beyond a formal 5th week warning to a closer look at problems and circumstances.)

* Near the end of the quarter, take a class session to prepare students to compose their self-evals. This meeting can preview how to approach the writing and review program content for the quarter. It helps students to hear good potential ways to frame their narrative. You can propose such questions as the following: "Describe the challenges the program posed for you and how you met them." "Why were you drawn to the program, what did you think you might learn, and what *did* you learn?" "Assess your most significant work." "How do you see your learning in relation to the goals/issues of the inquiry?" "...in relation to the foci/Expectations emphasized in the program?"

* Encourage those who need additional guidance (typically, new students) to attend an Academic Advising workshop or to review their draft with a tutor at the Writing Center. Both places offer solid support. Academic Advising hands out a smart statement by emeritus faculty member Richard Alexander arguing that self-evaluation is the most important part of the transcript. Many Greeners take advice in this essay to heart. "The self-evaluations taken as a whole should provide a running record of your ACADEMIC PROGRESS through Evergreen," Alexander writes. "Readers who start with the first evaluation and read through to the final one, should be given the autobiographical story of your work here. Why did you choose to come to Evergreen? What were you prepared to do? What did you want to do? Why did you want to do it? Why did you choose this program at this time? What did you learn? How have you changed? grown? developed? Are your goals still the same? What do you plan to do next? and why?"

* Explain to students how you want them to approach their "in-house" self-evaluation in comparison to their final one. You might stress, for example, increased detail, freewheeling form, the difference in audience, the value of frankness.

* Give students a draft copy of the program description for end-of-program preparation. If you can't, tell them what it will cover. That helps them avoid repetition and decide what to address in their self-evaluation.

* Consider in what way and what context to review program content. Here, for instance, is a method of Matt Smith's: "I take one full morning or afternoon for students to make a map of the year-to-date program. The map is made by small groups. (Students need to bring their books, notes, papers, syllabi, journals, projects, group work, lab notes, etc. to this exercise.) The map should include all the activities of the program. It should have images/arrows that connect these activities conceptually, and explicit statements of what they see as connections. These maps are shared and explained by each group to the

program as a whole at the end of the session." This exercise not only prepares students for evaluation, it also clarifies for faculty how the class sees the learning that's occurred.

* After students undertake the review Matt describes above, they write a two to three page essay on their critical learning. "I ask them to identify three documents (academic journal entries, papers, presentations, etc.) where this learning took place and to write about it and its importance. For students remaining in the program, this is their self-evaluation. Those who are not rewrite the essay as a self-evaluation for the transcript." Students submit portfolios, with the essay and the three documents as the key pieces of evidence about their learning, and all their other writing as supplementary.

* A still more structured approach is used by Sarah Williams. "Students were provided handouts at mid-quarter and quarter's end during fall, winter, and spring quarters that required a written reflection regarding all aspects of program work. Embedded in these worksheet exercises was ongoing assessment work done in critique sessions with regard to studio work. Also, portfolios were required and assessed during workshops through written evaluation forms including peer review of both the content and form. We met in the computer lab at mid-quarter and quarter's end to read and review a narrative compilation of each student's evaluative work. The goal was to have this narrative become the most polished and accomplished piece of writing each student produced during each quarter." As part of this process, students decide how to distribute their own program credits, based on categories and criteria provided by faculty. Their final narrative becomes the primary document in the transcript evaluation. (Appendix E)

* Hold a session during the tenth week for peer review of self-evaluations. In small groups, students take turns reading their drafts and receiving feedback. You should offer guidance at the beginning on how they might best help one another. Fellow students are a fine audience for the drafts. They smell bull, spot omissions, and suggest clarifications. Hearing each other leads to new recognitions about personal and shared learning. After the session, students redraft their self-eval. (This was a favorite device of Richard Jones in the early years.)

* Consider the potential for student peer evaluation in your program. Faculty member Sarah Ryan has found it valuable both for increasing faculty knowledge of students' work and for engaging students in reflection as a communal responsibility. Sarah's colleague Nancy Parkes introduced her to it as tool in assessing group projects. Sarah writes: "The covenant says that 'students will evaluate one another's work in project groups in writing at the end of the quarter.' Then, when it actually comes time to write these, we suggest that they write a short paragraph or a couple of sentences about each project group member's contribution. In addition to letting faculty know who contributed what to the final project, we also got some good language for evaluation and the students felt it added to the accountability of the group. It took away some of the anxiety for those who fear they end up doing more work than others for the same credit." Similarly, peer evaluations can play a significant part in cluster contracts, where a faculty member sponsors a group of students to pursue independent study, at least in part, together.

* You can also make broader use of peer evaluation, as Sarah Ryan did in the evaluation workshop at the end of a multi-quarter program. The team gave the following instructions: "If there were other students who contributed something important to your education, write a sentence or two about each person and what her or his contribution was. You're welcome to comment on their seminar or small group contributions, their personal and intellectual friendship, their written or performed work, or anything else." Sarah notes, "We got some results we expected, but also got some surprising consensus on people who may not have spoken up much but were really teachers in the class in their interaction with peers."

* Get the transcript self-evaluation, in best-draft form, before the conference. This enables you to (1) draw on it in thinking about your evaluation, and (2) prepare editorial suggestions for the student. The latter is critical. While a portion of the self-evals that reach your desk are ready, as is, for the transcript, most need varying degrees of tweaking. There may be mistakes in mechanics (punctuation, spelling, grammar). There may be problems of structure or content (e.g., repetition, unfinished points). There may be redundancy with the program description. There may be overblown claims about accomplishment, or too much self-deprecation. With a short investment of time you can assess what's needed. During the conference, go over corrections and advice. Your interest in the self-eval at this stage may well determine whether the student finishes it for the transcript.

* If you think a self-eval *shouldn't* go in the transcript, level with the student. He or she probably needs help in the future from Academic Advising and the Writing Center. (If you've made inclusion a class requirement, simply remove your reference to the self-eval in your eval of the student.)

* While some faculty prefer to get the interim self-eval prior to the conference, others wait until the meeting. An advantage of that approach is that you learn face-to-face how the student thinks about her or his work. The conference can begin with the student reading and commenting on the self-eval. You respond. Then you read your eval to the student. The dovetailing (or not) of the two documents makes for rewarding conversation.

Senior Self-Evaluations

With the absence of departmental major requirements, Evergreen seniors face the challenge of defining for themselves how to complete college. The Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate speak to the faculty's hopes about this: "As a culmination of your education, demonstrate depth, breadth and synthesis of learning and the ability to reflect on the personal and social significance of that learning." Seniors document this experience through their transcript self-evaluations.

Summative self-evaluation. The idea that graduating seniors should reflect on their entire college career in a final statement placed at the top of the transcript was endorsed by a faculty vote in the 2001 Gen Ed deliberations. The Study Group found, however, that

while many seniors have heard about the desirability of such a statement, extremely few write one. We learned about a recent experiment, a part-time studies class for summative self-evaluation writing in which students produced many drafts with intensive guidance from faculty. The students, we heard, learned a lot from the experience. We applauded the effort but were dismayed by the implication. Stretched as faculty already are, who has time for multiple meetings of this kind? Some of us were also ambivalent about the results. One member of the group complained that from the distance of hindsight, this set of students tended to "write about themselves as though they were someone else, as though they were case studies." He found much of their language "bureaucratic, dispassionate, at times almost clinical."

We think that a summative statement is no substitute for ongoing self-evaluation that shows what the student did and learned in the immediacy of specific studies. Its presence could even be counterproductive, detracting attention from the student's voice elsewhere in the transcript. At the same time, we recognize that some students file few if any self-evaluations. Some don't do senior projects. Some long for a sense of perspective on their education. For students such as these, a summative self-evaluation might be the ticket to tie things together. Having the chance to reflect on their undergraduate learning in a structured setting could be a valuable capstone for them. It seems likely that few seniors will write summative self-evals without ongoing guidance, but a limited number will choose to if 2-credit classes and individual contracts are offered for that purpose.

Senior project. Students undertake major projects of many kinds: laboratory, field, and library-based research; internships, community service, and social action; artistic creation and performance; study abroad. Many of these activities are pursued in programs, many in independent contracts. For seniors, such projects often become culminating experiences in the development of their own work: their most advanced undergraduate studies. We agreed that senior self-evaluations of this learning, when well fashioned, constitute an exceptionally valuable part of the transcript. Appearing at or near the top of that document, they can persuasively show achievement of depth, breadth, and synthesis by discussing what the student actually did. (For an example, look at the self-evaluation in Appendix C.)

The more students are able and encouraged to pursue senior projects (or theses), the better! While some faculty and planning units explicitly offer these opportunities, we think that many students who would benefit by carrying out part of their senior year's studies in this way are not sufficiently aware of the potential for doing so. Advising by faculty, starting in junior year, can help orient students to consider these projects and to find promising contexts in which to pursue them.

Integrative paragraph. When seniors compose their self-evaluation for their final quarter, faculty can advise them to include a paragraph or two of reflection on their studies as a whole. Many students, at this moment before graduating, are mulling over their education. It's a natural topic to discuss in the last conference. Writing about it briefly is a modest, realistic task—one that many graduating students welcome.

V. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

The program description should succinctly describe the nature and content of the inquiry, the activities involved, and the texts and other materials studied. It should avoid redundancy with other parts of the evaluation. Suggested limits are the same as for evaluations of students: 1/2-1 page for a one-quarter program, a page for a yearlong one.

For most external readers, who think of undergraduate education in terms of courses and majors, program descriptions offer an important sense of how study is organized at Evergreen. The need for clarity and compactness applies at least as much to these documents as to the other parts of the evaluation. Readers, after all, will be more interested in the student's achievement than in the program *per se*. We were struck by tendencies to repeat information in description and evaluation and by the substantial number of descriptions longer than a page in length (40% in a sample of 2000-1 graduates). After reviewing examples of well-honed descriptions, a number of us found it easy to improve our own. Here are suggestions for writing them based on patterns we observed:

* Draft the description before writing the final evaluations, so the two documents are complementary, not overlapping and redundant.

* Include all team members' names and fields of study. (They're absent surprisingly often.)

* Begin the description with an overview of the program. (Some may read no further than the first lines of the first paragraph.)

* Put essential details about program activities into the description, reducing boilerplate in the evaluation.

* Integrate learning objectives—the purposes of program activities—into the description. For example, instead of saying "students wrote a research paper," say they wrote it "to develop ability to organize, synthesize, and assess the reliability of a range of sources."

* Instead of listing books, films, speakers, etc., as blocks of text, present them in the context of program themes. There's no need to list them all!

* Consider the value of noting how subjects referred to in the equivalencies figured in the content of the program.

* Make the description intelligible to readers unfamiliar with the fields, and avoid jargon internal to the program.

* Check the catalogue copy or syllabus for already existing language about the nature and content of the inquiry that can be adapted to the description.

* In multi-quarter programs, develop the description quarter by quarter, synthesizing new material as the program proceeds. This usually makes for the most economical effort, since different versions are needed to cover students who weren't enrolled from beginning to end. (The registrar's office reports that sometimes this isn't done, leading to confusion about what these students actually studied.)

VI. CREDIT EQUIVALENCIES

Credit equivalencies should use disciplinary, sub-field, or interdisciplinary terminology that will be clear to graduate schools. When feasible, the number of credits assigned should be comparable to college courses.

Clarifying Equivalencies

The original motivation for credit equivalencies was to provide a translation of programs into the language of disciplinary content for graduate schools and employers. The need for such redaction—inadequate as it often is in characterizing the actual substance of programs—remains as real as ever, even in this increasingly postdisciplinary age. The Study Group found that nearly all the terms that faculty use for equivalencies make sense when taken in the context of their program description and narrative evaluations. The trouble is that few readers have time to study the transcript in this way. Most encounter the equivalencies in the form of a summary list in the "Record of Academic Achievement" that is attached at the front of the transcript. So equivalencies need to be self-explanatory. Often they're not. In a sampling of credit equivalencies in 100 program descriptions across all planning units, the Office of Institutional Research estimated that 43% were not stated as easily-discerned subjects, even when using interpretive criteria a good deal more flexible than standard terms for disciplinary content of undergraduate courses.

We suggest several kinds of labels that can help make equivalencies easy to grasp:

By discipline and topic. Example: "History: Agrarian Reform Movements." Simply listing the discipline (History) is insufficient, when one thinks of departmental courses. So is simply listing the topic (Agrarian Reform Movements), which by itself offers no indication of the scholarly approach. Was it historical, political, or sociological? While all three may have been involved, often one encompasses the others.

By sub-field of knowledge. This is an area that is smaller or more focused than the standard disciplines, and seems best described in its own terms. Often it bridges disciplines. Examples: "Oral History," "Filmmaking," "Spectroscopy."

By interdisciplinary designation. When the parsing of content in either of the above ways seems inapt, a broader label can be perfectly acceptable. Examples: "Cultural Studies," "Quantitative Reasoning," "General Science." Terms such as these have become common in many institutions. They are preferable to condensed or rephrased program titles that may seem cryptic to outsiders. They can be further defined by topic ("Cultural Studies: American Identities").

The term "Research" often appears in credit equivalencies without further explanation. What about the field and the skill required? Was it a self-directed exploration or a programmed set of lab or workshop exercises? (These questions may not be clarified by the evaluation, either.) By clearly naming what the subject and nature of the research were, the credit equivalency fulfills its purpose as translation.

We advise that, when feasible, credit equivalencies be defined broadly enough that the number of credits is roughly comparable to a typical college course: at least three, often four, sometimes five credits. Divisions of two credits—the equivalent of a "mini-course" at other institutions—should be done sparingly. A single credit equivalency should be avoided if at all possible.

When it comes time to craft credit equivalencies, it can be very useful to return to the catalogue copy. Following the categories for credit proposed there usually serves students well because the subjects are easily comprehensible.

Designating Upper-Division Credit

On this matter, we think the faculty needs to decide on a consistent policy.

As things stand, there is no faculty-wide agreement about how or when to denote upper-division credit. Some indicate it by placing an asterisk (*) after units of credit in the equivalencies. Others do not. This lack of consistency can be quite misleading. Outside readers who see asterisks by some credits but not others can logically conclude that un-starred credits represent lower-division study. Even if the program description states that the work was upper-division, those credits will *look like* they're lower-division if they appear, un-starred, alongside starred credits in the full list of equivalencies at the top of the transcript. Students, for example, may receive asterisked credits in sophomore but not senior year, even though their senior studies were much more advanced. The list of equivalencies looks, mistakenly, like a hodgepodge of lower- and upper-division work.

Some background on how this came to pass: Asterisking began with the introduction of the Bachelor of Science degree, which is awarded only to students who have obtained 48 upper-division science/math credits. At first, only science faculty adopted the practice.

Later, when state regulations for admission into Masters in Teaching (MIT) programs required certain courses in the student's major area to be certified as upper-division, other faculty were asked by Evergreen's MIT program to attach asterisks to those credits at students' request. Although state policy no longer demands this certification, the use of starring has continued to spread among some humanities, arts, and social science faculty.

Our Study Group took no position on what the policy should be. We want here to note some dimensions of the issue and to suggest alternative solutions.

At the root of the issue, unsurprisingly, is the fluidity of Evergreen's curricular structure compared to that of other colleges, which designate courses at "100" to "400" levels. True, we call some programs "upper division." But we call others "all-level." And while some parts of the curriculum are clearly sequential, others clearly do not require previous preparation of a specific kind. A hallmark of multi-quarter programs is that students progress to increasingly advanced work—with different students moving more quickly and further than others along different continua of the inquiry. These considerations don't rule out the use of asterisks. But they suggest some of the complexities involved in codifying the distinction between upper- and lower-division credit for a college that puts such a premium on students' individual learning.

Let's say that the faculty was to adopt the policy that faculty members will asterisk all credits that they deem to be upper-division. Each faculty member would remain free to determine how, when and why she or he designates this credit. Some may decide at a program's outset that it will be taught at an upper-division level and designate all credits awarded as upper-division. Others might wish to determine whether a particular student completed work at an upper-division level. In that case different students in the same program might receive different amounts of starred credit. Or a team might designate some, but not all, of the credit awarded within the program as upper-division.

Note the likely divergence, in an asterisked system, in the basis on which faculty would award upper-division credit. For some, starring would indicate only that the subject was *taught* at a junior/senior level. So long as a student earned credit it would automatically be starred—just as, at another college, one could get a "D" in a senior level class. Other faculty would reserve award of upper-division credit to those who achieve a level of quality that constitutes upper-division *learning*. Starring, for example, might be the equivalent of superior work for freshmen and sophomores in certain contexts.

What about eliminating asterisks? Faculty have always had other means to signify that studies are upper-division. They identify upper-division programs as such in program descriptions. In evaluations, they often make judgments about student learning that explicitly or implicitly characterize its "level" with respect to specific subjects. There are some faculty who prefer to avoid the upper/lower distinction altogether when they can, because they find it problematic: much undergraduate education, after all, falls into an intermediate zone, a mixture of "sophomore" and "junior" levels that's neither "beginning" nor "advanced." But other faculty find the distinction essential in presenting students for admission to graduate school. Wendy Freeman, director of Career

Development, shares this view. She believes that sometimes admission depends on whether students' upper-division work is clearly visible in their equivalencies—not necessarily through asterisks, but somehow.

Here, then, are four choices for the faculty to consider:

1. Adopt asterisks as a college-wide practice, giving faculty autonomy about how and when to use them. (If the College goes this route, it will be important not to *over*use them.)

2. Identify all classes in the transcript "Record of Academic Achievement" by level: "first year," "all-level," "intermediate," "upper-division." Credit equivalencies will not be individually starred. Readers will rightly assume that upper-division programs award upper-division credit. For other kinds of programs, they will need to consult the evaluation to learn about the level of student work. Faculty will be encouraged to specify the level(s) at the beginning or end of the narrative.

3. This approach resembles (2) in that classes are identified by level, but with the difference that asterisks are used, and faculty specify which part of the credit equivalencies in all-level and intermediate programs are upper- and lower-division. Each team will be free to decide whether to award upper-division credit on a student-by-student basis or to make the apportionment the same for all students.

4. Science and math faculty, only, use asterisks. An explanation appended to the transcript Record of Achievement will state that these are credits towards the B.S. degree.

VII. INTERNSHIP AND INDEPENDENT STUDY CONTRACTS

Student and faculty evaluations, taken together, should give an accurate, descriptive, and non-redundant account of the work accomplished. For a 16-credit contract, these evaluations should be at most a page long—and proportionately shorter when for less credit.

Since Evergreen opened its doors, self-directed learning has been a central aim of the College's pedagogy. It is knit into programs, fostered by the faculty, and pursued energetically by students through internship and independent study contracts. These contracts occur plentifully in all planning units.

Care needs to be taken in crafting evaluations for and by students who contract for independent study and internships so that there exists a readable, useful report of activities undertaken, as well as what learning ensued from it. In this regard, the "project" and "developmental" narrative strategies often seem especially apt, as do the "blended" and "response" experiments described earlier in the guide. Whatever strategy

is employed, faculty, students, and (where appropriate) field supervisors should cooperate to assure that there is an accurate and minimally redundant description in the evaluations of the work undertaken. (See Appendix G for examples of internship evals.)

Our Study Group recommends that the "Internship Learning Contract" and "Individual Learning Contract" forms—the ones that students fill out and that sponsors, supervisors and deans approve before the work commences—be dropped from the transcript. To do so will require a faculty vote. Removing the form would eliminate misapprehensions caused for readers when specific elements of a plan shift in the course of the quarter. It would also eliminate repetition of what appears in faculty and self-evaluations. Completion of the form would still be required for registration: it remains the agreed-upon contract, essential for student preparation. In lieu of having the form in the transcript, student and faculty should make sure to include relevant information from it (such as name and location of organization, name and position of supervisor, nature of duties, learning objectives, books read) in their evaluations.

To support proportionality within the transcript, student and faculty evals should each be a maximum of one page for a 16-credit contract. If the student describes the work well, the faculty sponsor can often write a succinct commentary. With internships, faculty should use their judgment to decide whether to excerpt the field supervisor's letter in their evaluation or to include the entire letter. If the letter is long, diffuse, overly critical, or repeats what's covered in the other evals, excerpting it makes great sense.

We were surprised to hear from David Marshall that student evaluations for internships and independent study were missing nearly as often as not in transcripts, since the work is so obviously devised, observed and conducted by students themselves. For both internships and individual learning contracts, the point made earlier in the guide needs emphasizing, namely that the act of writing self-evaluations offers a critical moment for student reflection upon and integration of their experiences. Student and faculty may very well find intensified moments for collaboration and complementarity in meetings and discussions during the period of contracted study, but *especially* during the evaluation conference. The presence of student voice as an official part of the transcript goes a long way toward conveying what happened.

Here are some commonsense practices that prepare the ground for good evaluations:

* Be persuaded that the student is prepared to undertake the proposed work. Don't hesitate to ask for an example of previous work or evaluations.

* Get the student to be realistic about the number of credits. The standard formula is 2 1/2 hours of work per credit. Ask the student to log hours, to monitor him- or herself.

* Help the student develop an academic component as part of an internship. This often becomes the basis of your ongoing connection, and later of your evaluation.

* Keep to the meeting or contact schedule that you agree to at the outset. Problems tend to occur when student and sponsor fall out of touch, against expectations they'd had.

* Make a site visit or speak by phone to the internship supervisor if appropriate, at a point that's good to check on how the student is doing.

VIII. EVENING AND WEEKEND STUDIES EVALUATIONS

Evaluations for Evening and Weekend Studies offerings should follow the same guidelines as those for full-time offerings. They should be proportionately shorter in length: 1/2 page at most for an 8-credit description/evaluation, and 1-3 sentences for a 2-credit one. Students should write a single unified self-evaluation that covers all their study in a quarter, or in several quarters if they are continuing in a multi-quarter program.

The guidelines in this report are for the most part fully applicable to writing evaluations for offerings in Evening and Weekend Studies. (See Appendix H.) But there are particular features of EWS offerings that call for special comment.

As noted in the introduction, the growth of the EWS planning unit (prior to spring 2002, called Part Time Studies) has been one of several changes that have placed a strain on transcripts. EWS comprises offerings that vary from yearlong, half-time programs to 2-credit courses, with a great many one quarter, 8-credit programs and 4-credit courses. While many students enroll in a full-time program and augment it with a 2- or 4-credit course, others only take offerings from EWS: for instance, an 8-credit program together with one or two courses, or sometimes, three or four 4-credit courses in a quarter. These modes of study constitute a significant change from the college's original ideal—and normal—mode of study: study within a single, multi-quarter, full-time coordinated studies program.

The growth of new modes of study at Evergreen within EWS raises some challenges to narrative evaluations. First, there is the matter of length of student transcript. The proliferation of offerings that a student takes in a given quarter leads to a proliferation of pages within the transcript. EWS has already addressed this matter with some success, in the following ways. While full-time programs normally place the program description as a separate document from the faculty evaluation within the student transcript, the norm within EWS is to combine these within a single document. This commonly keeps the description/evaluation sets of 2- and 4-credit courses as well as some 8-credit programs to a single page. Further, the EWS Faculty Handbook gives specific advice to faculty on how to write a concise narrative evaluation:

Faculty Evaluation of Student Achievement

There are three types of information about the student's work included on this form:

26

Course/Program Description:
Evaluation of Student Work
Suggested Course Equivalencies:

Description: Write a short (usually one or two paragraphs) description mentioning primary learning objectives (concepts, principles, skills, etc.)

Evaluation: As briefly as possible, describe the student's progress in meeting the learning objectives you mentioned above. You will not have space to address all of the work the student accomplished. Consider referring to some of the work as exemplifying the student's learning. When you write student evaluations, a good rule of thumb is to begin with a general descriptive statement of the student. For example, *Gail exceeded all requirements of this course and showed particular strength in facilitating collaborative working groups.* Or, *Holly met sufficient requirements for credit in this course, and showed, by her seminar participation and writing, that she is grappling with fundamentals of critical thinking.* Next, address the learning objectives in your course or program, using seminar, or project work, or an essay only as an example. *Ivan demonstrated a very solid understanding of the ways in which historians approach their work in his well developed oral history project.* Finally, consider indicating where you would place the student in terms of academic levels: *Jerry is well prepared for advanced work in linguistics.* Or, *Kerry needs more work in fundamental cellular principles before doing intermediate work in biology.*

Suggested Course Equivalencies: List equivalencies normally used in traditional colleges and universities. College catalogues can be found in the reference section of the library if you need inspiration. Please do not use general categories such as Social Science or Psychology. Instead, try to be specific, and break the credit down if necessary.

Second, faculty teaching in EWS do not have the opportunity to come to know their students as well as faculty teaching in full-time programs, simply due to contact time. This fact limits what EWS faculty can reasonably say about the student. Faculty teaching in 2- or 4-credit courses are unlikely to be able to speak meaningfully to a student's character development, for instance, so a "developmental narrative" will simply not be appropriate. Similarly, major project work is understandably less frequent in EWS offerings—though it can and does have a place in some half-time programs, particularly multi-quarter ones. Thus, EWS evaluations most commonly do and should fit within the "skills narrative" type.

A third issue is that for those students who enroll only in two, three or four 4-credit courses in a quarter, there is no single faculty member who is recognizably the student's primary faculty. For these students, no faculty can address whether and to what extent the student has integrated his or her studies. The only person who can speak to this is the student, in the self-evaluation.

But this leads to a fourth issue, that of student self-evaluations within EWS. Presently, student self-evals within EWS are handled formally just as they are for full-time programs: The standard is, "one offering, one self-evaluation." Thus, a student who takes four 4-credit courses could conceivably be expected to submit four transcript self-evaluations for the quarter. This would fragment the student's own voice and remove the opportunity to do the integrative work mentioned above.

It would be a reasonable and slight modification of the current standard to expect students to write *at most* one transcript evaluation per quarter—the guideline would be that when the "longest running" offering that a student is taking ends, the student submits a transcript evaluation. Faculty teaching in 4-credit courses may still require a student to write a transcript evaluation, but only if the student isn't, say, continuing in a multi-quarter full- or half-time program. In such cases, the faculty may require the student to draft a self-evaluation which the student intends to incorporate later into a transcript evaluation. In any case, it is to be understood that even when a student is required to write a transcript self-evaluation, that document will likely range beyond the student's work in a single EWS offering.

Recall the importance of proportionality among the parts of the transcript. The integrity of the document as a whole—the sense that readers can make of it—depends on keeping the length of evaluations in line with the number of credits earned. We suggest a 1/2 page limit for an 8-credit description/evaluation of a program that lasts one quarter, and one page if it's yearlong; 1/4 page for a 4-credit class description/evaluation; 1-3 sentences for a 2-credit description/evaluation. We also think it's worth considering whether transcripts ought to be reformatted so that all 2- and 4-credit description/evaluations appear in a series, perhaps at the end, in the interest of saving space and making a clear demarcation for readers between large and small units of study.

IX. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

There were times in our Study Group's discussions when we contemplated junking transcript evaluations altogether. So few ever read them! The sweat that goes into them! The worst part of the job! Whatever you write feels concocted! It's the conference that matters! We all came back to that: to the conference as the beating heart of student-faculty interchange. And we asked ourselves whether there might not be some better way to create an official record: a way that let faculty conserve energy and sanity while supporting the vital work of reflection with students. Could there be a third choice that steered between the muteness of a grade and the thorniness of a narrative? Could we imagine a decoupling whereby faculty put grades (or mini-comments that served a similar purpose) in the transcript while writing evaluations for students' eyes only?

We could imagine it, but the prospect gave us no joy. There is a powerful bond, we agreed, between the conferences and the transcript evaluation. As teacher and learner take responsibility to make a public accounting, attention shifts from college towards the larger society. If that bond were broken—if narrative evaluation somehow became only an internal process—what would happen to the conference? We suspect it would tend to become more subjective, even solipsistic, and less essential to both students and faculty. The felt need to make sense of the learning to a world beyond Evergreen heightens the evaluation's meaningfulness. (See Appendix I for further discussion of why Evergreen has narrative evaluations.)

A drumbeat of concern about transcripts and support for the evaluation process sounds across the College's history. It was present in the 1981 Evaluation and Transcript Review DTF. Based on data from recent alumni and still-enrolled advanced students, that DTF found: "In spite of the inherent difficulties in convincing graduate schools of the validity of a voluminous TESC transcript, there were very few respondents who favored letter grades as a replacement for written evaluations...Former students did say that evaluations ought to be written so graduate admissions committees could readily ascertain an applicant's skills and abilities." The DTF called on the faculty to show "precisely what this student did and how well he/she did it."

If this guide marks a new phase in collective thinking about evaluations, then we hope a forum will be created to further the conversation. Faculty with questions or issues to raise, practices or examples to share, objections or rejoinders to make, or experiments or ideas to propose, ought to be able to engage with others so that experience can be pooled and horizons expanded. If interest warrants it, an ongoing group should be set up, perhaps with a website and e-bulletin board. One potential next step: the materials in the appendix to this report could be augmented by more examples from faculty across the curriculum. Especially valuable, we think, would be examples of succinct evaluations and descriptions, and of techniques for writing critically about students' academic difficulties. Another, not-so-distant topic for discussion: as the evaluation system moves online, there will be opportunities and issues regarding the linking of transcripts to the development of e-portfolios.

Confident though we are that guidelines offered in this report will make evaluations easier to read and to write, we remain acutely aware of the effort they will continue to require. Given external economic pressures currently faced by public colleges and universities, we think it important to point out that the very feasibility of the existing system—and the prospects of strengthening it—probably hinges on maintaining current class sizes.

We know that in the future, the faculty as a body may decide to consider larger structural changes in the evaluation process. Two such ideas emerged in our discussions. One is old, and was exhaustively debated in the past: the semester system. An obvious advantage of it is that evaluation would happen twice instead of thrice a year, reducing strain on faculty. A point most of us hadn't considered is that the growing number of one-quarter programs may be less conducive to self-evaluation than semester-length programs would be. Students may find it harder to reflect on their learning (they've got less to reflect *on*), and some faculty may find it harder to devote precious class time to self-eval preparation.

The second idea is new: for Evergreen to set aside the final week each spring as a time for year-end reflection. Students would write a single transcript self-evaluation covering their entire year's work, based on informal statements they'd composed each quarter, and meet with faculty in conference. The reasoning behind this idea is that, with the increasing fragmentation of the curriculum into one-quarter and part-time pieces, students have greater need than they once did for integration. The student's voice in the transcript

might be stronger if it were represented by a small number of inclusive, refined self-evaluations. Students could be expected to use this week as well to put finishing touches on their best work of the year and, if they chose, to build an e-portfolio.

Our experience as a group sharpened our respect for the founding faculty's decision to replace grades with narratives that reflect upon learning. There is nothing coercive about their insight. It contains no hidden agenda about what is or is not worthy of attention. Rather, it's a gust of fresh air for undergraduate education. It returns to the simple challenge of interpretation that animates the liberal arts tradition: the question of saying something about something. What can you say that's truthful and interesting about what has been done? What you can say is open. It's a playful invitation.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:
SKILLS EVALUATIONS

From Ecology of Hope ('01-'02), a yearlong Core program

Faculty evaluation (Matt Smith)

Note: This eval says what the student can now do, based on what he accomplished in the program. Treatment of learning activities is broad, with attention also to specific projects and the student's development. The writer selects, synthesizes and condenses, covering the entire year comfortably in less than a page.

M has been a full-time student in the Ecology of Hope program in the 2001-02 school year. He attended classes regularly, turned in all required work, and receives full credit. M came to college after many years out of school. He brought with him considerable experience in the world and a passionate desire to challenge himself and learn. He has done just that. M has had an outstanding year. He has developed the ability to read difficult texts and think critically. He has developed a complex understanding of the nature of environmental issues and the question of human relations to the natural world. He has become a very strong observer of and writer about the natural world. And he has used the experience of the program to rethink and reform his understandings of his capacity for acting on and understanding environmental issues.

M came to seminars with excellent readings of the texts. His pass papers, seminar questions, journal entries, and consistent capacity to point to the relevant passage all attest to his complete and serious reading of the texts. M was a quiet leader in seminar. He asked questions, reframed issues, and worked hard to inspire deep reflection on the text. (No easy task in a freshman seminar.)

M's solid reading and thinking about texts was reflected in his thoughtful expository essays. In at least two of these essays, one on "Balance of Nature" and the other on "Moral Action in The Plague", M expanded his essays into full scale complex critical arguments of extraordinary quality. He is a fine thinker and writer.

In Winter quarter M undertook a focused and complex case study for his inquiry paper on the issues of forestry management in the Pacific Northwest. He carefully examined an outbreak of pine bark beetle infestation in the Idaho National Forest. He sets his analysis inside of the debate between preservation and economic exploitation of forest resources, and is able to argue effectively that Forest Service plans for limited intervention are a necessary for the restoration of forest health and the appropriate interaction of people and wild lands. M does a fine job of research and of laying out the political and ecological issues.

In spring quarter he worked with a group of others students interested in Natural History to strengthen his skills and capacities to observe and understand the natural world through careful attention and writing. Using Kruckeberg's A Natural History of Puget Sound Country and several field guides, M undertook a formal natural history journal, a sketch journal, and a personal journal dealing with his observations. His final work and especially his reflective essay demonstrate his accomplishments both in writing evocative description and in responding with intelligence and feeling to his experience of the natural world.

Equivalencies:
5 Expository Writing
3 Introduction to Physical Science

6 Social and Ecological History
3 Introduction to Cultural Studies
6 Community Studies: Participation and Engagement
5 Science and Society: Global Warming
3 Environmental Education
5 Environmental Ethics
2 Sustainability: "Environmental Space Analysis"
4 Individual Inquiry (winter): Forest Policy
6 Individual Project (spring): Natural History of Puget Sound

****

Student self-evaluation

Note the searching quality of the student's statement, and his care in choosing which aspects of his learning to address. It ends with an open-ended sense of direction for future work.

My first year at Evergreen was about becoming aware. I entered the program "The Ecology of Hope" with little or no understanding of the problems our world faces or what could be done about them. I was seeking ways to connect and engage in the world around me responsibly and sustainably.

There were several times throughout the year when my old thinking was challenged by the new ideas presented to me through the work. This was not easy, nor comforting, but it was essential to my learning. One instant of the change in my thought was well reflected in the essay on the balance of nature. In this example I was forced to clearly question my prior belief that nature was static and well ordered. I found through the process of writing that my ideas were beginning to change. This change opened the door to a new objectivity and was the beginning of my deeper inquiries.

William Cronon's Changes in the Land, Emerson's Nature, Hugh Brody's The Other Side of Eden, and Jan Dizzard's Gong Wild all helped me understand the development of ideas, especially those concerning people's perception of nature. These books pushed me along the path of my inquiry, toward my winter project, on the ways we perceive, value, and use our Forest Resources. This project gave me a deeper look at how our perceptions of what nature is are reflected by our interactions with nature. I continued this line of thought through my spring quarter project. In spring I went into the field with a group of dedicated student naturalists. Using Field guides and Kruckeberg's Natural History of Puget Sound Country, we learned to identify much of the Flora of the Pacific Northwest. I really pushed myself to question things that were familiar, and to learn the why behind the what. This project was about rediscovering place and understanding within the framework of the natural world.

Also of interest to me was the development of American ways of life. The readings throughout the year helped me to understand how our present capitalist system and agricultural society are cultural constructs. I now see how American society is an extension of European ideas that are rooted in things like the scientific revolution, religious doctrine, imperialism, and land ownership. The Nature and Logic of Capitalism presented me with a thorough understanding of how our present day systems work. In the Atmospheric Chemistry workshops I learned the chemistry behind the problem of global warming. Through the science workshops and the work we did understanding the origin and development of cultural perceptions, I also became aware of how complicated global issues can be, and how to live hopefully in the face of complex obstacles.

The most striking aspect of my work this year is the level of critical thinking I engaged in. This is reflected in my essay on The Plague. In this essay I worked hard to understand the distinctions of the characters, and of their involvement in a hopeless struggle. However, I also developed other skills that will help my studies progress. I now feel confident presenting my

33

thoughts in written form, as well as articulating my ideas clearly to a large group. The seminars helped me learn to discuss my thoughts, often with those of contradictory opinions. I learned the importance of working with a group, and working together as part of a community to find solutions to problems.

        This year's work left me with a feeling of discomfort that requires a diligence in inquiry, thought, and action. The work has left me disturbed and driven. I am interested in learning more about the origin of thought and the development of ideas, and with knowledge and action I intend to live a higher quality of life.

****

Program description

The description begins with central questions underlying the inquiry. Rather than simply list the books read, it shows their relationship to program themes. There's no redundancy with the faculty eval. Three quarters of studies are described in a single page.

Ecology of Hope: Program Description

John Bullock, Ph.D. (Chemistry), Rita Pougiales, Ph.D. (Anthropology), Matthew Smith, Ph.D. (Political Science)

The Ecology of Hope program began with the assumption that we are in the midst of radical environmental and ecological changes.   These changes compel us to question and transform our ideas of nature, success, freedom, and science. The program asked the following questions. How can we best understand these changes? How can we learn to act deliberately and thoughtfully in the face of such transformations?   What practices and principles of reflection, creativity and community might we generate to approach our dilemmas from fresh perspectives? And how can we engage in these changes with a spirit of hope that will allow us to continue this work throughout our lives?

In fall quarter the program studied the scientific, historical and cultural origins of environmental dilemmas. We explored what we mean by nature and how the relationship of humans to nature has evolved. Emerson's essay "Nature" provided a distinctive American view of these issues. We then traced the interactive dynamic between cultural practices and environmental conditions. Readings included White's The Organic Machine, Cronon's Changes in the Land, and Muir's Reflections On Bulloughs Pond.   Our reading of Brody's The Other Side of Eden allowed us to thing about how these issues worked out in pre-industrial cultures. A field trip to the Columbia River and the Basin Irrigation project supported our understanding of these issues. The final readings of the quarter, Dizard's Going Wild and Merchant's The Death of Nature, raised for us the way in which culture shapes our knowledge of, and response to, nature. We introduced our topic of "hope" by reading Sepulveda's novel The Old Man Who Read Love Stories. In fall and winter quarters students attended six hours of seminar and weekly lectures and workshops in support of their reading. Students were expected to write regularly in an academic journal, turn in weekly response essays on the texts, and complete and revise five, two to four page, expository essays in response to the readings. Each quarter students wrote extended reflections on their learning. The practice of journal writing and response writing continued throughout the year.

In winter quarter we examined the personal and social dynamics that underlie the experience of community and hope. We began our study of community by reading Williams' Refuge, Levi's Periodic Table, and Camus' The Plague.   We considered the social dynamics that draw people together in a hopeful response to crisis or, on the other hand, alienate them. We had the good

fortune of having bell hooks as a guest in our program when we read <u>All About Love</u> in which she discussed the barriers to love and the importance of reclaiming love as the basis of community relations.   Kozol's <u>Ordinary Resurrections</u> and Palmer's <u>To Know as We Are Known</u>, we considered the role of education in the formation of community.   Finally, Heilbroner's <u>The Nature and Logic of Capitalism</u> and Leggett's <u>The Carbon Wars</u>, allowed us to focus on the market system and it's role in dealing with crises that transcend the community level.

Spring quarter focused on the issue of action in support of sustainable environmental practice. We read Orr, <u>Ecological Literacy</u>, to develop an understanding of sustainability and the processes of social change. Then we read Snyder, <u>Practice of the Wild</u>; House, <u>Totem Salmon</u>, and Leopold, <u>A Sand County Almanac</u>, Friere, <u>Pedagogy of Hope</u>, Ibsen<u>, An Enemy of the People</u>, and Solnit, <u>Savage Dreams</u> to develop ethical and practical understanding of the function of place, community, education, and struggle in becoming effective citizens.

In the fall students began a study of physical science in a weekly four hour workshop that laid a foundation for a more in-depth study of global warming that began in winter quarter. The topics covered included introductions to energy and energy conversion, atomic theory, thermodynamics, combustion chemistry and light. The series culminated with a discussion of the origin of the greenhouse effect. In winter quarter we investigated the phenomena of global warming. The students read Graedel and Crutzen's <u>Atmosphere, Climate and Change</u> and the workshops served to give a more complete picture of the underlying scientific principles, including chemical bonding, catalysis, nuclear chemistry and radiometric dating techniques. We also focused on the concepts behind numerical modeling. We examined how global warming is portrayed by the mass media and critiqued some of the poorly explained science we discovered. We also read two different analyses of global warming   (Lomborg's <u>The Skeptical Environmentalist</u> and <u>The Carbon Wars</u> by Leggett) to gain a sense of the wide range of responses to the crisis.

In winter and spring quarter students had the opportunity to undertake independent "inquiry projects" in which they articulated a question or topic, and then engaged in a process of inquiry that included research, writing and a public presentation. In winter these projects were individual projects and based on library research. Students were expected to produce 10-20 page papers. In spring the six quarter hour project work included opportunities for field experience, research work, laboratory work in chemistry, and group project work. Students met with seminar leaders in support of this learning and presented their results to the program.

From Hydrology ('04), a one-quarter upper-division program

Faculty evaluation (Paul Butler)

Though this program consisted of separate modules, the eval is a unified narrative. Faculty voices are effectively combined, and one gets an overall picture of the student's work based on evidence of specific accomplishments. The first paragraph is a summary judgment. The first sentences of the second and fourth paragraphs are boilerplate, used to frame the assessments that follow.

E has successfully completed her work in the Hydrology program. She was extremely conscientious about meeting program expectations, and made excellent progress.

In the surface-water portion of the program, the majority of the work assigned involved solutions to problem sets constructed from published hydrologic data, or information collected by the students and faculty. E clearly spent considerable time and effort on each one. They were carefully prepared, submitted on time, with virtually no mistakes, especially towards the end of the quarter. Overall, from these assignments and a very good final-exam score, there is solid proof that E has a developed a very strong understanding of the principles of surface-water hydrology.

E also worked very hard to gain a solid understanding of the principles of groundwater flow. All of her assignments reflected tremendous attention to detail and a desire by E to completely understand the material. Her strong quantitative reasoning skills were evident in her calculations of groundwater flow in aquifers and to wells. E did very well on both the theory and quantitative questions of the in-class final, but her best work was her interpretation of a water resources report; she did an excellent job interpreting the information in the paper. This clearly showed E's ability to apply the knowledge that she had gained in this program to issues raised in the report.

E's strong desire to lean ArcInfo8 resulted in a demonstrated aptitude for GIS. She attained a level of proficiency that allowed her to utilize this tool to display, query, and analyze spatial data. She also gained an understanding of how to use this tool to address specific hydrology questions. E completed all of the applied GIS workshops in a timely manner and consistently did very well. Her answers were generally very thoughtful, reflecting an understanding of the problem as well as the tool. Her ability to navigate and utilize ArcGIS improved dramatically as the quarter progressed; her final workshop, delineation of Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, was particularly well done.

Students were afforded the opportunity to complete additional computer lab and fieldwork that complemented their study of surface-water and groundwater. E's dedication paid off here too. All computer labs were very well done, demonstrating a fine grasp of quantitative reasoning skills. She did an especially good job of delineating the elevation of various flood recurrence intervals along the nearby Deschutes River. E also completed several very good field-trip write-ups. She has developed very good skill at "reading the landscape," i.e. applying concepts learned in the classroom to actual field situations.

In summary, E was an enthusiastic participant in all program activities, and we enjoyed working with her this quarter.

This evaluation is a compilation of comments by professors Paul Butler and Ken Tabbutt.

SUGGESTED COURSE EQUIVALENCIES (in quarter hours) Total: 16
4*   Groundwater Hydrology
4*   Surface-Water Hydrology
4*   Introduction to Applied Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
4*   Computer Lab and Field Studies in Hydrology

        *indicates upper division science credit

****

Student self-evaluation

Here is a fine example of a student reflecting on the state of her learning when she entered the program (first paragraph), the challenges she faced and how, exactly,

she met them (middle paragraphs), and the state of her learning and her direction as she leaves the program (last paragraph).

As a new student at Evergreen State College, I entered this term with a hint of apprehension towards shifting to an unfamiliar learning style. Evergreen is known to educate by hands on exercises and experiences, personal connections, and exploration of knowledge without proper grades. My prior educational history, including over 2 years of college experience, emphasized achieving a high GPA rather than understanding information at depth. Although I have become quite familiar, and succeed within this learning style, I recognized that a truly well rounded education was not necessarily what I have been obtaining. I transferred to Evergreen State College to enhance my understanding of natural earth processes, fluvial systems, mathematics, and other sciences by having the flexibility and encouragement to solidify and explore these fields.

Ready for the challenge, I dove in immediately, with serious intent to understand and question every assignment, lab, reading, lecture and project. I gained and reinforced a great deal of knowledge about surface water, ground water and their interconnectedness from the readings and lectures. The field trips and lab exercises helped me understand and perform actual data collection and analysis. We calculated discharge by gauging the Deschutes River, calculated and plotted flood frequency charts, and became familiar with survey equipment and instruments that are being used today. I valued this component of the course because of my intent to do field studies and research upon completion of my Bachelors of Science Degree.

As the following components of the course were expected and desired upon enrollment, early into the program, I realized that there were also some hidden requirements expected of me, of which I had no prior experience or knowledge. These missing pieces included a lack of familiarity with Microsoft Excel, general computer navigating and file management, and a basic understanding of statistics. These skills are undoubtedly important in my field but have been overlooked in my prior studies. The major movement and progression I felt this term, which built on top of a gained Hydrologic understanding, was accomplished by struggling, searching, practicing and applying this new information. Seeking to understand statistical terms and applications, I spent time with tutors in the Qualitative Reasoning Center, individual time with the instructor, and regularly sat in on an evening class, which offered basic lectures in statistics. I am now confident and at ease with Microsoft Excel, can navigate, explore and troubleshoot the GIS program, and by the end of this course I am explaining and helping other students understand the relevancy and results of our statistical tests and how they related to our data.

I am looking forward to continuing my studies in statistics, hydrology, mathematics, GIS, and geology, all of which are outlined in my course work for my senior year. What Evergreen helped me realize, in the closure of my Junior year, is that I have been focusing my attention in the field of Science to a level where some areas and practical uses of my education have been overlooked. My transition into Evergreen immediately helped me pinpoint these missing pieces, and provided me with abundant resources to complete a working knowledge of new information.

****

Program Description

Each component of the program is described in compact detail. The first paragraph offers an overview, including options available to students. The description doesn't repeat the faculty eval.

Hydrology Program Description
Spring Quarter 2004

The Hydrology program is an upper division science offering taught by Paul Butler and Ken Tabbutt. It centered on two, four-credit components: surface-water hydrology, and groundwater hydrology. Students then had the opportunity to do additional work in one or two of the following four-credit modules: natural history of the Grand Canyon, computer lab and field studies in hydrology, or applications of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) in hydrology.

Surface-Water Hydrology
This component was taught by Paul Butler and designed to familiarize students with the basic principles of river processes on a basin-wide scale. Primary emphasis was placed on the following: runoff models, flood-frequency analysis, and fluvial geomorphology, including channel form adjustments over time and the impact of human activities. An understanding of the basic principles was accomplished through weekly problem sets and lectures and discussions in conjunction with the text, *Fluvial Forms and Processes: A New Perspective* by David Knighton. Each student's evaluation was based on the problem sets and an in-class, open book final exam.

Groundwater Hydrology
This portion of the program, taught by Ken Tabbutt, was designed to familiarize students with hydrogeology with an emphasis on quantifying groundwater flow. Readings in *Applied Hydrogeology* (4th Edition) by C. W. Fetter were augmented by weekly lectures, workshops, and problem sets. Students were introduced to the properties of aquifers, principles of groundwater flow, flow to wells, soil moisture, and regional groundwater flow systems. The students also completed two final exams, a take-home exam that involved reading and interpreting a USGS Water-Resources Investigations Report (*Surface Water – Ground Water Interactions Along the Lower Dungeness River and Vertical Hydraulic Conductivity of Streambed Sediments, Clallam County, Washington, September 1999 – July 2001)* and an in-class open book final exam.

Applications of Geographic Information Systems in Hydrology
This accelerated GIS offering began with an introduction to ArcInfo8 and then progressed to more advanced hydrology applications. The class used *Getting to Know ArcGIS Desktop* (Ormsby et al., 2001) as the primary text, reading and completing exercises in nearly all chapters in order to gain a working knowledge of ArcMap, ArcToolbox, and ArcCatalog. Hydrology workshops included delineating regions affected by sea level rise and groundwater flooding, importing and merging Digital Elevation Models (DEMs), delineating drainage basins using the Hydrology Modeler extension, Strahler stream ordering. This information was used to assess the law of stream numbers, law of stream length, and law of drainage area. Students were also required to generate stream profiles and model Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs). These hydrology workshops allowed students to learn more advanced GIS procedures, particularly using Spatial Analyst and modeling using the Raster Calculator.

Computer Lab and Field Studies in Hydrology
Four field trips were taken during the quarter that focused on surface-water hydrology. First, we traveled to McAllister Springs (source of the City of Olympia's drinking water), the LOTT sewage treatment facility, and a storm-water retention basin to learn more about the hydrologic cycle of the local area. Next, we took a discharge measurement and discussed land use planning along riparian zones at a park on the lower Deschutes River as part of an analysis of flood frequency for the basin. Later in the quarter we went to the Skokomish River basin in the southwest Olympic Mountains to look at basic fluvial processes and the relationship of glaciation to the present river basin, along with the impacts of forest practices. Finally, some students participated in an optional raft trip on the Middle Fork of the Snoqualmie, to observe river mechanics and channel features. The computer labs focused on analysis of precipitation records from the Olympia airport, flood levels of various recurrence intervals along the lower Deschutes River, and modeling drawdown at wells in both confined and unconfined aquifers.

NOTE: Additional descriptive material for those students completing the Grand Canyon trip appears in their accompanying FACULTY EVALUATION OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

APPENDIX B:
DEVELOPMENTAL-BASED EVALUATIONS

From What's Love Got to Do With It? ('02-'03), a two-quarter Core program

Faculty evaluation (Charles Pailthorp)

Note: The emphasis is on the student's character and development, shown through key moments of growth for her in the program. There is frank assessment of challenges she faces and advice about how to move forward, all in the context of affirmation of her promise and what she has accomplished. (Thus the eval, though referring to her in the third person, is addressed primarily to the student.) While longer than a page, that is this faculty member's long-standing practice—and is justifiable by the quality of the narrative.

"What's Love Got to Do With It?" has been R's introduction to college level studies. Every new student faces issues in making this transition, but they are not the same for everyone. R has known for some time how to live on her own, something some students struggle with for months. Nor has R been surprised or disoriented by finding herself an African-American in an almost entirely white crowd. Perhaps what did challenge her, however, was finding how far removed Evergreen is from anything close to urban life and how it feels to be surrounded by peers nearly all of whom have lived in sheltered, albeit "liberal," social worlds. Social naiveté isn't new to R, but being surrounded by it, has been challenging. For some time, R's response was to hold back, proceed cautiously, seemingly unsure whether her voice could be heard in such a milieu. She "whispered," as she puts it. In the final weeks of the quarter, however, R got fed up with holding back. The storm broke, and R came out – passionate, articulate, and informed.

Two developments in our final weeks prompted this break through. Donna Franklin's *What's Love Got to Do With It?: healing the rift between Black men and women* is addressed to an African-American audience. Some of the white students thought this effectively made the work irrelevant to them; others were shocked to learn the details of what it meant to be enslaved or how horrific Reconstruction and an era of lynching had been, and they were confused that current horrors demonstrated all this was not yet safely "in the past." R challenged the implicit racism in these responses to Franklin's work. Had the study of white middle-class culture been irrelevant to her simply because she was neither white nor middle-class? No one missed R's point. Because R had developed strong friendships with many of the students, her anger drew them closer rather than push them away. For many, this confrontation forced them to notice that their own denial of racism and blindness to white privilege had obscured their understanding, and not of Franklin's work alone.

The second stage of this breakthrough came with the Legislative Hearings Project. R and one other student argued in favor of the proposition that same-sex marriage should be legally recognized in all states, as marriage, not just as a legal "civil union." They likened this secondary legal status to a doctrine of "separate but equal," applied here to couples rather than race. R presented her position in a professional manner and gave forceful responses to questions raised by the hearings panel and the larger student body. Her passionate advocacy brought into full view R's tenacity when arguing for what she knows is right and just.

R's written testimony for the Hearings Project was much closer to finished work than anything she had written earlier. R still has hard work to do on writing fundamentals, from syntax to organization. This final essay demonstrated, however, that with careful rewriting, she can avoid many errors that characterized her first drafts. She has resolved, in her self-evaluation to "jump

into the pool," now that she knows the point of getting wet. It is imperative that consistent, thorough rewriting and close work each week with tutors become routine for her.

Each week during both quarters, R assisted in a 1st -2nd grade classroom at Lincoln Elementary School. Her supervising teacher valued her work and found that she had developed good relationships with the children.

In seminar, R at times has been largely on the edges of the discussion and at other times right in the center of it. Although R enrolled in this program with her eyes open, throughout much of fall quarter, exactly what point this curriculum would have for her, herself, was not clear. (Every student must face this problem: faculty provide a rationale for a curriculum, and, nonetheless, students must make their own sense of where it fits into their educational lives, perhaps in terms largely their own.) R's first steps in preparing for seminar, as well as in her writing, often were not followed by persistent determination to figure out how the pieces fit together in solving larger puzzles. Her postings would offer first impressions rather than probing reflections. Even so, in seminar R listened thoughtfully, joined in appropriately (although not yet with the force that would become apparent later), and made tentative progress with our readings. Her best work has come at the end. Once R has decided where she is headed, she moves ahead with exciting energy and determination. Even better work in seminar is bound to follow.

All in all, then, after a slow and tentative beginning, R leaves this program showing some admirable accomplishments and a renewed determination to make certain her money and time have been well spent. She said, in reflecting on her experience with the Legislative Hearings Project that she had been told she should study law, and now she was beginning to believe she might. Whatever the professional outcome -- and law does make sense given R's intelligence, energy, and forthright commitment to making the world more just – R certainly has discovered how this institution can be used to her own purposes, truly what Evergreen's innovations were designed to inspire.

Suggested Course Equivalencies (in quarter hours): Total - 26

8 - American Social History: 19th – 20th century
4 - Expository writing: thesis-driven essays
4 - Sociology: introduction to social thinking
4 - Public Policy: family and children's issues
4 - Field service and journal writing
2 - Quantitative Reasoning: understanding data

****

Student self-evaluation not submitted for transcript.

****

Program description

"What's Love Got to Do with It?"
2002/2003 Fall and Winter Quarter
Program Description
Faculty: Stephanie Coontz, Charles Pailthorp

Fall quarter, "What's Love Got to Do With It?" began with a study of the historical evolution of family life, marriage, courtship, and sexual mores from the end of the 18th century to the early 20th century in the United States. After a brief exploration of some contemporary dilemmas faced by men and women today, the first few weeks our work centered on Mary Ryan's account of how family life and gender roles were transformed by the transition from an economy of colonial productive households into an increasingly urban, industrialized economy that separated work from home and divided responsibilities for women and men into distinct spheres. Then, with Ryan's framework in view, we explored other resources for both breadth and detail about sexual mores and practices, the relationship between family life and the state, and the significance of class. As we moved into the later part of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century, we turned to literary sources for insights into all these topics: Gillman, Alcott and Stratton Porter. We ended the quarter with a quick excursion into the '40s and '50s, and a forecast of the work to follow.

In winter quarter, the curriculum addressed four broad areas of American family life, marriage and sexuality; changing family norms and practices from the 1950s through the 1970s; the transformation of gender roles and work in the same period; developments in gender relations, sexuality and love after WWII; and contemporary issues of family policy and practice.

Assigned writing emphasized learning how to develop and improve a thesis-driven essay. Initially this was aimed at deepening an understanding of Ryan's challenging work. Then, in winter quarter, two larger writing projects were assigned: an ethnography developed from student field notes on service work undertaken at elementary schools (or elsewhere in a few instances), and an argumentative essay written in support of one side of a controversial issue in some aspect of public policy and the family (part of the Legislative Hearings Project).

Both quarters, students were required to post comments on the program internet-site comments, and respond to one another on topics pertinent to the reading assignments for each of the two weekly seminars. In winter quarter, additional postings were assigned that related to both the longer writing projects and the films shown. Finally, near the end of fall quarter, students were required to sit for an "essay and identification" examination on the quarter's reading.

In four workshops, students were introduced to the interpretation of quantitative information (as it is used, for example, by Mary Ryan) and the fundamentals of descriptive statistics. For the latter, the focus was on income distribution, how best to describe what it is and how it is changing

How to take field notes and the fundamentals of ethnographic writing were taught in two workshops. Throughout the program each student was required to work as a volunteer one day a week (a full day, fall quarter; a half day, winter quarter) either at Lincoln or Garfield Elementary Schools. Students were required to keep field notes of this service and fieldwork in which they noted their observations about children, family life, and gender. During winter quarter, students were asked to write an ethnography, using their field notes, in which they developed an account of some feature of the social organization and interactions they had witnessed. This ethnography was submitted in draft form, and again with revisions, with the expectation that students had given both a clear descriptive account of what they had witnessed and an analysis showing how what had been described could be understood and interpreted.

The concluding activity in the program was the "Legislative Hearings Project." Here, students were asked to identify a contemporary controversy in public policy that affected family life in the United States. Ten groups formed, and students prepared written testimony for simulated legislative hearings addressing each question. The issues included welfare reform, sex education, commercialism in the schools, same-sex marriage, gay adoption, and the abolition of marriage rights (taxation, inheritance, citizenship). Each student argued either a "pro" or "con" response to a particular policy proposal. Then, in the hearings, each student presented testimony and sat for questions from the hearing panel, which consisted of other students who took turns

playing the role of members of a legislative committee on Family Policies and Practices. All students served on one or more panels.

Overall, this program provided an intensive introduction to social history, the skills of critical reading, writing and small group discussion, and an opportunity for students to adjust to the demands of rigorous, collaborative, interdisciplinary study at the college level. The curriculum emphasized the relevance of sound historical understanding to both the study of contemporary social dilemmas and devising strategies for resolving them, whether on a personal or a structural level.

Fall Quarter Book List:
Alcott, Louisa May, *Little Women*
Bailey, Beth L., *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in 20th c. America*
Bennett, Jeffrey O. and William L. Briggs, *Using and Understanding Mathematics*
Coontz, Stephanie, *The Way We Really Are: Coming to Terms with America's changing Families*
Cott, Nancy F., *Public Vows: a History of Marriage and the Nation*
D'Emilio, John and Estelle B. Freedman, *Intimate Matters: a History of Sexuality in America*
Ehrenreich, Barbara, *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment*
Gilman, Charlotte Perkins, *The Yellow Wallpaper*
Graff, E.J., *What is Marriage For?*
Lemert, Charles, *Social Things: an Introduction to the Sociological Life*
Porter, Gene Stratton. *A Girl of the Limberlost*
Ryan, Mary P., *Cradle of the Middle Class: the family in Oneida County, NY, 1790-1865*

Winter Quarter Books and Articles:
Bailey, Beth, *Sex in the Heartland*
Cancian, Francesca M., "The Feminization of Love"
Coontz, Stephanie, *The Way We Never Were*
Coontz, Stephanie and Nancy Folbre, "Marriage, Poverty, and Public Policy"
Dudley, Kathryn, *The End of the Line*
Franklin, Donna, *What's Love Got to Do With It? Healing the Rift between Black Men and Women*
Fraser, Nancy, "After the Family Wage"
Heritage Foundation, "Press release: Marriage, not Education, is Fastest Way out of Child
        Poverty"
Hochschild, Arlie, *The Second Shift*
        Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierette and Michael A. Messner, "Gender Displays and Men's
Power: The 'New Man' and the Mexican Immigrant Man"
Krugman,Paul, "For Richer"
di Leonardo, Micaela, "White Lies, Black Myths: Rape, Race and the Black Underclass."
McIntosh, Peggy, "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack"
Miner, Horace, "Body Ritual Among the Nacirema"
Raley, Gabrielle, "No Good Choices: Teenage Childbearing, Concentrated Poverty and Welfare
        Reform"
Rector, Robert, Kirk A. Johnson, and Patrick F. Fagan, "the Effect of Marriage on Child Poverty"
        Sugrue, Thomas, "Poor Families in the Era of Urban Transformation: The Underclass
Family in Myth and Reality"

From American Community ('99-'00), a yearlong all-level program

Faculty evaluation (Sam Schrager)

Note: The eval assesses the student through her main work, covering one project each quarter. The most advanced project gets fullest treatment, with quotes from the paper included as evidence of its distinctive qualities. (Another project is described in the words of a second faculty member.) The first paragraph sums up the student's accomplishment, the last the direction of her work. By describing the work, the evaluation gets at her character. Mention of seminar and other program activities isn't needed. The full year is addressed in a page.

M's self-evaluation accurately describes the remarkable synthesis she achieved in her senior year of college – her first at Evergreen. Throughout the year she did advanced work of excellent caliber, identifying fundamental questions about art, democracy and community in America and exploring them in original, exciting ways.

All three of M's major project papers met very high standards for research, interpretation, and writing. In Fall, she incisively tackled the American antagonism between informal (i.e., experiential) and formal (i.e., school-driven) education, arguing that it is only when they "fuse with, engage and challenge each other, finally, that democracy is most stimulated and enriched." M did a splendid job of assembling evidence for this position from the full range of texts we'd studied during the quarter, offering consistently fresh, persuasive readings that showed how this debate has been a critical undercurrent, historically, in American life.

In Winter, M wrote an impressive life history of a local country musician. Michael Pfeifer, her seminar leader then, assessed her paper as follows: "It comprehensively, sympathetically, and eloquently interpreted Gene Clark's remembrances in light of larger themes such as Kentucky's experience of the Depression, Los Angeles's emergence as the archetypal post-World War II metropolis, and the transformation of country music…Her linkages of cultural experience, historical developments, and perennial ideological strains in American life were cogent and fascinating."

M's Spring ethnographic study of journalists on the Olympia newspaper was a *tour de force* of narrative and analysis. Like the best creative non-fiction, her fifty-two page paper made the world of its subjects pulse with life; like the best ethnographies, it actually captured and explained central tensions of their culture. Here, for example, are a few lines from M's account of the sensibility of the local crime reporter:

> She writes of elderly people for whom she has cared. No romanticization, but somehow her images evoke sympathy despite their distance from the ideal. Sympathy for the woman who spits on her as she leaves, sympathy for the man who twists her wrists, saying that his wife doesn't have to know. In the starkness of their faults lies their humanity; that starkness engages our own…She need not lean into the states and plights of her subjects with tear-begging lilt in order to make them felt.

M's larger point is that this reporter and others, from their varied standpoints and despite the formidable structural obstacles they face, aspire to do transforming "cultural work." She draws this notion from literary critic Philip Fisher: "it is in the process of working with ordinariness," as M puts

it, "that the shape and substance of our society may be shifted." M's exacting, imaginative attention to the hopes and frustrations of her journalist subjects, anchored in her strong grasp of matters American, shows that she is fully prepared to embark on her own work of democratic renewal.

48 cr
12 American history
10 Community studies and social thought
8 Advanced ethnographic research: journalists and their culture
7 American literature
4 Oral history
4 Humanities
3 English composition

****

Student self-evaluation

This senior describes how the series of projects she undertook, in the context of inquiry in the program, enabled her to fulfill her aspirations for undergraduate learning. By explaining the synthesis she's attained, she shows the developing direction of her life's work.

 I embarked into American Community (and Evergreen) hoping to converge and culminate the somewhat scattered interests of my previous three undergraduate years, and I feel that, to an unanticipated degree, I have been able to accomplish this. My interests have centered broadly around the roles of education and art in America's structure, myth, and practice; my underlying concern was for exploring their potential to perform what I have come to think of as, in Philip Fisher's terms, cultural work. By the end of the first quarter, after having grounded my final paper on the argument that education in a democratic society must be both experiential and demonstrate fluidity between the roles of teacher and student, I had become interested in the strength that *feeling* holds in civic/social life – the intimate, the sensual, the subjective elements of individual and shared experience. This interest drew me closer to the role of art during the next quarter, when I wrote an oral history of a long-time country musician and explored the idea of mutuality between audience and artist. In the process, I came to apply that idea of mutuality to my own relation, as oral historian, to my subject. The obvious struck me, namely that history is very literally people's stories, and I felt it to be of paramount importance not only that stories are told, but that their tellers are *heard*. These convictions, along with a little circumstance, led me to consider journalism as an outlet through which one (I?) could circulate stories, in true democratic fashion, to all reaches of a community, as a means both of extending the scope and content of experience, and of validating lives. At the end of second quarter, this all seemed beautifully cut and dry. Third quarter awakened me to the reality that there are myriad complexities inherent in any role of storyteller, and perhaps particularly that of a journalist; questions of sympathy and subjectivity and source. After a rather fortunate false start at an ethnography about poets, I went about pursuing my questions and my final project among local journalists.
          This final work is based upon field notes gleaned predominantly through casual conversation and interviews. It found form as eight essays, each centered around a focus of inquiry – the relation to subject and source; the question of journalistic sympathy or even crusade; the extent to which poetics have relevance to the press – and is underlaid with the motif of narrative. Supplementing my field work are various texts from class and elsewhere, with which I attempt to place my questions and subjects into a larger perspective of democracy and community. I feel that this culminating work for the year has pulled together the most vital of threads of inquiry from all three quarters and beyond. What I have come to is the notion that

there is not much in our lives that is not about story. Story is our history, our culture, our communication, our art; it is fluid, it is feeling-infused, and it shapes cultural perception and action alike. It is the authentic hearing and telling of these stories, I am convinced, in manifold form and voice, that is at the heart of what we call cultural work.

In other areas of the course, I feel that my work has been consistent within reason and circumstance. My journal suffered somewhat during the third quarter, as a result of overcompensation for the stresses of field work and transcription, but it nonetheless chronicles some significant junctures of academic and personal thought. Although by nature I am not much of a speaker, I think that I have contributed an insight here and there.

Ultimately, I am pleasantly surprised with the extent to which I feel I have educated myself. I did not expect to put so satisfying a wrap on my undergraduate education, nor to feel at all pulled, with any sense of passion, to places beyond. I think that this has happened due as much to fortuity as to my own abilities, but nonetheless feel that I have responded well in striving to fuse my various chapters of interest, incident, and act.

****

Program description

The focus of the inquiry, main topics studied, structure of the program, nature of the assignments, and field trips are all described in a single paragraph—and it covers the entire year.

American Community
Fall, Winter, Spring
1999-2000

Faculty: Sam Schrager, Ph.D. (Folklore); Michael Pfeifer, Ph.D. (History); David Marr, Ph.D. (American Studies and English)

American Community, a yearlong, upper division American Studies program (open to qualified freshmen), examined the history of community from roughly the close of Reconstruction to the present. Topics included Mormons, Populists, post-Reconstruction freedmen and freedwomen, urban industrial workers and social life, the 1930s, individual and group identity, education, family violence, the Second World War, the Civil Rights Movement, the 1960s and aspects of recent American social and cultural life, among others. Students and faculty drew on historical monographs, literature and literary criticism, autobiography, documentary, film, music, folklore, social criticism and social theory in a collective inquiry into the prospects for community and democracy in the twenty-first century. Class work consisted of workshops, lectures, twice-weekly seminars and writing groups. Students and faculty spent four days in October studying community in the Long Beach peninsula of southwest Washington and one day in February studying community in Seattle's International District. Students wrote expository essays, a term paper on the assigned materials (Fall), an oral history of the life of a living man or woman (Winter), and kept a fieldwork journal. In Spring each student carried out an independent research project in one of three specialized seminars (ethnography, social history, or criticism), which constituted about one-half of his or her academic work for the term.

Texts in order read: Lasch, *The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy*; Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*; Sinclair, *Journal of Exploration*; Arrington and Bitten, *The Mormon Experience*; Hawthorne, *The Blithedale Romance*; Stowe, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*; Fisher, *Hard Facts*; Goodwyn, *The Populist Moment*; Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*; Pfeifer, *Rough Justice*; Native American myth text; Selznick, *The Moral Commonwealth*; Washington, *Up From Slavery*; DuBois, *The Souls of Black Folk*; Johnson, *The Autobiography of an Ex-Colored Man*; Fields, "Ideology

and Race in American History"; Higgenbotham, "African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race"; William Graham Sumner, "Socialism," "The Forgotten Man," and "The Absurd Effort to Make the World Over"; Peiss, *Cheap Amusements*; Cather, *My Antonia*; Dreiser, *Sister Carrie*; Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House*; Ellison, *Collected Essays;* Lewis, *Babbitt*; Bourne, *War and the Intellectuals*; Chauncey, *Gay New York*; Hurston, *Mules and Men*; Dewey, *Democracy and Education*; Cohen, *Making a New Deal*; Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath*; Kempton, *Part of Our Time*; Terkel, *"The Good War"*; Fentress and Wickham, "Class and Group Memories in Western Societies"; Whyte, *Street Corner Society*; Gordon, *Heroes of Their Own Lives*; Hacking, "The Making and Molding of Child Abuse"; Ellison, *Invisible Man*; Miller, *Death of a Salesman*; Albee, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*; Branch, *Pillar of Fire*; Farber, ed. *The Sixties*; Chin, *The Phoenix Gone, The Terrace Empty*; Didion, *After Henry*; Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition"; Davis, *City of Quartz*; Gates, "Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Black Man"; DeLillo, *Underworld*.

Specialized Seminar Texts (Spring): Duneier, *Sidewalk*; Myerhoff, *Number Our Days* (ethnography); Barzun, *The Modern Researcher*, 4th ed. (social history); Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class*; Thoreau, *Walden* (criticism).

Films: *Making an American Citizen, Documentary video on logging and community in Washington, She Done Him Wrong, Duck Soup, Three Came Home, Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?, Jailhouse Rock, Saturday Night Fever, Medium Cool, Blue Velvet.*

From Scale and Detail ('02), a one-quarter all-level program

Co-evaluation (Jim Stroh and student)

Note how this eval conveys agreement between teacher and student about the student's achievement. Though the student is represented in the third person, his own views about his performance are prominent. The opening paragraph declares to the reader that the narrative was composed collaboratively. The detail and judgment, by turns positive and critical, show the care put into getting things right. The eval is more compact than separate faculty and student statements.

The student contributed much of this evaluation. The faculty verifies that it reflects achievement fairly and truthfully.

L has learned a great deal this quarter in Scale & Detail with Bob Leverich and Jim Stroh. He accomplished all of his personal objectives and feels that this program was a successful continuation of his work in Eco Design in the Real World.

L attended all seminar discussions, almost all class meetings, and worked consistently in the wood workshop throughout the quarter. He also spent much time in the computer lab learning the Rhino 3D modeling software. His only regret was that he was unable to attend the Portland/George field trip due to illness.

He participated some in all the seminar discussions, both large and small group, and gained a better understanding of the reading materials through the discussions. He found the books interesting with a strong preference for *Uncommon Ground* because of the variety of authors presented. But, he did not turn in the three required reflection writings and did not finish all of *Design with Nature*.

The training manual for the Rhinoceros 3D software served as his most valuable piece of reading material this quarter.

L enjoyed the hall table start-up project. He found it challenging to work within the requirements of the project's many constraints. He completed the project, adhered to all of the required rules, and is satisfied with the resulting furniture piece. It used a unique tension design and the finish work was well above average. He was also satisfied with completion of his primary table project as well, which included all the elements he had initially planned. Both projects combined left him with a much more solid understanding of woodworking. L shared his ideas and learned woodworking techniques with others in the furniture group throughout the program.

Over all, L made good academic progress this quarter and looks forward to learning more skills with woodworking, possibly on smaller scale sculptures, and most defiantly continuing with the Rhino 3D modeling software. His weakness was in writing responses to the seminar books, seminar discussion, and writing a quality environmental impact statement for his project. These were important academic components that L did not take seriously. On the other hand his design and craftsmanship were well above average.

Suggested Course Equivalencies (in quarter hours): Total - 16

3 Environmental Design Seminar/Workshop
3 Start-up Project (Woodworking Basics or Surveying Basics)
6 Individual Project
4 Adjunct Study (supportive of Individual Project)

****

Program description

First, the major questions of the inquiry are stated. Next, the various activities are described. There's no redundancy with the co-evaluation.

Scale and Detail: Designing with the Environment   Spring 2002

The Evergreen State College   Faculty: Leverich, Stroh

Program Description

Design is a way of thinking about and solving problems with complex and often conflicting variables. How can designers and planners, working with different tools and at different scales, design in ways that are responsive to environmental concerns and to human communities? What common cycles and patterns do they work with? What skills can they learn from one another? How can they make their work ethical, beautiful and part of a sustainable way of life? These were some of the animating questions in this sixteen credit, all-level program.

Each student began the program by making, revising and signing off on an individual study plan that spelled out learning objectives, activities, research sources and a timeline.

Students read and discussed *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, edited by William Cronon, and *Design with Nature,* by Ian McHarg in three seminars. They compared the two books and related them to their own projects in three short seminar response papers.

Students maintained a work journal with weekly entries reporting on their technical and conceptual learning and their work in context. They wrote an environmental impact analysis report on a material or process relevant to their individual projects. They made final public presentations of their primary projects for the term and maintained and presented a program notebook documenting all their efforts for the program.

The entire group attended a series of videos on ecological design hosted by William McDonough, a panel discussion on sustainable wood use, and a workshop on photographing their 2D and 3D design work. They also toured works by the landscape designer and architect John Yeon in the Columbia Gorge and Portland.

Most students undertook one of three short start-up projects, a small hall table (for those planning furniture-scaled projects), a site survey project, or a boundary monument survey project. The hall table brief specified area and height limits and called for one hand-cut joint, one manufactured material, one carved surface, no more than seven parts and use of the wall as partial or full support. The site survey consisted of mapping an old homestead using a plane table, alidade and tape for horizontal and elevation control. Structures were measured with a tape. Tree elevation was determined trigonometrically with a tape for distance and Abney level for angle. The plane table map was converted to campus coordinates, digitized, and exported in ArcView GIS format to become part of the campus data base. The Evergreen State College property monuments,

placed in 1969, were located by interpreting original surveyor's drawings, taping distance with a fiberglass tape, and measuring angles for a forester's staff compass. A metal detector helped discover buried monuments. All sites were flagged. The campus data base was updated with the new findings.

Over the term, small groups of students attended green building conferences in Eugene and Portland, visited the Hardel Plywood Factory in Centralia, and traveled to other sites relevant to their projects.

APPENDIX E:
RESPONSE EVALUATIONS

From Transcendent Practices ('03-'04), a yearlong all-level program

Faculty evaluation, spring quarter (Sarah Williams)

Note: The eval is a response to the self-evaluation, affirming and expanding on what the student has said. The first paragraph explains, in boilerplate, the relation between the student and faculty statements. (The opening sentence indicates level of achievement.) The second paragraph is an extended comment on the student's learning. Since the self-eval already describes learning in detail, the writer is free to address what seems most significant and interesting. The narrative directs the reader's attention—and adds the team's authority—to the student's reflection.

L excelled in the spring quarter of *Transcendent Practices.* In keeping with the highly experiential and collaborative pedagogical design of this program, the accompanying Student Evaluation of Personal Achievement reflects the most comprehensive assessment of student achievement. The creation of that document was supported by program work and is the result of required participation in assessment exercises, writing workshops, peer reviews, and faculty reviews—including an individual evaluation conference between the student and seminar faculty. What follows is a response by the faculty team as a whole to L's spring quarter work and self-assessment.

In response to L's self-evaluation the faculty need only exclaim, "YES!" L truly did exceptional work in all aspects of our program. Her engagement with the themes and practices of the program was inspirational. Through her own research, writing, yoga practice, and her practice teaching, L embodied the integration of personal process and academic scholarship at the heart of this program. Her enthusiasm and generosity demonstrated in powerful ways the truths she was realizing through study and practice. And this is not coincidental. Along with her peer, AT, L spent the quarter putting the insights of quantum physics into conversation with the insights of spiritually based wisdom traditions. L found that conversation to be blissful and entered into it. For example, L's research paper was an exceptionally well written account of her integration of, and transformation through, the wisdom teachings of quantum physics and Kashmir Shaivism. Never has the faculty had a student who took seriously the suggestion that the key insights of quantum physics could be read alongside of the truths of 5000-year old sacred texts of the yogic tradition. L decided to try this out. Her reading of Swami Shantananda's recent translation and commentary on the *Pratyahbhijna-hrdayam*, The *Splendor of Recognition*, was profound. In short, L's individual study project encompassed the highest ambitions of *Transcendent Practices* in ways that surpassed faculty expectations.

Credit Equivalencies (in quarter hours): Total 16

2- Ground, Flow, Sustenance: Seminar Work
4- Yoga Asana, Body and Earth: Collaborative Learning
2- Interdisciplinary Self-Assessment
8- Individual Study: Quantum Theory and Kashmir Shaivism

****

Student self-evaluation, spring quarter

In the first paragraph the student explains her goals for the quarter. In the second she summarizes the course of her independent inquiry and the breakthroughs she experienced. In the next two, she describes what she learned from shared program activities. In the last, she synthesizes and looks ahead.

I began Spring quarter determined to sustain and create conversation between two practices: yoga and academia. Hoping to continue the solid level of engagement with my colleagues that began during winter quarter, and in addition to all-program activities, I chose to embark on a journey of intense independent study of consciousness. I had three goals in this inquiry: to sustain my personal practices of asana and meditation, to use research to uncover and address similarities regarding the idea of consciousness as presented by quantum theory and yogic (specifically Kashmir Salvist) philosophy, and to understand how contemplative and physical practice can integrate with committed scholarly learning.

In addition to the texts required for the program, I read *The Tao of Physics* (Capra), *The Holographic Universe* (Talbot), *The Field* (McTaggart), *The Splendor of Recognition* (Shantananda), and also worked with *The Dancing Wu Li Master* (Zukav), *The Elegant Universe* (Greene), *Beyond Power Yoga* (Bender), and various articles related to my topic. I found that the idea of unity is supported by both spirituality and science, and an awareness of this interconnected nature of life is imperative for the health of the individual, the society, and the world. The negative effects of mechanistic education also emerged, on levels both personal and societal. All writing I produced for the class was insightful and had drastically improved technically and stylistically from previous quarters. My cumulative paper regarding the interconnected nature of the knowledge of the heart and mind was the most successful piece of writing in my college career. I can say with confidence that the work I produced spring quarter was the most thoughtful, critical, and integrative of my entire life.

All-program activities provided an excellent framework and source of embellishment for my independent inquiry. Guest lectures were particularly helpful in gaining a well-rounded understanding of the different cultural and historical contexts around the enigmatic themes of consciousness and sustenance in practice. Yoga studio lectures regarding emotional/biological research helped me to learn to work with my body in different ways to enhance my personal practice, and to understand the applications and benefits of yoga for mental, physical, and spiritual health and awareness. By keeping a clear mind and understanding the workings of our minds we can make better personal choices and become more productively engaged in society.

Weekly seminar discussions offered an opportunity to engage on a critical level with my colleagues and helped to integrate the recurring themes of my research and practice (unity, intention, perception, etc.) with ideas presented in our texts and in the larger context of the program. Through the texts and discussions I discovered that my work surrounding consciousness related to society on many levels I had not anticipated, including (but not limited to) methods of education, social responsibility, and physical and psychological health. I began to see that cultivating an understanding of consciousness from the perspectives of both the heart (contemplative practice) and the mind (science) can provide a way to make positive change in the self and, simultaneously, the world.

Through practice and study I have learned that the human experience of the world is entirely subjective. Western society teaches us to fragment our lives and to look at the world in terms of parts without considering the whole. This quarter I discovered that quantum physics is beginning to validate what mysticism has been saying for thousands of years: at the most basic level, everything that we see is made up of energy and is connected in an indivisible web of existence. This epiphany has had profound impact on all aspects of my life and, in effect, has created a complete sense of unity in my life. By delving so deeply into study from many angles I have learned the merit of true scholarly learning that involves both heart and mind. I have cultivated a passion for learning and I am confident that I can continue my study of consciousness at a graduate or even post-graduate level. The knowledge I have gained this

quarter can apply to any profession I choose but I have found a desire to use it in a manner that serves other people in some way.

****

Worksheet for student self-evaluation, spring quarter (Sarah Williams and Bob Leverich)

Faculty required students to complete worksheets at the midpoint and end of each quarter as part of credit-bearing self-assessment work. (For more on this process, see the Student Self-Evaluation section above.) The team identifies salient features of each activity, guiding students to reflect on the various aspects of their learning in the context of the program's goals and vision. The document provides the starting point for writing the self-eval. (The blanks-to-fill-in on the worksheet below have been eliminated to save space.)

Transcendent Practices/S04   Final Self Evaluation Working Outline

Your Name: Seminar Group:

Background Documents

Get copies of the following documents:

- **The S04 Syllabus and S04 Program Description,**
- **Your weekly response/reflection sheets and seminar papers,**
- **Anything else that records your process** (journals, sketchbooks, notebooks, etc.)

Work through the following working outline for your midterm self-evaluation. Don't bog down writing prose, just make lists in the spaces provided.

Working Outline

Material for your opening paragraph:
❑   Describe your experience, hopes and learning goals at the start of this program this term and this year.

❑   Describe your performance in the program to date. (How was your attendance? Did you attend fully? Were you fully engaged? Did you complete the work assigned? Did you work hard? Did your effort reflect your abilities?

Material to draw from for your central paragraphs:
Here is a list of the major program activities. Try numbering them in the order of their significance to you, and then address them in that order.   Characterize your learning in each and what you feel were especially significant experiences and insights for you.

❑   **All Program Activities** Monday AM Yoga (physical practice and *Body and Earth* connections) / Monday PM guest lectures / peer group meetings / *Body and Earth* "To Do" work and/or *Trail Guide to the Body* work / *Body and Earth* Chapter Project (What was your topic and how does it relate to program themes?) / weekly response/reflection work and Thursday all program integration sessions / Interview project. Describe your efforts:

- ❑ **Yoga Focus Group (Sarah)** (Tuesday AM practice; Tuesday PM check-in/workshop – your attendance and participation; on-going progress re: your individual study plan, especially answers to the five questions; self-assessment skills re: embodiment of Rumi's "two intelligences" in relationship to your individual study plan; completion and presentation of your individual study plan.)

- ❑ **Individualized Studies (Bob)** Identifying and planning your study; attendance and participation at weekly check-ins; challenges and successes, what you learned and how, documenting your learning, your presentation…)

- ❑ **Bronze Workshop** Assess your progress in the following areas: Sculpture concepts (scale, frontality vs. in-the-round, activating space, basing the work, multiples), The lost wax casting process, Wax work, Investment, Pouring, Chasing, Finishing. Life drawing concepts (gestural drawing types, anatomy review, proportioning, cues to form and space, scale and 'overlaption,' composition strategies.)

- ❑ **Poetry** Participants in Poetry Workshop should comment on what they've learned about themselves as writers and readers in terms of the intensive focus that is the aim of Transcendent Practices' Spring Quarter. What is it like to spend 20 hours/week on poetry and poetry-related topics? What sustains your poetry-writing practice, and how does the practice sustain you? What have you gleaned from your reading of the Alexie, Cisneros and Hass texts? How would you relate your definition of Transcendence to what you've experienced so far, either as a writer or as a reader/critic? How have your critical skills developed/improved?

- ❑ **Seminar** (How's your ability to explore ideas in dialogue? Did you make progress? What insights came out of the discussions for you?

- ❑ **Writing** (Journal entries, note-taking, research papers, seminar papers, poetry… What kind of writing can you do now? Improvements? Changes in your thinking?)

- ❑ **Thinking and Judgement** (Critical thinking-insight into your own and other's work, integrative thinking-making connections between ideas, investigations, methods, etc.)

Material for your final paragraph(s):

- ❑ How would you characterize your grasp of the skills and ideas presented? Passing? Fair? Very Good? Excellent? Detailed or general?

- ❑ What "light bulb" have you had? (Discoveries, realizations, career ideas…)

- ❑ Has your perception of yoga, sculpture and poetry changed? How?

❑ How has your understanding of the terms *transcendence, practice, grounding, flow* and *sustenance* changed?

❑ What progress did you make toward the goals you listed above? What have you learned about yourself?

❑ What will your next steps be? (Next term? Long term? New hopes? New goals?…}

<u>Your Final Self Evaluation-Instructions</u>

1. Write your first draft. Try using the simple Introduction/Body/Conclusion format suggested in the Working Outline. Edit this for gross errors, and spell check. <u>Maximum</u> length is one page, one inch margins. Use 11 Point Arial or Times New Roman type font. Print three copies. The question to keep in mind is this: **How would you summarize your learning for someone unfamiliar with your efforts in the program?**

2. At the Self Evaluation Workshop, get together with two other students and have them critique your draft. Be fearless in offering <u>constructive</u> criticism. *This is a very important step*. You, in turn, should review the drafts of two other students. <u>Sign each draft that you review.</u>

3. *Revise* your own draft final self evaluation.

4. **Save the Word document on a disc and/or e-mail it to yourself.**

5. **Turn in your final double-spaced draft and two edited copies by the end of the final self-evaluation workshop. That is Thursday, May 27, 2004.** Your seminar leader will review this draft. If we think it needs more work, we'll turn it back to you by Tuesday of Week 10 for another revision.

Next steps:

6. **Make three copies on the official form.** (One for your seminar leader, one for yourself and one for your transcript.)

7. **Turn in one final copy, on the official form, to your Seminar Leader's mailbox by 9AM on Friday, June 4, 2004.**

One more note:

Consider the voice you use. Does what you say about your work sound vague? Pompous? Overly personal? Defensive? Obsequious? Apologetic? Strive to write clear, well-crafted prose. Note your accomplishments without over-inflation. Tie generalities back to your own experience. Be objective. Consider quoting yourself or your own writing in regard to personal and heartfelt work.

From Light and Terror ('03), a one-quarter intermediate program

Faculty evaluation grid imagined (Stacey Davis)

Note: For an example of how a grid approach to evaluation might look, a faculty member devised a set of criteria based on the content and learning objectives in an already-completed program. Such an evaluation would be tailored to the individual student by treating areas of strength in greater detail. The listing of criteria could also be ordered so as to highlight the student's best work. Following the grid is the description of the program. (Grids haven't been approved as a mode of transcript evaluation; more investigation of their promise is needed.)

Summary: [a short paragraph would give an overview of the student's performance]

Area 1 (Content):

Ability or knowledge evaluated:	Evaluation:
Demonstrated understanding of Enlightenment philosophy	
Demonstrated understanding of *ancien regime* French society, culture, history and art	
Demonstrated understanding of the French Revolution	
Demonstrated grasp of new trends in the cultural, gender and social historiography of the French Revolution	
Demonstrated understanding of the links and tensions between Enlightenment philosophy, *ancien regime* culture, and the trajectory of the French Revolution	

Area 2 (Analysis):

Ability or knowledge evaluated:	Evaluation:
Demonstrated capacity to analyze texts closely and in light of program themes	
Demonstrated capacity to synthesize information across sources and disciplines.	
Demonstrated ability to explore complex historical, philosophical and artistic theories	
Demonstrated oral presentation style	

Area 3 (Written and Oral Skills):

Ability or knowledge evaluated:	Evaluation:
Demonstrated ability to explore program themes and analyze texts orally in seminar	

Demonstrated ability to write well-supported essays analyzing primary and secondary sources in literature, history and art history	.
Demonstrated capability to write a short research paper using sources from scholarly journals	
Demonstrated writing style	

Suggested Credit Equivalencies:

- 6 Social, Cultural and Political History of the French Revolution
- 6 The European Enlightenment
- 4 Eighteenth-Century French Art in Cultural and Political Context

****

Program description (Stacey Davis)

       Light and Terror: France in the Age of Voltaire and Robespierre was an intensive study of the history, literature, art and political theory of the French Enlightenment and the French Revolution in the larger European context. Throughout, we focused on two main questions: firstly, to what extent did the political theory, philosophy and literature of Voltaire, Rousseau and their more humble "grub street" imitators influence the course of the Revolution? Secondly, how could the Revolution itself be considered the opening moment of the modern era in areas as diverse as politics, law, propaganda, art, social structure and gender relations?

       Students read extensively in both the primary literature of the time and modern historiography, with a particular emphasis on new trends in cultural, gender and artistic studies. Their Enlightenment texts included works by Montesquieu, Rosseau and Adam Smith, as well as bawdy popular pamphlets attaching Queen Marie-Antoinette. Their history texts included Rogier Chartier's *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, Lynn Hunt's *Politics, Culture and Class in the French Revolution* and David's *The Death of Marat*, edited by William Vaughan. In workshops they studied French art from Watteau and Fragonard to David and paid particular attention to the revolutionary use of artworks and other images as political symbols and propaganda. Much coursework also focused on questions of changing gender relationships during the revolutionary era.

       Besides participating in two book seminars and one primary document workshop each week, each student completed one lengthy midterm take-home essay exam on the *ancien regime* and the Enlightenment, and one in-class final exam covering the Revolution itself. Each student also wrote one analysis of an Enlightenment primary source of their choice and one final research paper on a topic concerning revolutionary history, art or literature. Each gave a ten-minute final presentation to the class on this individual research.

_____

From Metapatterns ('98-'99), a two-quarter Core program

A grid of learning objectives(Don Bantz and Ariel Goldberger)

Note: Students respond to the form when the program begins, assessing how they regard themselves with respect to each criterion. At the end, when student and

faculty write their evaluations, the responses serve as a baseline for reflecting on development over the course of the program. The final eval isn't written in the form of a grid, but the grid helps both student and teacher focus on similar criteria and make their evaluations complementary.

Metapatterns: Fall, '98   Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student:

Evaluation criteria	Assessment[1]	Comments
Reading		
Comprehension of material		
Intellectual engagement of material		
Application of theories, concepts		
Verbal		
Conveys insights effectively		
Collaborative colleague		
Consistent seminar contributor		
Small group process skills		
Engages colleagues in conversations		
Writing		
Integrates disparate ideas		
Research ability		
Use of literature, evidence		
Produces interdisciplinary work		
Coherence		
Sophistication		
Critical Thinking		
Cultivates multiple perspectives		
Inquiring mind		
Originality of thought		
Analytical, engaging ideas		
Motivation, work habits		
Timely completion of assignments		
Quality of portfolio		
Able to put theory to practice		
Artistic thinking		
Understanding of subtlety, complexity		
Create meaning;communicate imagery		

---

[1] √√ = Strong   √ = Adequate   NW= Needs Work   IE= Insufficient evidence to assess

feelings, ideas thru artistic media/tech		
Critique different approaches to making imagery		
Artistic processes		

"Seeds of Change," an internship contract

Faculty evaluation (Gilles Malnarich)

Note how the faculty uses a detailed account of the successful project to show the student's development. She quotes judiciously from the field supervisor, whose praise provides good evidence for the faculty's assessment. She gleans further evidence from the student's writing, which she quotes and glosses. As sponsor she knows much about the internship, having worked closely with the student on the academic component.

In Spring Quarter 2003, A worked with 30 children from kindergarten to 5th grade at the Hansen YMCA after-school childcare program on a garden project she titled "Seeds of Change." Prior to A's involvement, children typically played video or board games inside or went outside to play in the playground.

H, A's internship site advisor and Senior Program Director for Children & Family Services at South Sound YMCA, was skeptical about A's garden project since attempts at other YMCA sites hadn't worked. Ms. H's evaluation report describes a first visit to the newly-created garden and her surprise: "The beds were meticulously prepared, and there was an archway adorned with a wind chime...the garden was teeming with the starts of flowers, vegetables, and a tree all cultivated by the children. Artwork all over the site reflected the children's participation in the garden. A's activities were expansive in that children of all ages had opportunities to engage at their own level of ability and interest…the project included a greenhouse for planning, preparation, and study." In the same report, A is complimented for how well she works with Hansen staff, adapts to the needs of others, and has developed her ability "to follow- through on long-term plans." Ms. H, who knew A from previous volunteer work at Hansen Elementary, concludes her report with high praise: "A has conducted herself in such a manner as to only reflect positively on the YMCA. The quality of A's performance indicates tremendous potential for her to succeed in the field of youth work."

As faculty sponsor for A's Spring 2003 internship and an earlier contract in Fall 2002, I also have observed A's development over several quarters. While she continues to explore how creative self-expression can be a powerful entry point for working with children, she is sure-footedly developing her *own* approach. In the Hansen YMCA project, she chose to work with young people who rarely participate in enriched out-of-school learning activities. She launched the garden project in a spirited and determined manner, knowing that other projects had not been successful. She imagined something different. Children would create *their vision* of a garden from what they wanted to eat/plant to the kind of place where they wanted to be.

A's essay, her journal entries, the garden book, and notes from our meetings indicate that for her the garden is a place where people can learn from one another. She describes the garden as "a physical space for growth"…(it would be) "a source of motivation for many types of learning." She welcomes everyone's contribution from making garden furniture to researching and reporting on the growing cycle and needs of a particular plant. She writes about children's excitement when they connect school learning to the project (how flowers reproduce, the value of insects, ways to chart plant growth, ways to measure plots, etc.). Other unanticipated connections are made: "As the garden grew, stories were told about family and food." Soon, family and community members become involved. People bring plants; older children teach younger children; girls confess they like to work with dirt; and, boys love the beautifully illustrated garden books. A writes: "I began to

see the diversity in the students—in age, learning style, and particular interests. With each week, I learned to arrange my plans according to the diverse needs." For A, the garden project leads her to learn about construction, the benefits of native plants, and art and environmental therapy.

During this internship, A learned more about planning curriculum based on students' interests and experiences. She also became more *analytical* in her approach to teaching: "I grew to understand each child through visual and written observation, which in turn increased my ability to create situations for successful learning…I began to step back and see the whole picture in order to problem solve in different situations." This acknowledged accomplishment represents another development in A's ability to reflect on her own learning. She is becoming confident about her *own observations and judgment.* During her internship at Hansen Elementary YMCA after school program, A demonstrated one of Evergreen's expectations for our graduates—"integrative, independent and creative thinking." Congratulations on a fine quarter's work, A.

SUGGESTED COURSE EQUIVALENCIES (in quarter hours) TOTAL: 12
6—Teaching Internship
6—Curriculum Development

****

Student self-evaluation

The student's description of what she did and learned has its own authority. While the ground covered is similar to the faculty's eval, it's not repetitive. The self-eval has the effect of strongly confirming the judgments of the sponsor and supervisor.

As the assistant director for Hansen Elementary Y Care, I worked to develop a curriculum within the loose structure of the after school care. The program consisted of thirty children, kindergarten through fifth grade, and two other staff. Having experienced a year at Hansen prior, I realized the benefits of structured learning activities within the after school environment. The program "Seeds of Change" was created around a central gardening project designed and developed with the children from the ground up, to empower and challenge everyone involved. I intended to help them grow in community through experiential learning in which we examined the interrelations of our work. Connections became apparent as we prepared soil, planted seeds in the greenhouse, and watched the plants grow. Children learned to care for the plants and transplanted them when they grew larger. We read stories about gardens, community, and ecology; and we discussed the importance of creating a garden together as we learned about each plant. We observed changes within the garden and children shared related classroom learning as well as stories from friends or family gardens.

The garden inspired the children to observe changes and challenge ideas of growth. It also influenced community members to contribute in different ways. My communication skills developed as I learned new ways of teaching, took practice in conflict resolution, and made connections with coworkers and parents. I learned to use art as a doorway to cross-curricular learning, as we made paper, planted trees, painted and built a garden bench, made wind chimes, learned color theory by mixing many shades of green, and created a book about the experience. These activities allowed children time for self-exploration and choice in creative expression, while making links to studies taking place in the garden. Comments from the children reflect on the impact of gardening and learning together. "It was fantastic!" "We learned to work together." I observed development in expression as children kept written and visual observations of our progress. With varied activities, I was pleased to share something with each child. I learned to develop a curriculum suitable for different age groups and diverse learning styles. I was surprised at my ability to influence children who were non-expressive or non-participatory. As we learned together, they grew to trust and understand me. They became open to different means of expression and found a voice in personal growth.

With the children, I have learned much about growth. By keeping logs of my work as a teacher, charting the growth of the children and garden, and planning daily activities, my organizational and creative skills have developed. I have gained confidence in my ability as a teacher. In creating an intentional creative curriculum, I learned to follow through with long term plans and systematic learning structure, while also learning to bend and flow with the needs of the children. The garden project gave me new understanding of children' growth and creative space. I see the value of creative space in children's lives. By creating communal space for learning, children learn to value the learning in the space they help design and build. This process builds confidence and creates space to share skills and learning.

Moving forward from the garden project, I have recently assisted at the Olympia Waldorf School where I helped build a playhouse with the summer camp children. As with the Hansen children, we built from scratch and created a space for learning, community building, and creative expression. Continuing my work with children as an artist, I hope to be a source of empowerment and self-growth through my teachings and creative inspiration. With each project, the children teach me as I grow into my role as artist and teacher.

_____

"Stranger Than Fiction," an internship contract

Faculty evaluation (Greg Mullins)

Note: This evaluation treats the internship quite succinctly. The first paragraph describes it; the next three quote the supervisor's assessment; the last reviews the academic component. The faculty member writes affirmatively; while fleshing out details, he relies on the student and supervisor evaluations to provide most of the record.

T's internship spring quarter involved working as staff support for Production Services and Information Services at *The Stranger*. Her work included training in Photoshop and how to work with web pages, and she was responsible for 1) finding and scanning images (using Photoshop); 2) organizing and filing promotional materials; 3) filing artwork, and/or returning it to the artist; 4) general office work; and 5) helping maintain the newspaper's web pages. T supplemented her internship with academic work on a publishing project involving her family.

At the newspaper, T worked under the supervision of Design Director J. J reported favorably on T's internship experience, noting alterations in the original conception of the internship that allowed T to spend considerable time working with the Information Services department on the newspaper's web pages. J wrote, "T has been interning here in the Production department during the spring quarter of 2000. She has been a cheerful and enthusiastic intern during her time here."

"T's position here basically did include all (the agreed upon) activities. I believe that the filing activities, and the returning of artwork fulfilled the description in the contract exactly. T also received some minimal training in Photoshop and did a large number of scans for us. I taught her some basic photo retouching skills. She learned how to access our network server to transfer documents. She also used Filemaker and Excel to create two different databases for us. Unfortunately, because our weekly production schedule is so hectic, there is limited time for anyone to do training. So, to my knowledge, T never received any instruction in Quark Xpress. If she had been here longer, I'm sure we would have found the time. It is, however, the reality of the job. I think that …T was able to get a feel for what a peak period at a weekly paper is like."

"I felt like T fit in well here. She has good energy and got along well with everyone. She was interested in learning new skills, but also willing to take care of mundane tasks. Once she was assigned a project, she would finish it without supervision."

Regarding the academic component of her quarter's work, T laid the groundwork for her on-going project on epistolary communication. She conducted research on anthologies and collections of correspondence by way of planning for her own publication, and she began organizing the material she is working with. This project will continue during summer session 2000.

Suggested Course Equivalencies (in quarter hours) Total: 16

12—Internship: The Stranger
4—Research: Epistolary Composition

****

Student self-evaluation

The student uses the first paragraph to explain why and how her internship plan shifted. She is frank in her critique of what happened, but not at all nasty. In the second paragraph she describes technical skills she acquired. In the third she describes the research she conducted in addition to the internship. Finally, she explains how she intends to move forward with what she learned.

I spent the Spring 2000 quarter as an intern at *The Stranger*. My initial goals were to work on my computer skills, creative techniques, and office diplomacy, increasing my marketability while accruing school credit. My supervisor was J, and he agreed to the intent of the internship at the beginning of the quarter. As it turned out, J was new to the paper and unsure of his needs. He started me on the task of re-filing all of the music, movie and theatre photos of the past five years, and when this was completed he offered little guidance. Due to the weekly turn over at the paper, the production staff had little time to train me and the resources were limited. Fortunately for J, the Assistant Design Editor, Production Designer and, towards the end of the quarter, the entire Technical/Information Services staff took me under their wing and made my time at the newspaper worthwhile.

I was taught the Quark Program and used it to launch a new ad campaign for K, who also provided me with weekly Internet searches for images needed to highlight text. L coached me on PhotoShop projects, LinoColor scanning. Photo touch up, de-screening process, and for a two week period we worked together on production layout. The technical crew offered me the opportunity to shadow their web designers by posting the paper on the web site weekly, and transferring archives into HTML, via a dispatch service. They also taught me how to manipulate Dreamweaver while writing programs and how to transfer images into web-ready coding.

I had a side project of compiling letters and considering the importance of correspondence, which proved to be a vast and interesting topic. I researched anthologies and collections of correspondence to assist me in formatting my work, and began the process of editing the letters intended for my own compilation. While doing this, paired with disappointment in my internship, I decided to continue and deepen my studies of interpersonal communication, while terminating my contract with the newspaper.

This quarter proved to be an educational rollercoaster and actually landed me with more experience than I expected, albeit a completely different concentration. I will continue to intern for Information Services in an agreement I have with them, without being academically bound, and am excited to learn more about web production. My faculty sponsor has shown enthusiasm for this, although is unable to be my advisor for my summer contract. I feel that I have had an interesting and broadening quarter, which, with refinement, will only increase in the future.

From Logic, Language and Life ('03) , a one-quarter, half time program

Program description and evaluation of student (Stephen Beck)

Note the tightness of both description and evaluation. The eval is quite specific in assessing the student's level of accomplishment in each aspect of the program. It ends with suggestion about what the student might do next. It also endorses the self-evaluation, referring the reader to it for a fuller account. No words are wasted.

Description:
The primary goal of "Logic, Language and Life" was to teach students a formal language of first-order logic. Through Quine's *Methods of Logic*, students studied progressively more fine-grained logical languages, beginning with sentential logic, then proceeding to monadic predicate logic, and ending with polyadic predicate logic (the logic of relations). For each language, students studied both syntactic forms and semantic concepts, and they learned both what relations hold between syntactic manipulations and semantic inferences and how to justify those relations. Students learned of the indecidability, soundness and completeness of polyadic predicate logic. An additional goal of the program was to allow students to reflect on the value and importance of formalized logic in practical life. Faculty evaluation is based on the student's understanding of these topics as demonstrated in portfolio, problem sets, quizzes, and exams.

Evaluation:
M completed all program work and is awarded full credit. His self-evaluation gives an accurate and detailed account of his achievements. M had trouble in those areas of the program that required applying formal rules in careful detail in order to arrive at a conclusion. His grasp on the semantic concepts of logic, particularly those of sentential logic, was much more secure. In addition, he was deeply engaged in class discussions regarding the practical and personal value and significance of logic and reasoning. M would do well to continue to work on his ability to perform the kind of detailed, step-by-step abstract reasoning exemplified both by logic and mathematics. He is prepared for further study of this kind.

Course Equivalencies (in quarter hours) TOTAL: 8
4 — Philosophy: Deductive Logic
4 — Philosophy: Philosophy of Logic

****

Student self-evaluation

The self-eval shows inquisitive, creative engagement in the subject. The presence of the student's voice reorients the faculty criticism: though he didn't do well in part of the program, he clearly learned a lot.

I took this class thinking that if someone asked me the question: "Is this argument logical," that I already knew the answer. After learning three separate languages of logic and the various methods of syntactic manipulation, semantic concepts, memorizing truth tables and rules of passage, I know that I previously had very little of what could be considered logic.

This class was a high paced intensive course that challenged me to my limits. There were times where difficult material was introduced in the first half and then quizzed on the second half. Most exams and quizzes in this class were meant to be extremely challenging by the professor's own admission. Often a student was told if they felt strong in any area of an exam they should be extremely satisfied. I feel I performed up to the significant standards of the homework assigned, quizzes and exams.

We were allowed to reflect on logic and the value it may or may not have in everyday life. Although specific uses of logic may be limited to the purely academic and or mathematical applications, logic does have value outside of that. When one begins to evaluate what implication means, if-then, if and only if, a dramatic improvement in critical reasoning and critical thinking occurs. After this class I am prepared to evaluate arguments and statements in everyday life better than I ever have before. With the constant manipulative qualities of advertising, television and politics, I consider myself at an advantage having this exposure and knowledge of logic.

An aspect of learning in this class that cannot show up on exams or tests is the intuitive nature of logic. Many times symbols lose their meaning in the midst of intense syntactic manipulations. In the end, one is asking themselves questions in their head such as: "If this is true, and this is true, then this has to be true, doesn't it? But this isn't true, is it." Or "There is something that is not everything." These thoughts are an interesting internal exploration of how an individual evaluates and relates to the concepts of "truth" and "false", what one may consider possible and how what one thought of as perfectly valid belief system may indeed be completely false.

APPENDIX I:
WHY NARRATIVE EVALUATIONS?

In thinking about how to write narrative evaluations, you might well ask the question why we here at Evergreen write them at all. You could of course fall back on the authority of Evergreen tradition or informal understandings of "the Evergreen way." Instead of relying on that authority, the following attempts to give a reasoned answer to that reasonable question.

There is no presumption, however, to giving the *official* answer, the *final* answer, the answer of the *consensus of the Evergreen faculty* [!]. Rather, the purpose here is to enter into a continuing conversation about the nature and purpose of a liberal arts education, particularly at Evergreen.

The simple answer to the question, "why narrative evaluations?" is simply that we don't give grades. Evergreen's distinctive pedagogy, it is often noted, was founded on a list of "No's" – prominent among them, "no grades."

But what reasons lay behind the "no grades" imperative? On this point, Pete Sinclair's memo to the 1996 Narrative Evaluation DTF is instructive and worth quoting from extensively.[1] According to Sinclair, "the purpose of no grades was to change fundamentally the traditional dynamic of power and authority between students and faculty." He expands on this by listing and then explaining "the four rules why we are without grades: grading undermines our political ideals, is rude, doesn't work, and inhibits learning of all kinds in any political or social system." The first two reasons concern the decrepit foundations of grades, while the last two concern their ill effects.

On the first reason, Sinclair writes that grading's "chief value is to depersonalize, certify and sort the minions of [the military-industrial] complex. … The only students whose professional prospects we are qualified to certify are future college teachers, which is not to say that we should be doing that, either." On the second, he writes: "To tell an adult that he or she fails to meet my standards is rude. To tell an adult that he or she meets or exceeds my standards is patronizing. Neither is conducive to learning."

As for the effectiveness of grades, Sinclair says that they don't work in the sense that the "prophetic value of grades is nil beyond predicting how the student will do in school," while as for motivation, "grades motivate students to get the grades they get."

Implicit in Sinclair's reasons is the view that grades represent themselves as reliable measures of objective standards of academic excellence. In this way, grades avoid serious questions about authority, such as, who is to be recognized as competent to pass judgment about what this student has learned? Whether, as an individual faculty member, you firmly believe in your authority to pass judgment, or whether instead you doubt you have such authority, by assigning a grade you presume that authority. For in the institutional context, grades are bound to be read as authoritative. This presumption of authority inhibits learning.

What we developed instead of grades is the narrative evaluation. Why narrative evaluations, in particular? In 1971, Merv Cadwallader argued for the view that "grades could not be eliminated without replacing them with some other method of evaluating students." Further, he held that the nature of the coordinated studies mode of study would

---

[1]Sinclair, Pete. "The History of Narrative Evaluations." Memo to the Narrative Evaluation DTF. February 3, 1997.

have the result that "both the student and the teacher would be in a position to write a rich qualitative evaluation."[2] Cadwallader envisioned at the inception of the college something very much like the system we have had since, in which both faculty and student evaluate the student's work in official transcript documents.

Cadwallader's argument, at least as represented here, doesn't fully explain why narrative evaluations in particular are a sensible response to the rejection of grades. The following is an attempt to fill in that argument.

First, narrative evaluations make sense pedagogically. To the extent that the faculty's audience is the student, a narrative evaluation serves essentially the same purpose as faculty comments on any other student work, the only difference being that of scope. Narrative evaluations, seen as written *only* to the student, are nothing more or less than teachers' commentaries on their students' performances.

But evaluations are not normally written only to the student. Even most "in-house" evaluations are aimed not just to the student but also to faculty colleagues within an ongoing program. Transcript evaluations also include in their audience potential readers outside Evergreen. What, then, is the point of putting narrative evaluations in our students' transcripts?

Narrative evaluations explain to outsiders what our students have done in their studies with us. These explanations are not an incidental augmentation to the award of credit; the rejection of grades by itself places upon us the obligation to give these explanations. Since we are bucking the established practice of grades, outsiders can be reasonably expected to, and regularly do, wonder just what our students have achieved in their studies with us. "I understand," an outsider might say to us, "that Evergreen is a liberal arts college and that this person here is an Evergreen graduate. But without grades, how am I to understand just what this person has learned at Evergreen?" The narrative evaluations answer this question, in detail.

In other words, our transcript narrative evaluations make sense as responses to the reasonable request to explain our work with our students, as fitting within the tradition of a liberal arts education. They describe the nature of our students' work and offer the faculty's judgments about the quality of that work.

Within that justification for narrative evaluations, there is considerable latitude for different positions about the nature and purpose of liberal arts education, and in particular, for different views about authority to judge student learning. There is room for faculty members to defer to their students' own authority over their educations, or to assume a great deal of authority. There is room for faculty members to apply whatever conception of academic standards they accept. There is room for faculty members to address whatever features of the students' work they judge to be most relevant.

What narrative evaluations *do not* permit, though, is the *invisible, automatic* presumption of faculty authority to pass judgment on student learning. Simply by writing a narrative, you assume the obligation to *establish* your authority — whatever level of authority you believe you have — through your written voice. Evaluation writing has this in common with all writing. As writers of evaluations, we know that our readers will make judgments not just about our students' competence but about our own. While this can be cause for anxiety, it is also an opportunity for each of us to reflect on the nature and sources of our authority. It is an opportunity that we should welcome.

---

[2] Marshall, David. "Pedagogical Values at Evergreen." Draft manuscript. March 23, 2004.