

Faculty Support of Student Self Evaluations

**Stephen L. Beck
The Evergreen State College
July 2005**

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Summary	1
I. Documentation of Practices	1
The Program: “Work and the Human Condition”	2
Support Provided for Transcript Self-Evaluations.....	2
The Study	4
II. Assessment of Transcript Self-Evaluations.....	5
1. Accuracy	5
2. Five Foci and Six Expectations.....	11
3. Distinctive Voice	20
4. Presentability.....	21
Summary of Assessment.....	26
III. Connections Between Practices and Self-Evaluations.....	27
Evidence from the Content Analysis	27
Evidence from Particular Students’ Work	28
Results of Survey of Students	29
Summary of Connections.....	31
Conclusions.....	31
Appendix A: Handouts for Reflective Exercises for Fall and Winter Quarters	33
Appendix B: Handouts on Guidelines for Writing Self-Evaluations.....	39
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form	42
Appendix D: Content Analysis	43
Appendix E: Grid of Responses to Survey on Self Evaluation Support.....	44

List of Tables

Table 1: Types of Program Content in Self-Evaluations	13
Table 2: Extent of Content within Self-Evaluation.....	14
Table 3: Technical Errors in Self-Evaluations.....	21
Table 4: Philosophical Terminology in Self-Evaluations.....	23
Table 5: Connections between Workshop Prompts and Self-Evaluations.....	27

Acknowledgements

This study was written with the support of the office of Institutional Research at The Evergreen State College through a Mini-grant to Support the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at Evergreen. I thank Laura Coghlan, director of the office of Institutional Research, for her support. David Marshall, the former director, also helped to invigorate discussions of teaching and learning in connection with assessment and I learned much from him also.

The study is the product not only of my own teaching and experience and reflections on that experience but also of a long series of conversations about assessing complex learning and the scholarship of teaching and learning, dating back for me to 2002. These conversations, through summer faculty institutes and regular gatherings during the academic year, were initiated and led by Emily Lardner and Gillies Malnarich of the Washington Center for Improving Undergraduate Education, and they richly deserve my gratitude. Those conversations have included varying groups of Evergreen faculty but foremost regular participants include Ernestine Kimbro, Helena Meyer-Knapp, Susan Preciso and Joli Sandoz. These faculty and others as well have enriched my own thinking about and practice of teaching.

A second thank-you goes to Susan Preciso for her warm intellectual engagement as a colleague in “Work and the Human Condition.” Faculty seminars with Susan, along with Martin Kane, Mark Harrison and Sarah Ryan were indispensable as well as enjoyable for their own sakes. I value the support my colleagues provide me as well as the challenges they set to my thoughts. Both deepen my teaching practice and reflection on that practice.

Finally, I thank the students in “Work and the Human Condition,” whose academic work and progress is partially documented here. Their reflections and voices occupy the core of this paper; their achievements — the achievements of all my students — are the mainspring of my professional gratification.

Summary

In the summer of 2002 I participated in a transcript review project, during which I read about two dozen transcripts. This experience convinced me of the great value of student self-evaluations in the transcript. Since that time I have developed several practices aimed to help students to write transcript self-evaluations, and I have hardened my insistence on their inclusion in the transcript.

What motivated me to conduct this study was the question of how my practices for supporting students in writing their self-evaluations actually help them to write good ones.

In investigating this question I did three things:

- I. I documented my practices aimed at helping students to write their transcript self-evaluations.
- II. I reviewed and assessed the quality of students' transcript self-evaluations;
- III. I looked for connections between my practices in the transcript self-evaluations.

My findings are in summary these. First, my practices influenced but by no means determined the nature and quality of the transcript self-evaluations students wrote. There is evidence to show that the kinds of prompts I gave students led them to address some topics more than others. Second, there is reason to believe that the practice of incorporating regular reflective exercises throughout the program allowed students to develop and hone their reflections on program themes. As their transcript self-evaluations frequently show evidence of depth of reflection, it is reasonable to suppose that those self-evaluations are deeper and more substantive than they otherwise would have been. Third, this study has led me to decide to modify my practices in small but important ways. But on the whole, I have strengthened my confidence in the broad structure of support I provide students. In the future, I hope to further develop the inquiry I have begun here.

I. Documentation of Practices

I conducted this study in connection with the program "Work and the Human Condition," which I discuss below. I then describe the practices I followed with respect

to students' transcript self-evaluations. This is followed by an account of my methods in documenting this study in connection with the program.

The Program: "Work and the Human Condition"

"Work and the Human Condition" was a full year half-time interdisciplinary program during academic year 2004-5. Susan Preciso and I taught this program during fall and winter quarters. For the last part of fall quarter, Mark Harrison joined the program to facilitate students' performing dramatic enactments of work activities. In spring quarter, I left the program and Martin Kane joined Susan. My study focuses on my own direct work with students during fall and winter quarters, though I consider spring quarter through the work of students who continued in the program all year.

"Work and the Human Condition" focused on the place of work in human life through study of philosophy, history and literature in the Western tradition. We followed a historical sequence: in fall, we focused on the ancient world but leapt ahead to the mercantilist era by the end of the quarter; in winter, we concentrated on the 19th century and more specifically on industrialization; spring quarter, Susan and Martin studied the 20th century and in addition students produced a photographic profile of a contemporary working person. Students were required to write a transcript self-evaluation.

Support Provided for Transcript Self-Evaluations.

For each of fall and winter quarters, Susan and I supported students in writing their self-evaluations in three ways. The first and main way was to give students regular opportunities to engage in sustained reflection on program themes. Susan and I created three in-class activities each quarter to do this: one on the first day, one at mid-quarter, and one during the tenth week.

The first class activities prompted students to write down their initial thoughts about work. The fall and winter quarter activities differed from each other. In fall quarter, we asked students to write on several questions: First, what are your concepts about work? Second, where did your ideas about work come from? Third, what question about work do you want to answer in this program? This exercise, together with the viewing of a film, group discussions, and group presentations, took about two hours. For winter

quarter, we had students write their ideas about work on a first-class survey, which served several other purposes as well (e.g., gathering contact information for a class roster). This was followed by a brief discussion among students in small groups. The whole exercise took approximately an hour in total.

The mid-quarter activities prompted students to reflect on their studies thus far, to revisit their first-class writing and consider whether, and if so, how, their thinking had changed or developed. Again, the fall and winter activities were different. The fall quarter exercise was structured as a workshop, in which students began by reviewing their own work and notes and writing reflectively on it, then entered into discussions with others, first in a small group and then in a larger one. This exercise took about an hour and a half. In winter, we had students write answers to a series of questions on a “Mid-Quarter Reflection” handout. After working individually on this, students joined into small groups to share their current ideas about work. This exercise took about an hour.

The tenth week activities were workshops on writing self-evaluations. They directed students to summarize their final paper and their current thoughts about work and the human condition, and to compare these to their initial thoughts at the beginning of the quarter. The winter self-evaluation workshop specifically directed students to reflect on their mid-quarter reflection. The workshops directed students to write a series of sentences: the first, about the student’s thoughts about work and the human condition at the beginning of the quarter; the second, on the student’s current thoughts about it; the third, about a significant moment in the program; the fourth, about a significant idea or theme in the program. The winter quarter workshop prompted students to write a fifth sentence, about what the student wants to do next. (This question was mentioned but not emphasized in the fall quarter workshop.) The workshop suggested that students write a quick draft of their self-evaluations around those four (or five) sentences. Mentioned but not emphasized in each workshop was the question of whether the student had built upon any skills or abilities in the program. The fall quarter workshop took an hour and 40 minutes, while the winter workshop took about an hour.

Overall, the goal of these activities was to create the space within the program for students to reflect on their own thoughts about work and the human condition, on their own work within the program, and on other significant ideas or themes in the

program. We emphasized the continuity of those reflections over the course of each quarter, by asking students to connect their earlier thoughts with their present ones. We balanced solitary reflective writing with publicizing those thoughts in group discussions. The total class time dedicated to these reflective exercises during fall quarter was approximately five hours; during winter quarter, three hours.

See Appendix A for the handouts on these activities. Note that there was no handout for the first class activity for fall quarter.

The second way I supported student self-evaluations each quarter was by distributing a handout of guidelines on self-evaluations, which included the program description. In this handout I articulate the context within which their transcript self-evaluation will appear — i.e., in juxtaposition with the program description and the faculty evaluation — and the distinctive role of the student self-evaluation within the transcript. That role, I say in the handout, is twofold: First, the self-evaluation can give details about the nature and significance of the student's own work; second, the self-evaluation can explain the place of this program within the student's overall education. (See Appendix B for these guidelines.)

Third, for those students in my seminar group, I provided specific advice at evaluation conferences for revising their self-evaluations. The amount of advice and subsequent revision by students varied. For some students I read two drafts of their transcript self-evaluation before they submitted a final version, while for others I did not see any draft other than the final transcript copy.

The Study

For this study, I originally obtained consent from 39 students whose self-evaluations I would examine. (See Appendix C for the Informed Consent form.) This group included all students for whom I was the seminar leader during either fall or winter quarters. It also included several students who were enrolled in the program for the full year, even though I was not their seminar leader. From this group, one student was dropped from the study due to failure to complete program work, one was dropped because the student decided not to continue in the program through spring quarter, and four were dropped because they had not submitted self-evaluations in time for inclusion

in this study. The final sample, then, consisted of 33 students: 11 who were enrolled for fall quarter only; 5 enrolled for winter quarter only; 10 enrolled for fall and winter quarters; and 7 enrolled for the full year.

The work I examined of each student consisted of the students' transcript self-evaluations, as well as some or all of various reflective writings and draft self-evaluations. Specifically, I studied the following documents drawn from students' portfolios: (a) the fall quarter first-day reflective writing; (b) the fall mid-quarter reflective workshop and writing; (c) the fall end-of-quarter self-evaluation workshop notes; (d) the fall quarter draft or in-house self-evaluation; (e) the winter quarter first-day survey; (f) the winter mid-quarter reflective exercise; (g) the winter end-of-quarter self-evaluation workshop notes; (h) the winter quarter draft or in-house evaluation. Some students wrote several drafts of their self-evaluations before submitting a transcript copy. Not all students enrolled in the program for a quarter completed all of the reflective exercises for that quarter, due to late registration or absences.

Also included in this study are students' responses to a survey I distributed at the end of winter quarter regarding my support for their self-evaluations.

II. Assessment of Transcript Self-Evaluations

My two goals in this study were first, to assess the quality of student self-evaluations, and second, to assess the connections between the ways I supported students in writing their self-evaluations and the self-evaluations they actually wrote. In this section I discuss both of these together.

My original criteria for assessing student self-evaluations were the following four:

1. accuracy with respect to students' achievements,
2. demonstration of students' achievements relevant to the Five Foci and the Six Expectations,
3. representation of students' distinctive voices and experiences, and
4. public presentability as transcript documents.

1. Accuracy

I now see this to be much more problematic than I originally thought. It is of course possible for me to judge the accuracy of such claims as, "I now know that ... ,"

where the ellipse is filled in with some characterization of, say, a philosopher's view. Similarly, I can judge the accuracy of students' claims about skills acquired (in the case of writing skills, the self-evaluation itself often supports or falsifies a student's claim). But accuracy in this sense is not interesting to me in connection with student's self-evaluations: I already assess students' knowledge and skills directly from their assignments and report my judgments in my evaluations of them.

But there is another sense of accuracy particularly relevant for students' self-evaluations; call it "internal accuracy." Internal accuracy concerns the significance the student finds in the whole of their studies in the program. A student's self-evaluation writes is *internally accurate* to the extent that it faithfully represents something of the student's interior mental landscape. What a student writes in a self-evaluation about *that* can be accurate to a greater or lesser degree, but I have no access to it beyond the student's report.

Through reading and re-reading the self-evaluations for this project, I have developed a re-enlivened awareness of the extent to which they are generative of and not merely reports of students' educations. Students do not simply point their inner eye at a static mental landscape of "what they learned" and report it, in the manner of a security camera pointed at the counter of a convenience store. The inner eye is active; by looking, the inner eye changes the mental landscape it passes over. Iris Murdoch writes of this in connection with moral reflection:

Moral tasks are characteristically endless not only because 'within', as it were, a given concept our efforts are imperfect, but also because as we move and as we look our concepts themselves are changing.

And later:

We do not simply, through being rational and knowing ordinary language, 'know' the meaning of all necessary moral words. We may have to learn the meaning; and since we are human historical individuals the movement of understanding is onward into increasing privacy, in the direction of the ideal limit¹

While Murdoch is specifically concerned with moral concepts and judgments, I find it useful to understand students' efforts in writing their self-evaluations as following a similar process. There is an ongoing dialogue between *seeing something to be*

¹ Iris Murdoch, "The Idea of Perfection," in *The Sovereignty of Good* (London: Routledge, 1971), 27; 28.

significant and expressing that significance. The really interesting question of accuracy in students' self-evaluations has to do with how far a student follows this dialogue. As Murdoch says of "moral tasks," a student's task of articulating complex learning is endless, for the object changes and develops with each new description of it.

Students cannot of course pursue this "endless task" through many repetitions; time is limited and they have vacation plans. But they can pursue this task through a few stages, and the best ones do. Here are several examples of what I mean.

Student X: Fall and Winter Quarters

In fall quarter's first day reflective writing exercise, X recorded these preliminary thoughts about work:

Work sucks, work is money — money is life. Work is anything that sustains you.

X's mid-quarter reflection focused on the texts almost entirely and had little to say about work — only the following:

I think the difference in the way that the Bible and the Odyssey treat this theme reflects the Greek culture to be something that has it all figured out, and the biblical characters as people seeking truth, evidence, answers. Arendt thinks that the value of work depends on why you do it.

At the end of the quarter, X wrote the following in the self-evaluation workshop:

I have come to believe that work is what gives us the opportunity to exercise our human capacities of creativity (sometimes), to move our bodies, and to exercise our knowledge. ... When I started this class I thought that work was about making a buck, now I know that it is crucial to evolving my soul.

In the draft self-evaluation for the quarter, X has arrived at a tentative idea about work.

X wrote, more formally:

I began this quarter thinking about work as an individual burden. After reading *The Human Condition*, *After Virtue*, and *Robinson Crusoe*, I am starting to see that work is not individual, but universal, and that it is not necessarily a burden, but is actually essential to living a virtuous life.

In winter quarter's first-day reflection, X echoes this position and expands on its personal significance:

Work is (still) what we do to make a living, or to make our lives interesting. I am starting to believe that work is also our primary means for living a virtuous life. In my life, its primary place is in the future, as I try to decide what to do with my life. Work is what creates society, because if no one worked, people would not be able to (1) live and (2) have anything to relate about.

By mid-quarter, X is struggling to deepen this idea of work as an arena for virtue by considering its social context:

I still believe that work is (1) what we do to make a living and (2) our primary means of living a virtuous life, but now I am puzzling over what makes work virtuous, and who gets to do that kind of work.

In the draft self-evaluation for both quarters, X has arrived at the following:

I started this program thinking of work as an individual burden, and I leave this program knowing that work can be understood this way, but it is more productive to look at it as a means of living a virtuous life, the glue that holds society together, and as a historical and sociological benchmark.

This latter idea, new to X in winter quarter, is better articulated in the transcript self-evaluation:

I started this program thinking of work as an individual burden, and I leave this program knowing that work can be understood this way, but it is more productive to look at it as a means of living a virtuous life, the glue that holds society together, and as a gauge for evaluating past and present social conditions.

In this series of reflections, X proceeds from an offhand comment through an increasingly careful series of statements, at each stage further honing the conception of work. What is striking about the statement in the transcript self-evaluation is both the great care and detail it exhibits and its unfinished quality. X has replaced the metaphor of a “historical and sociological benchmark” with a somewhat more precise one of a “gauge for evaluating past and present social conditions”; the reader still wants to know how work can function this way. While X does not directly answer this question, there is a clue in the self-evaluation’s final paragraph:

My most profound change this quarter has been my revelation about the injustices in our society that are supported by the institutions of privilege. This change in perspective has been troubling, especially as I have seen how it [presumably, privilege] manifests in our society through discrepancies in work opportunities.

So, while the reader is left to draw the inferences, they are nevertheless clear: since privilege is manifested in the way work opportunities are distributed, looking at who does what work is a good way to measure social injustice.

X took advantage of all opportunities for reflection throughout both fall and winter quarters. Each stage of reflection shows clear advance over the previous stage. At the end, the transcript self-evaluation exhibits a well-honed account of the nature and value of work. That account is not complete; further reflection would result in further progress, as is always the case. This fact, nevertheless, does not undermine X's achievements.

Student AI: Winter Quarter

In response to the first class survey's prompt to write "about your current thoughts and attitudes about work," AI wrote the following:

Work is a mixed blessing. It feels like a necessity for a productive mind and a healthy sense of being, yet, it feels degrading and cyclical in other respects ... dare I say a form of wage slavery or a single cog within a system created to control and repress?

In responding to the question about how initial attitudes had developed in the mid-quarter reflection, AI wrote that "I feel that although my attitude has not changed much, I believe it has become broader." In connecting current attitudes to the mid-quarter paper, AI expanded on the above:

I feel as though work is not only a means of sustaining ones lifestyle but it contributes to our overall personality/being. This aspect of work seems really creepy and somewhat intentionally constructed to keep people tired, apolitical and constantly consuming.

In the self-evaluation workshop, AI wrote the following two sentences about initial and current thoughts about work:

I started the quarter with an unrefined position on work. I have refined my position and strengthened my opinions about work/built on the overall ideology of work.

This was the basis for the opening of AI's draft self-evaluation:

I entered this course with a passionate, yet unrefined position regarding work. Through the duration of this class, my ideas and stance on work and its impact on the human condition have become strengthened and developed.

In response to that sentence at the conference, I asked what that “unrefined position” was and suggested that a substantive account of it would be worth including instead. AI responded by writing in the transcript self-evaluation:

I entered this course with a passionate, yet uneven position regarding work, viewing work as a mixed bag of both bad and good. Through the duration of this class, my ideas and stance on work and its impact on the human condition have become strengthened and developed and it has become easier to acknowledge how stifling and oppressive work has been and continues to be for so much of the world. ... As a full time production worker, I found the course to address the frustrations and grievances I’ve had with respect to working and I came to identify the significant correlations to my work like with many of the concepts and philosophies studied this quarter, most notably Marx’s Theory of Alienation and Labor Theory of Value.

This sequence doesn’t show a change in attitude towards work but only different descriptions of that attitude. On this score what interests me is that in the self-evaluation workshop notes and the draft self-evaluation, AI had removed the substance of that attitude; the revisions in the final version are really a matter of restoring the content present in earlier reflections.

The sequence does, however, demonstrate a deepening of that attitude, insofar as AI is able to make more sense of it by appeal to new theoretical material in the transcript self-evaluation.

Student B: Fall Quarter

Not all students take up the opportunity to revisit and deepen their reflections. B, a transfer student new to Evergreen, wrote in the first day’s reflection:

I don’t know what counts as work because not all jobs are physically demanding, which is what I usually associate work with. Maybe work is anything that demands some kind of challenge from you, and hopefully someone pays you for it.

B did not record any reflections from the mid-quarter exercise or from the self-evaluation workshop for the portfolio. But in the draft self-evaluation, B wrote:

One of the points we discussed in the class that stands out for me is that a person’s work in life isn’t limited to mere employment.

The tentative view of the first day has developed somehow, but the new view is only characterized negatively. So, in the evaluation conference, I advised B to “say

more”; what did B come to understand about work that goes beyond employment? B responded by *removing* the above sentence from the transcript self-evaluation. A clue to why B did so is found in this paragraph from the transcript self-evaluation:

For me, a significant moment of clarity came this quarter when we started working with Mark Harrison. After we began creating the vignettes and became physically involved in acting out what we discussed, it made much more sense. This suggests to me that work isn't in fact meaningful until you start actually *doing* something. Maybe the reason why the concept of work is so difficult to puzzle out is because it is about action and creation; we may never be able to completely explain in words why we do it. Perhaps one just has to experience it to truly understand it.

B does not give an account of work but instead gives an account of why no account of work is given. I think B *could* say more about work than this. Still, the view B articulates is itself substantial and thoughtful. The only reservation I have about it is that it lends itself to putting an artificial end to the “endless task” of reflection.

Future Work

The above three examples illustrate differing levels of engagement in the process of seeking “internal accuracy.” At this stage in my research I lack confidence in any method of measuring internal accuracy across the whole of my sample of self-evaluations. The best I can do for now is what I have already done above — to read the self-evaluations and preliminary documents with care, interpret them as intelligently as I can, and offer my best judgments about them.

2. Five Foci and Six Expectations

While most if not all of these are relevant to my sample of self-evaluations, to address more than a few would be impractical. I made the obvious choice to address Expectation One, “Articulate and assume responsibility for your own work,” for clearly, students are articulating their own achievements in their self-evaluations.

The above concept of internal accuracy is closely related to Expectation One. Students who take up the task of reflecting carefully and in a sustained manner on their developing conceptions thereby substantially meet this Expectation. But there are other ways to meet it as well. In looking for them, I undertook a rough content analysis of self-evaluations.

To develop my content analysis, I reviewed the students' self-evaluations without any fixed filter in my thoughts regarding what content would prove to be relevant. Given that I had established some specific topics for students to address in the self-evaluation workshops, I began my readings with an eye for those topics. At the same time, though, I retained an open awareness for recurring topics and noted these as I went. Through multiple readings, I developed a clearer sense of the patterns of content.

Through doing this work, I discovered content relevant to Expectation Six: "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." This is the most complex of the Expectations; the evidence I found is relevant only to parts of it, namely:

- Reflection on the personal significance of learning
- Reflection on the social significance of learning
- Demonstration of synthesis of learning

For the full results of the content analysis, please see Appendix D. Below I summarize the results relevant to Expectation One and the above components of Expectation Six.

Expectation One: "Articulate and assume responsibility for your own work."

What most gratified me about the self-evaluations that students wrote was that they described the substantive content of the program. In their self-evaluations, students wrote about Arendt's distinction among labor, work, and action; they wrote about Rodgers' account of how the work ethic changed during the age of industrialization; they wrote about virtue and work; they wrote about MacIntyre's conception of a practice; they wrote about Marx and alienated labor; they wrote about the sociality of work. Students wrote about these ideas as descriptions of our texts; they presented them in the course of an overview of the program; they related them to their own work in the program; they connected them to their own lives; they deployed them to support claims of social justice. No students did all of these, and a few did not discuss the program's content at all. But nearly all did at least one and most did several. The content of the program was typically at the core of the self-evaluation.

This is not surprising. This is what my practices encourage students to write about, this is what other college documents encourage students to write about, and I assume it is what other faculty encourage students to write about. The content of the program is at the forefront of students' thoughts when they come to write their self-evaluations in any case.

But how does the academic content of this program fit into the six Expectations? It has no obvious home, but Expectation One is the best fit: By explaining the content of the program, students are articulating the content of what they learned. By taking Expectation One in this way I am committing an interpretive act, albeit a mild one. But it is an interpretation I wholly accept and would urge on my colleagues. The "work" of our students mentioned in Expectation One is their academic studies; to articulate that work is to explain what they have learned; and to explain what they have learned, they must actually describe and not merely name their knowledge.

The relevant content areas that I found in students' self-evaluations fall into two categories: descriptions of program content in isolation, and descriptions of program content in explicit relation to the student. I specifically counted only *descriptions* of content and set aside the mere naming of texts (e.g., "I read Aristotle") or topics (e.g., "I learned about the industrial revolution"). The table below summarizes the content areas in each category and shows how many self-evaluations contained each type.

Table 1: Types of Program Content in Self-Evaluations

Program Content in Isolation		Program Content in Relation to Student	
descriptions of program ideas or themes	21	descriptions of student's current ideas about work	18
descriptions of ideas from texts	23	descriptions of significant moments for the student	8
		descriptions of examples of student's work	17
At least one of the above	28	At least one of the above	26
At least one description of any type: 31			

The above table shows that some program content or other was described in the vast majority of self-evaluations. But it doesn't say anything about *how much* program content is present. You may wonder how many self-evaluations contained both discussions of program themes as well as of ideas from texts; how many related the program content to the student in more than one way; how many contained several or many of all of these different content elements. The following table provides this information. While not an ideal measure of depth of content (a self-evaluation may go into considerable detail about just one element), it provides some indication of how much program content is in the self-evaluation.

Table 2: Extent of Content within Self-Evaluation

(N) – number of elements	<u># of Areas of Pgm Content in Isolation</u>	<u># of Areas of Pgm Content in Relation to Student</u>	<u># of Areas of Pgm Content, All Types</u>
4 or 5	--	--	7
3	--	3	12
2	16	11	8
1	12	12	4

It is noteworthy that nearly half — 16 of 33 — describe *both* program themes and ideas from texts, and that a smaller but comparable number (14) related program content to the student in two or three ways. Looking at all ways of incorporating content checked for in the analysis, we see that 19 describe three or more. This provides some support for the conclusion that most of the students discussed program content extensively in their self-evaluations.

Further support for this view can be found by examining several examples, to see how individual students actually incorporated the program content into their self-evaluations.

Student L: Fall Quarter

L's self-evaluation illustrates the limitations of the last table. What stands out here is not the range of content elements described but the sustained attention to one particular element of content: the exploration of a central theme from *The Human Condition*:

Arendt critiques the Industrial Revolution. At the beginning of the revolution there was a promise that the Industrial Revolution would create less labor for human beings and create more leisure time, but for some reason that never happened. Maybe it's because humans don't know what to do with all of their leisure time? Maybe it's because humans now have to work two jobs to make enough money to live on. Whatever the reason, in today's society we are no longer doing what Arendt considers to be work or action. We are a laboring society, and soon we won't even be doing labor. The machines will be doing all of our labor for us. It is my belief that in order for humans to be truly free we must consider living in a world where everyone has the opportunity to participate in all three activities: work, labor and action.

L here show some depth of thought about Arendt achieved by the end of the quarter. The language is common and easily accessible. The interpretation of Arendt is not precise. Still, this passage demonstrates serious engagement with and significant understanding of a difficult work of philosophy.

Student AK: Fall and Winter Quarters

Other students described the knowledge they gained in the program in more general but still useful terms. AK is concerned with providing an overview and does not provide details that might obscure the big picture:

We continued to study literature from the industrial revolution and in my journal and seminar papers I developed an outlook of the people working and living in this time. They were caught up in the whirlwind of a die-hard work ethic with little time to try and understand how the type of work they did and the rewards they received were changing and how this change affected the value of their work.

Reflecting on this I began to view work in society today and make some connections. I have found that what we receive for our work does not always fulfill certain human needs. This deficiency often leads us to seek fulfillment from other sources, which can cause negative results. I wrote my final essay about how the meaningfulness of our work is at stake when we allow money to be the main overall motivation to work.

AK tells us neither what "certain human needs" work fails to fulfill nor what "negative results" follow. But the reader can intelligently interpolate, and there is something to be said for omitting that level of detail in the interests of presenting the big picture concisely.

Student S: Full Year

Here is an example of an even more compressed yet rich treatment of program content:

In the winter quarter we focused our reading on the nineteenth century. Rodgers' book on the work ethic in America was a good representation of how and why we, as Americans, have absorbed and institutionalized the culture of work that we carry on to this day. Our readings also gave me a frame of reference to better understand the changes that have occurred in work and the human condition because of the industrial revolution. I was given a different framework to view these changes with the readings by Karl Marx. The most compelling idea of the quarter for me was Marx and Arendt's discussion of the exchange market and how we, as workers, have moved from being creators of a product to being mere instruments in the process of making the product.

S's account of winter quarter is highly selective and telescopic, and it is clear that S made these choices with care. S's descriptions are accurate and given the brevity of the paragraph, remarkably detailed.

Expectation Six, in part: Reflection on the Personal and Social Significance of Learning

My content analysis also revealed notable frequency of students' descriptions of the significance of what they learned. I checked separately for descriptions of personal significance and descriptions of social significance. More students discussed the personal significance of what they learned than discussed its social significance (20 as opposed to 14). But 22 of the 33 discussed at least one of these. Not surprisingly, none of these 22 lacked for discussion of program content, either alone or in relation to the students themselves; after all, it is hard to discuss the significance of something without describing it first.

Implicit in the above figures is the fact that 12 of the self-evaluations treated both personal and social significance. Political engagement is often, even characteristically, also personal, so this is not a surprising finding. Here is an example of a student who found both personal and social significance in the program.

Student H: Fall Quarter

My most significant moment in this program came during a video of a speech by Allan Johnson, who visited TESC in November, 2004. He spoke about people who disclaim any relation to or responsibility for

slavery because “their family never owned any slaves.” This was very meaningful to me because my family never owned any slaves. I knew in my heart, though, that this attitude was a cop-out. I didn’t know how to express my feeling of indirect participation in slavery. After listening to Mr. Johnson, I realized that because our entire society was built from the Industrial Revolution which was itself fueled and financed by the antebellum slave trade, every one of us is an ‘accessory-after-the-fact’ of slavery.

... Now I realize that ... work is not only what people do, it is how they define themselves. They define themselves by the work they do based on the history of their practice, the satisfaction they get out of doing their job well, and sometimes from the money and power that their position confers upon them. I am also more aware of how our society has been and continues to be built on the foundation laid by the hardest physical laborers who provide for the basic survival necessities in order to relieve the rest of us of those tasks, so we may engage in more emotionally, socially, financially rewarding pursuits. They deserve our gratitude and better pay.

In this way, H closes the self-evaluation. What I find striking is the movement shown in these two paragraphs. The first presents H’s personal attitude about and response to slavery, while the second shifts focus from H to the “hardest physical laborers.” H chose to end the *self*-evaluation with a statement about *others*. This is a sure sign of grasping the social significance of learning.

Expectation Six, in part: Demonstration of Synthesis of Learning.

In developing my content analysis, I decided to track those self-evaluations that made explicit connections between distinct topics within the program, as well as those that made explicit connections between this program and other studies. Only 10 self-evaluations made explicit within-program connections, and only 4 made across-program connections. Further, only 11 made at least one kind of connection.

One reason for the low frequency of connections is likely that it takes more space, or greater care, or both, to articulate connections than simply to describe a single topic. Students well versed in their material can make connections succinctly in a self-evaluation, if they exercise care; students with a more tentative grasp can do this only with great difficulty. It is notable that of the 11 self-evaluations that made some kind of explicit connection, 8 were written by multi-quarter students, and 2 of the other 3 were written by seniors near graduation.

Students frequently synthesize material without articulating explicit connections. The connections among disparate topics are left implicit or are entirely subsumed under a single main point. Students often focus on articulating this main idea fully yet concisely in the self-evaluation, yet behind this concise statement is a great deal of writing and thought that is not included, nor needs to be included, in the transcript itself.

One might even go further and claim that *merely* making connections is a mark of incomplete synthesis; synthesis is only complete once the elements the synthesis comprises are fully subsumed. I would not go that far. Still, I recognize that the content analysis as it stands is highly incomplete with respect to synthesis; it needs revision or augmentation by other evidence. Here I augment it with examples from self-evaluations.

Student AD: Full Year

AD's self-evaluation first summarizes the program's work for the whole year and then describes main ideas from the four program texts with the greatest impact on AD. One of these, Arendt's *The Human Condition*, was set above the other three. AD does not explain how these texts are connected, even though the reader is likely to suspect — and rightly so — that AD perceives a common thread among them. AD expands upon the impact of Arendt in the self-evaluation's third paragraph, quoted here in full:

As I move forward with my life and schooling I will not forget what Arendt said about man in isolation: we human beings are nothing by ourselves and our actions are not ours; it takes other people to judge and give our life meaning, a sense of worth. But along with that plurality there is pain because of our differing values and beliefs. Happiness and sorrow go hand in hand.

The careful selection of *one* idea drawn from all of the resources the whole program, followed by AD's own inference from that idea, makes for a succinct and striking statement of achievement. The reader not only knows something of the substance of what AD learned in the program; the reader also knows something of AD's powers of selection and judgment.

Behind that single idea is a great deal of work. In the interim self-evaluation for winter quarter, AD wrote:

I have realized that through our Puritan work ethic "work hard and you will be rewarded" and the invention of the machine we have pushed ourselves away from our connections to the earth. And today, with the push for technology, the computer and its gadgets, we are losing the human

connections we have with each other. What Arendt says is true, man in isolation is nothing and our actions are not ours; it takes other people to judge and give our life and actions meaning. But the drawback to plurality is often times conflict because it is impossible to always share the same beliefs and values.

So, AD originally positioned Arendt's point as a direct riposte to a disturbing trend in contemporary society. And *this* trend is itself rooted both in industrialization and the work ethic. AD's discussion of the work ethic above draws upon previous reflections, for example, the mid-quarter reflection:

Rodger's book has put a lot of light on a part of my life. I learned from his book and others I've read on my own just how deep the Christian religion has affected our country & our work ethic. This fascinates me because religion played a huge role in my early life.

AD is drawing upon a variety of sources — personal experience and outside reading as well as the Rodgers text — to develop a more sophisticated view about the work ethic. There is similar evidence regarding AD's views about industrialization, but I trust the point is clear: While the *work of synthesizing* isn't done in the transcript self-evaluation, that self-evaluation is itself the *product of synthesis* work AD has already done in the reflections.

Student V: Fall and Winter Quarters

Some students do reveal more of the inner workings of synthesis. V presents a single main point yet also draws upon both philosophy and history to support it. Yet even here, the connections are not quite explicit.

I realized that we don't really work in a vacuum — unless we are terribly unhappy in our work. After reading Hannah Arendt, I was in complete agreement with her theory that we are all social beings and we need others to survive (in our public, private, and social lives). While the "work ethic" has existed for centuries, it has evolved greatly. The Puritans believed that men had their calling and that this is what kept them at their labors — it was God's will. I have always felt that my work ethic was to do the best I could and be a loyal employee. Well, that is true. However, it still points up the reality that I need my co-workers, employers, family, and friends to keep me content in my labors.

V has successfully and explicitly drawn upon Arendt. In discussing the Puritans, V includes more details than AD did to support the main point of the self-evaluation. But V does not ground this discussion explicitly in program texts such as Rodgers' *The Work Ethic in Industrial America*. Nor was it necessary for V to do so. V's purpose is to

articulate current thinking not prove understanding of texts; that V's current thinking is essentially grounded in those texts does not entail that this fact be made evident in the self-evaluation. V's account flows smoothly as it stands.

3. Distinctive Voice

Like the criteria of accuracy, no readily extractable measure of distinctive voice suggested itself to me. In fact, the similarity between accuracy — taken in the sense of internal accuracy — and distinctive voice strikes me as more than accidental. Both require the careful attention to one's own ideas in tandem with careful efforts to articulate them. In future work I would do well to explore this connection further.

The way to judge distinctiveness of voice is just to listen to the students. I recommend that the reader review the previous selections from students' transcript self-evaluations with an ear to their voice. In addition, below are two further self-evaluations that may as well be bookends for this criterion — they mark the end-points of the range of distinctiveness in my sample.

Student M: Fall and Winter Quarters

M begins with an epigraph drawn from Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South*:

“Oh,” said Mr. Hale, sighing, “your Union in itself would be beautiful, glorious, -it would be Christianity itself — if it were but for an end which affected the good of all, instead of that merely of one class as opposed to another.”

M's point in using this epigraph becomes clear in the second paragraph of the self-evaluation, quoted here in full:

I was prepared to examine all the possibilities work could offer a human life. Reading Arendt gave me a new way of understanding human activity by distinguishing between “work” and “labor.” While studying the history of western culture, my eyes opened to a reality I had never wanted to see ... a reality in which people intentionally hurt others in order to get their way, and even more people unknowingly hurt their fellow humans. I had thought this was a relatively new occurrence, but it seems it has always been this way. I argue that it is not by stepping on each other, but by appreciating each other that humanity can reach its greatest potential.

M does not attempt to be comprehensive. Instead, M chose to describe the central, personal *impact* of the program. But this paragraph does so with simplicity, clarity, and power.

Student AH: Full Year

AH wrote a three-paragraph self-evaluation. The first discusses writing, the second, reading, and the third summarizes AH’s work as follows:

While working through the program I challenged my ability to complete all of the work required. I feel that I fulfilled every single requirement, worked to the best of my abilities and pushed myself to accomplish as much as I could. The program was challenging with a variety of requirements, but I learn almost as much about the philosophy, history, and literature as I was offered. The program projects were demanding with emphasis on completion. ... With completion of the program I also learned skills like analysis of lectures while taking notes, communicating orally and with writing, being understanding of group members, and being self-aware of my surroundings.

What I find striking in this self-evaluation is that there is no attempt to articulate what AH *learned* as opposed to what AH *did*. This student did indeed work hard in the program. But to what end? How did this student change, develop, grow? Without some answers to such questions, I can form no judgment about *who this student is*.

This strongly suggests to me that distinctive voice relies indispensably on the substance of what is said; while style may not be identical with substance, without real substance there cannot be real style. This is another avenue to explore in future work along these lines.

4. Presentability

I assessed quality of writing in self-evaluations in two ways. First, I assessed technical correctness, and second, I assessed accessibility to a general audience.

To assess technical correctness, I tallied the number of typographical errors, spelling errors and errors of punctuation, and I separately tallied the number of grammatical errors and errors of usage. Below is a summary of the results.

Table 3: Technical Errors in Self-Evaluations

	Typo’s; punctuation or spelling errors	Errors of grammar or usage	Any of these errors
--	--	----------------------------	---------------------

No errors	13	19	8
One error	8	7	8
Two or three errors	9	4	11
Four or more errors	3	3	6

With respect to these technical features, then, 8 self-evaluations are polished, while 6 are sloppy, and the rest range in between.

This is not a happy finding. Students are making too many errors in writing their portions of their own transcripts. I suspect that students are hurrying through the revision process, so that they can be done with the quarter and begin their break.

I have two ideas about how to address this problem. The practical idea is to assign each student a “buddy” within the program for evaluation proofing and revising. Ideally, buddies would have their evaluation conferences back-to-back, so that they could proof each other’s self-evaluation and revise them together.

The impractical idea (at least, impractical by myself) is to change the culture of evaluation week, so that students generally expect to be doing substantial work that week and not just having their evaluation conferences.

Presentability is not solely a matter of technical polish. A second criterion is accessibility to a general audience. This makes sense particularly with respect to self-evaluations that address program content extensively. To assess accessibility, I focused on use and explanation of technical philosophical terminology. Students in this program grappled with some difficult philosophical texts that defined ordinary words in specialized senses. Did students use these terms in their self-evaluations, and if so, did they explain what they meant in context?

I focused on the following terms, drawn from central philosophical texts:

- labor, work, action, *vita activa*, artifice (Arendt, *The Human Condition*, fall and winter quarter text)
- practice (MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, fall quarter text)
- alienated labor (Marx, selections, winter quarter text)

There were some complications in assessing the self-evaluations with respect to their use and account of these terms. First, some students used them only in the sense that they state it as a central concept in a text or in the program (e.g., “We learned about ... three activities: labor, work and action”) while others deployed these terms to

give further explanations (e.g., "...I am ready to pursue what MacIntyre calls a *practice*..."). It made sense to me to call the first kind a *statement* of the term and the second kind a *use* of the term.

Another complication is that since Arendt's central terms for activity (labor, work and action) are so very common, and since the theme of the program require use of such terms in other contexts, the question sometimes arises whether the student means "work" or "labor" in Arendt's specialized sense or only in the ordinary non-technical sense. I resolved these questions by making my best judgments from context.

I found out some interesting things. One was that a couple of students didn't use the terms but instead described the specific concepts they were intended to capture. Another was that a couple of students used several terms and then defined some — those most central to the points they wanted to convey — but not others.

Here is a summary of my findings:

Table 4: Philosophical Terminology in Self-Evaluations

<u>Occurrence and definition of philosophical terminology</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Used terms, and defined all terms used	2
Used terms, and defined some	2
Did not state terms but described underlying concept	2
Did not state or define terms	16
Stated terms and did not define	6
Used terms and did not define	5

With respect to this measure, the least accessible self-evaluations were the six that used the terms but did not define them. The two that both used and defined the terms were by contrast highly accessible. Arguably, the most accessible of all were the sixteen that avoided the terms altogether! Yet I would not encourage students to aim for accessibility at the cost of substance. My judgment is reflected in the order in which the above categories are presented, with the heavy line marking where I would divide the accessible from the inaccessible (with respect to terminology). While the top four categories all indicate accessibility, those that actually grappled with the difficult philosophical terminology are preferable to those that don't. Moreover, were I to rank these evaluations for their overall quality, in some cases I would place those below the

heavy line as better than some which avoid the use of the terms altogether. In other words, accessibility to a general audience is an important but not an absolute value.

Accessibility is more than defining technical terms, of course. For future work I will contemplate what other measures might be helpful in this respect.

More Troublesome Self-Evaluations

A faculty member at Evergreen can't avoid having students who submit self-evaluations that reflect poorly on the students. What to do with those self-evaluations?

My own policy is to require transcript self-evaluations from all students who complete the program. (In "Work and the Human Condition," I did have two students who were compelled by external factors to leave the program partway through fall quarter; these students earned partial credit and I did not require transcript self-evaluations from them.) The effect of my policy is that some students submit for their transcripts self-evaluations that are problematic in more serious ways than any I have discussed already.

Some self-evaluations are just written poorly. Here is a selection from the self-evaluation of a fall quarter student:

The literature studies with the applied philosophy gives me a more in depth understanding to the human conditional response overall. While I am quick to solve, this program challenged my own ideas that the artifice world has the ability to shelter mans' awareness of the natural world when it comes to the higher good. [*sic*]

Here is a selection from a student in the program for both fall and winter quarters:

Making the decision to persist in grasping the subject material I have become more conscious in formulating and expressing ideas. While it might be easy for me to believe that I understand something and almost as easy to think that someone understands me, this is not always the case. I am more engaged in the issues which has lead me to be more open to their relevancy. The actuality of reaching a mutual understanding between another and myself is a real possibility. [*sic*]

Another kind of problem showed up in just one self-evaluation I read. Here is a quote from it, written by a student in the program only for winter quarter:

My new opinion is that as long as I make enough money to have most of the typical American amenities, i.e. house, car, food on the table, etc. then I should be doing something that I truly passion. Something in which happiness stems from rather than something that brings me the means of buying my happiness elsewhere. Understanding this brought somewhat of

an enlightenment to me. I believe that I can actually be happy in life now without excess money as long as my work is something that I want to do.
[sic]

This paragraph, like the rest of the self-evaluation, makes no connections to specific texts or themes. To the contrary, it appears that this student did not learn much from the social and historical material we studied, for otherwise I would expect this paragraph to contain some critical reflection on ideas such as “typical American amenities” and “excess money,” not to mention the privilege of choosing one’s line of work.

Once I am presented with a draft self-evaluation at the end of the quarter, my role is to offer constructive criticism, and this I did for all of the above selections at the students’ conferences. It is up to the student, though, to decide what to do with that criticism. When the student tells me that this is the final version, I accept it as such.

The question arises here though: If a self-evaluation is deeply problematic, why allow it into the transcript? If a student proves incapable after several revisions of producing a self-evaluation that meets some minimum standards, why continue to insist on a transcript self-evaluation from that student?

This is a hard question. Some faculty may decide not to insist on a transcript self-evaluation from such a student. But I did and will continue to do so for the following reasons. First, each of the above problematic paragraphs is, unfortunately, a good representation of the achievements and the writing abilities of their authors. While they may not flatter their authors, flattery is not the purpose of the transcript. If the transcript is to be an honest record of achievement, then it is important to include self-evaluations that honestly reflect their authors, even for students with mediocre achievements. *What students say about their own achievements has more impact than what I say about them.* In my evaluations of the authors of the first two selections, I said that they needed to improve their writing. The above paragraphs show why.

Second, I consider what the cumulative effect might be on a student whom I give a pass on submitting a transcript self-evaluation. How seriously will this student take the process of reflection involved in writing a self-evaluation in the future? A student submits a poorly written self-evaluation for my program. Suppose I don’t send it on to the transcript. This student may well take the task of writing the next self-evaluation less seriously, upon remembering that I let the student off the hook for the poorly written one. Even if this student subsequently makes significant improvements in writing ability,

that improvement will not be reflected in the transcript. But now suppose I do send the poorly written one in to the transcript. The student would later take evaluation writing more seriously, upon reviewing the actual transcript self-evaluation with a more educated eye and a greater level of dedication to academic work.

This leads naturally to the third and decisive reason, which is that including a student's self-evaluation in the transcript is a manifest way of taking the student's work seriously. Many students don't take their own work seriously; perhaps I can teach them to do so by my example, and as a result they will improve their self-evaluations over the course of their career at Evergreen. But whether or not they take that lesson, I see it as a gesture of respect I owe my students independent of its consequences.

Summary of Assessment

Above I have developed some measures for assessing the self-evaluations with respect to two of the four qualities I aimed to assess. I developed no measure for accuracy, taken here as *internal accuracy* or distinctiveness of student voice: my intuition is that it is wrong — ethically — to do so. In fact, I am hesitant to hold up the other measures presented here as a firm basis for assessing the overall quality of these self-evaluations. It is better, I think, to point to the quotations from the self-evaluations and allow readers to draw their own conclusions.

Nevertheless, I will hazard a few observations about quality and decline the opportunity to aggregate them.

First, I found self-evaluations with a single main point to be (other things being equal) better than those with several unconnected points.

Second, I found those self-evaluations that attempted to articulate program content extensively to be better than those that did not.

Third, I found those self-evaluations that were technically polished to be better than those with numerous errors.

Fourth, I found those that expressed the significance of their studies to be better than those that did not.

III. Connections Between Practices and Self-Evaluations

In this section I discuss three sources of evidence regarding the connections between my practices and students' transcript self-evaluations: first, evidence from the content analysis; second, further evidence from particular students' transcript self-evaluations; third, the results of a survey of students regarding my practices.

Evidence from the Content Analysis

In addition to the features of the content analysis discussed earlier, I also checked to see whether students included statements that address the prompts I gave them in the self-evaluation workshops, around which I invited them to write the first draft of their self-evaluations. For fall quarter I prompted students to write four sentences. For winter, I used those same four prompts but added a fifth. The table below lists those prompts used, along with the occurrence of corresponding content in the self-evaluations. (Note that winter's fifth prompt was present on the fall quarter worksheet; it was not, however, emphasized as a specific prompt.)

Table 5: Connections between Workshop Prompts and Self-Evaluations

SE workshop: "Write a sentence about..."	fall only (N=11)	winter & fall/winter (N=15)
...your initial thoughts about work	4	7
...your current thoughts about work	5	9
...a significant moment for you	5	2
...a significant idea/theme	6	10
(W only) ...interest in future study	2	9

The content analysis suggests some but not an absolute correlation between self-evaluations and the prompts I gave students. Simply put, some students included their responses to those prompts while others didn't.

With such a small sample size, I cannot have much confidence in the variations from fall to winter transcript self-evaluations. Some variations are suggestive, however. That nearly half of the fall quarter students discussed a significant moment while only two of fifteen did in winter raises a question. One possible reason is that while fall quarter contained several dramatic activities, culminating in Mark Harrison's work with students in staging dramatic re-enactments of work scenes, winter quarter tended to

focus more on ideas. The major public activity winter quarter was the student presentations, which students typically did not discuss as a significant “moment.”

Another variation that stands out is that nine of fifteen students in winter described their future plans for study, while only two of eleven did in fall. To the extent that there is evidence here that my prompts made a difference in how students wrote their self-evaluations, this is it.

A less pronounced variation is from the six fall quarter students who describe a significant program theme to the ten winter quarter students who do. If this is significant at all, it may have to do with the fact that during winter quarter, we dealt with one major theme — the shift in attitudes about and patterns of work resulting from industrialization in the 19th century — that captured the imagination of many students.

But the above comments are speculative. The sample isn't large enough to support such generalizations.

There is a further and broader kind of evidence that can be drawn from the content analysis. The first-day and mid-quarter reflective exercises emphasized students' initial and developing conceptions of work as well as of related program themes; the self-evaluation workshops similarly emphasized program content. In 31 of the 33 self-evaluations I studied, there was some description of program content, and 19 self-evaluations described program content in at least three different ways (see page 14). Compare this with another common feature of self-evaluations across Evergreen, skill development. In my self-evaluation workshops, I mentioned that students may want to discuss skills that they developed, but this was not emphasized in the workshop (see Appendix A, pages 34 and 38). In my content analysis I found that significantly fewer self-evaluations, only 14, described a skill or ability the student developed. This suggests that in their self-evaluations students will tend to emphasize what I emphasize in my prompts. Since I ask the students regularly to reflect on what of substance they have learned, they do.

Evidence from Particular Students' Work

The clearest evidence comes from tracking the recorded thoughts of students from their written responses to several of the reflective activities, through their draft self-evaluations, to their transcript self-evaluation. I have already discussed several

examples in other contexts (see the discussion of X on page 7, of AI on page 9, and of B on page 10; see also the discussion of AD on page 18). All of these show some response to previous prompts, including the first day writing, mid-quarter reflection, self-evaluation workshop, and comments on the draft self-evaluation.

Other evidence, though, is present in the transcript self-evaluations themselves. Several students incorporated a discussion of one of the reflective exercises into their self-evaluations.

One student, W, enrolled in both fall and winter, expressed a central personal conflict with respect to the program. W showed how central this was by writing the following:

I found it perplexing that I spent so much energy arguing in essays and discussions that our culture is facing a “work crisis,” yet work means so much to me despite these beliefs. I examined this issue of hypocrisy and personal struggle in my first class survey and my mid-quarter survey, as well as in my position paper.

Another student, F, in the program for fall quarter only, wrote:

In an in-class workshop focused on tying together the content of the first five weeks, I experienced the importance of action for myself. As we shared our ideas, I found that I was able to tie more together and to develop my ideas further than I had on my own. This was a successful learning experience for me, and brought me to value the work that can be done in groups when the members are willing to tolerate the chaos of individual ideas for a while and let connections materialize.

Both of these selections show that not only can the reflective exercises help students to articulate learning that has already happened but also they can be occasions for learning in and of themselves.

Results of Survey of Students

At the end of winter quarter, I gave all students a survey regarding the support I provided for their self-evaluations. Of the 26 surveys I distributed, I received 10 responses. In the survey I asked five questions. The first four asked about each of the four kinds of support I provided during winter quarter — namely, the first-class survey, the mid-quarter reflection, the self-evaluation workshop, and the handout on guidelines for self-evaluations — whether and how this helped them to write their self-evaluation. In the fifth question I asked whether they made use of other resources on campus (e.g.,

academic advising or the writing center). For a complete grid of all responses to the survey, see Appendix D. Below is a summary of the responses.

All students indicated that the first-class survey was helpful. (“Helpful” here collapses distinctions ranging from “very helpful” to “a bit helpful.”) Nine of the 10 students said that the mid-quarter reflection was helpful, while one found it hard to “reflect on demand.” The self-evaluation workshop was judged to be helpful for 8 students; one student had already done the self-evaluation, while another had difficulty sharing reflections in groups. All of the students said that the handout on guidelines were helpful. Regarding other campus resources, two students said they used the Writing Center, and one other student planned to do so in the future; three students consulted the Evergreen website for guidelines and examples of self-evaluations.

Some common elements emerged in the survey responses. With respect to the first-class survey, 7 students found it helpful in recording their original views. One student put that “it was a record of my original thoughts on the topics we covered.” In addition, 4 students indicated that it was helpful in getting them to form their views; one of them wrote that it was helpful “in generating an accurate reflection of where I was upon entering the class.” The responses of 3 students fit into both categories.

About the mid-quarter reflection, 5 students mentioned that it marked how their views were developing or changing: One said, “This paper showed me how far I had come from the start.” Three students indicated that it allowed them to make connections among different parts of the program; for example, a student wrote, “It was helpful to compare essays and concerns that emerged from readings and activities.” One student, though, “found it difficult to reflect in the 5th week” and suggested that “perhaps students could be encouraged to write about any significant moments as they experience them.”

The self-evaluation workshop helped 6 students in focusing their attention on important details of the program; one student put it this way: “it prompted memories of previous events from workshops, group activities, lectures, seminars, films and guest speakers.” Two students did not find the workshop helpful — one student commented “I was so uncomfortable” being prompted “to share my ideas with others,” while the other wrote, “I think this might have helped me if I had not already written mine.”

Regarding the handout, 3 students found it helpful in selecting details. According to one of them, “This proved handy to have during the eval process to refer to when I

thought I might be forgetting something and to generally use for editing help.” But another said, it “kinda helped, but I used the evergreen website for help mainly.”

Summary of Connections

The students responding to the surveys overwhelmingly reported that the support I provided was helpful, and in just the ways I had anticipated them to be. Further, there are substantial traces of my prompts in students’ self-evaluations. The high frequency of description of program content correlates with the emphasis on program content in the prompts. Moreover, a substantial number of the self-evaluations attend to program content at some length.

It is just as striking to me, though, how variegated the sample is. While my prompts are reflected frequently, there are no detailed correlations to be found between prompt and self-evaluations. The reflective exercises and workshops laid out, as it were, a smorgasbord of topics that the students might address; the students themselves chose which topics made most sense to them. This is entirely appropriate.

Conclusions

Overall, this study confirmed my belief in the power and value of transcript self-evaluations. While varying widely, the self-evaluations as a whole demonstrate the distinctive, individual education that each student received in the program.

The study also confirmed my belief in the importance of faculty providing support for their students in writing their self-evaluations. It is clear that the students benefited from the reflective exercises and the self-evaluation workshop: they said so, and the evidence from their transcripts as well as their preliminary reflective writings supports that claim. Moreover, the time commitment for the program was minimal. We dedicated five hours total in the fall, and three hours total in the winter; over the two quarters, five percent of contact time. Since this time was dedicated not merely to reflecting on learning already acquired but *produced substantive learning* itself, it was a wise investment.

One thing I didn’t have in mind at the outset was the importance of a single main idea in a self-evaluation. Because programs are complicated and multifaceted, I

suppose I believed that self-evaluations must also be. But a self-evaluation can foreground one main lesson that the student takes away from the program and relegate more complex matter to a supporting role.

I plan, therefore, to revise my self-evaluation workshop to take account of this finding. That workshop already channels a multitude of student's thoughts, program themes, and significant moments into a single statement of each. The next step is to prompt students to decide which one of these is the main idea they want to convey to their readers. Many of the students already made this choice without my asking them to. If I ask, perhaps more students will, and those who would do so already will do so with greater confidence and awareness.

Another revision to my practice is to try out a buddy system for proofing and revising self-evaluations, so that fewer technical errors will show up in the transcript.

The conclusions I have reached here are necessarily tentative. This study was based on one program, with a fairly small sample of 33 transcript self-evaluations. It would be worth doing this again for my future programs, to see whether my findings change. It would also be worthwhile to investigate other faculty's practices together with their students' self-evaluations, or to examine the results of their own investigations.

However tentative they are, though, my conclusions can be summarized as follows. Generally and for the most part:

- If the faculty require students to write transcript self-evaluations, they will write them;
- If the faculty take transcript self-evaluations seriously, students will too;
- If the faculty give students the opportunity to reflect on their work, students will take advantage of this opportunity;
- If the faculty continually call students' attention to the content of the program in their reflections, students will write about program content in their self-evaluations.
- If the faculty do all these things, students will write transcript self-evaluations that are powerful and enlightening, and moreover they will learn significantly in doing so.

Appendix A: Handouts for Reflective Exercises for Fall and Winter Quarters

Work and the Human Condition
18 October 2004

Almost Mid-Quarter Concepts Workshop

To date, you have read and worked with the following texts:

Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chapter 1)
Carr, *What Is History?* (Chapter 1-2)
Homer, *The Odyssey*
MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (Chapter 10)
The Bible (Genesis and Exodus)

I. In class writing (25 minutes):

Look over your reading journal, response papers and class notes.

Jot down major themes from each reading

Note common themes:

- How are they treated in a similar way?
- Why are they important to each writer/text?
- How do the texts treat the themes differently?
- Consider how the *Odyssey* and the *Bible* in particular treat these themes. What does this imply about their respective cultures?
- What does each convey about the value of work?
- What does each convey about “the human condition”?

II. Discussion (30 minutes)

Work in groups of 3 or 4; appoint a note taker to record your conclusions.

Talk about the major themes from each reading, beginning from your in-class

writing. Do you all see the same themes in each?

What themes do the readings have in common? Where do they differ? See whether you can all agree to 2-3 interesting points of commonality and 2-3 points of difference among the texts.

How has the combination of readings changed the way you understand each?

For example, after reading MacIntyre, Genesis, and Exodus—do you understand something about *The Odyssey* that you wouldn’t otherwise consider?

30 minutes

III. Wider Discussion (30 minutes)

Each small group should join with 2 others to share their thinking. In this larger group, talk about emerging/developing ideas and concepts of work and the human condition.

Note: You should each take some notes, as this may shape your work on the integrative essay (due Nov.1).

Self Evaluation Workshop

Work and the Human Condition, Fall 2004

Estimated Time: 1 hour, 40 minutes

Form a group of about four people, and find a place where you can both talk together and write individually — you will be working alone and with your group throughout this workshop.

- I. (Alone) Write a paragraph that summarizes your final integrative essay. Describe your thesis and the general way you support it. (10 minutes)
- II. (Group) Take turns reading your summaries to each other. Discuss similarities among your projects; discuss the differences among them too. (20 minutes)
- III. (Alone) Review your in-class writing from the first day, in which you wrote about your question about work. Compare this to the paragraph you just wrote. Write out an answer to each of the following questions in a single sentence: (10 minutes)
 1. How has your question changed from the first writing?
 2. What does this suggest about how your thinking about work has changed?
- IV. (Alone) Reflect more generally, though perhaps drawing upon your experience in writing your final essay. Write a paragraph about your current thinking about work and its place within human life. Let your own ideas be your guide, but you may want to draw upon any of the texts, films, or activities we've engaged in this quarter. (10 minutes)
- V. (Alone) If you have them, briefly review your class notes, reading notes, workshop notes, and papers. If you don't, close your eyes and direct your mind to remember what is memorable to you from the quarter. (20 minutes)
 1. Make a list of at least 5 "significant moments" for you in this program. They could be moments in seminar, workshops or small group work, lectures, performances, or other program activities; they could also be moments when you were alone, reading or writing or thinking about our program themes or texts. Give a short name to each significant moment, and next to it, write a brief reason why it was significant. Choose **one** significant moment that stands out.
 2. Make a list of some ideas or themes we studied in this program that you found significant. The list doesn't have to be exhaustive. Next to each, briefly say why you found it significant. Choose **one** significant idea or theme that stands out.
 3. Finally, condense and summarize all of the above work in four sentences.
 - a. a sentence about **where you started** this quarter in thinking about work & the human condition
 - b. a sentence about **where you are now** in that thinking
 - c. a sentence about **your significant moment**
 - d. a sentence about **the idea or theme that was significant to you**
- VI. (Group) Take turns reading your four sentences to each other. After each person reads, the listeners should respond. Listeners: If you don't understand what the speaker meant in a sentence, ask for clarification. If you see a striking and fruitful connection between something the speaker said and something else we've studied this quarter, mention it to the speaker. Speakers: Take notes on the questions and connections that your listeners raise — these may provide good clues for how to further shape your account of your achievements this quarter. (15 minutes)
- VII. (Alone) Write one or two paragraphs as a quick first draft of your self-evaluation. As a start, try framing it around your four sentences that you presented to your group — tell the story of where you started, where you ended, and what you did that got you there (moment and idea). Once you've done that, here are some other things you may discuss: What skills or abilities did you build upon in the course of doing this work? What is the next step for you, in your education or otherwise? (15 minutes)

First Class Survey

Work and the Human Condition: Winter 2005

To help us teach the program as well as to ground your own ideas, please complete this survey. Information will be kept confidential. But we will make a class roster with phone numbers and email addresses, so do let us know what contact information it is OK for us to list.

Name _____

Phone Number(s) _____ OK to list on roster? _____

Email _____ OK to list on roster? _____

Why did you decide to take this program?

What other courses, programs or topics have you studied, and/or what other experience have you had, that will be relevant for this program?

If you have a health condition or disability that requires accommodations in order for you to participate effectively in the program, please let us know.

Write a paragraph (at least a few sentences) about your current thoughts and attitudes about work — what is it, what place does it have in your life, how does it fit in with the broader society?

Mid-Quarter Reflection

Work and the Human Condition: Winter 2005

Name _____

Review the paragraph you wrote at the beginning of the quarter about your thoughts and attitudes about work. In what ways have your thoughts and attitudes **developed** (which could mean in your case: *changed*, or *become problematic*, or *deepened*) since then?

Name one program reading or activity that has played a role in this development, and say how it has done so.

You no longer have your draft essay in your hands. But recollect what you wrote there. Write down, in a single sentence, the main position, question, or problem that motivated your essay.

How is that main thing related to the development of your thoughts or attitudes about work?

What is the topic of your historical research project? In what way do you think this research project can help you further develop your thoughts and attitudes about work?

Is there anything you want to tell Stephen or Susan about the way in which the quarter is progressing for you — things that are going well or things that are going poorly — that may help us structure the rest of the quarter?

Self Evaluation Workshop
 Work and the Human Condition, Winter 2005
 Estimated Time: 1 hour

Form a group of three or four people (no bigger), and find a place where you can both talk together and write individually.

- I. Write a brief paragraph about your final integrative essay, summarizing your thesis and how you supported it, and also about your research into your primary source. Were there interesting connections between them? (5 minutes)

- II. Now write a short paragraph about your current thinking and attitudes about work and its place within human life. Draw upon any of your studies this quarter that seem relevant. (5 minutes)

- III. Review your first class writing as well as your mid-quarter reflection. Compare these to the paragraph you just wrote. Answer each of the following questions in a single sentence: (5 minutes)
 1. Have your thoughts and attitudes about work *changed* or *developed*, or have they been *reaffirmed* over the quarter? In what ways?
 2. What are you interested in doing next – personally, academically, professionally, politically – as a result of your current thoughts and attitudes about work?

- IV. If you have them, briefly review your class notes, reading notes, workshop notes, and papers. If you don't, close your eyes and recollect memorable occurrences from the quarter. (15 minutes)
 1. Make a list of several (aim for 3-5) "significant moments" for you in this program – moments in class, or moments out of class that concerned our studies this quarter. Note why it was important. Choose **one** significant moment that stands out.
 2. Make a list of ideas or themes we studied in this program that you found significant, and note briefly why it was significant. Choose **one** that stands out.
 3. Finally, condense and summarize all of the above work in five sentences.
 - a. a sentence about **where you started** this quarter in thinking about work & the human condition
 - b. a sentence about **where you are now** in that thinking
 - c. a sentence about **your significant moment**
 - d. a sentence about **the idea or theme that was significant to you**
 - e. a sentence about **what you are now interested in doing next**

Now, convene with your group.

- V. Take turns reading your five sentences to each other. After each person reads, the listeners should respond. Listeners: If you don't understand what the speaker meant in a sentence, ask for clarification. If you see a striking and fruitful connection between something the speaker said and something else we've studied this quarter, mention it to the speaker. Speakers: Take notes on the questions and connections that your listeners raise — these may provide good clues for how to further shape your account of your achievements this quarter. (15 minutes)

Return to working alone for the last part.

- VI. Write one or two paragraphs as a quick first draft of your self-evaluation. As a start, try framing it around your four sentences that you presented to your group — tell the story of where you started, where you ended, and what you did that got you there (moment and idea). Once you've done that, here are some other things you may discuss: Did you develop any skills or abilities in the course your work for this program? Refer to the lavender card: Did you develop in any way in this program toward meeting any of the "Six Expectations"? (15 minutes)

Appendix B: Handouts on Guidelines for Writing Self-Evaluations

Self-Evaluations: Some Guidelines

Work and the Human Condition, Fall Quarter 2004

If you're leaving the program, you're required to write a self-evaluation for your transcript; if you're continuing, you'll write an interim self-evaluation. Either way, these guidelines should help you frame your self-evaluation. Also, consult information available from Academic Advising, on the web at <http://www.evergreen.edu/advising/evals-and-transcripts-links.htm>.

Your official transcript will consist of three documents:

1. The Program Description (below)
2. The Faculty Evaluation
3. Your Self-Evaluation

These three documents should complement but not repeat each other. The description describes the work that you did; the faculty evaluation is your seminar leader's general account of the nature and quality of that work. What, then, is the role of your self-evaluation?

There are two things your self-evaluation should do, and you alone are the authority about both. The first thing is a matter of detail. Your self-evaluation should provide some specifics about the nature of your work and what in your judgment you gained from doing it. This is your "report from inside," your own judgment of the meaning and purpose of your own work; you are the only person who is qualified to speak to that subject. So, speak to it!

The second thing is more general. Your self-evaluation should speak to the significance of this program within the context of your overall education: "How does this program fit into the whole?" You could address this by: relating the program to others you have taken, are taking, or plan to take; discussing how it has helped you to progress towards meeting one or more of the Expectations of an Evergreen graduate; relating it to future careers goals. You need not do *all* of these. The point, though, is to set this course in the context of *your own unique* education.

The challenge is to do these two things *concisely*. Think about people who may someday read your self-evaluation. They will have your *whole transcript* to review. They *will* be interested in reading your own words, but they will want to "get it" quick. So, say what you have to say briefly. A good rule of thumb: *Aim* for a self-evaluation that is as long as the description below. *Allow* yourself to write one that is twice as long, but no more than that.

Program Description:

The goal of this half-time program was to develop students' understanding of the nature and place of work in human life. In fall quarter we studied some foundational texts from ancient western culture, including Homer's *Odyssey*; Genesis, Exodus, and the Book of Job from the Bible; selections from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*; and Epictetus' *Handbook*. Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* pushed us to examine an early modern conception of work. We also studied Arendt's *The Human Condition*, Carr's *What Is History?* and MacIntyre's *After Virtue* to establish a broad historical context. Students attended regular lectures on philosophy, history and literature, engaged in several conceptual workshops, and participated in two book seminars a week. Students maintained a reading journal, wrote brief summaries for each seminar and composed two integrative essays. Students also participated in several dramatic enactments of activities of work. Award of credit and evaluation is based on attendance, participation in program activities, and review of student portfolio containing all written work and program notes.

Credit Equivalencies:

- 3: World Literature: Work and Society
- 3: Philosophy: Virtue and the Active Life
- 2: World History: Western Culture

Self-Evaluations: Some Guidelines

Work and the Human Condition, Winter Quarter 2005

If you're leaving the program, you're required to write a self-evaluation for your transcript; if you're continuing, you'll write an interim self-evaluation. Either way, these guidelines should help you frame your self-evaluation. Also, consult information available from Academic Advising, on the web at <http://www.evergreen.edu/advising/evals-and-transcripts-links.htm>.

Your official transcript will consist of three documents:

1. The Program Description (below)
2. The Faculty Evaluation
3. Your Self-Evaluation

These three documents should complement but not repeat each other. The description describes the work that you did; the faculty evaluation is your seminar leader's general account of the nature and quality of that work. What, then, is the role of your self-evaluation?

There are two things your self-evaluation should do, and you alone are the authority about both. The first thing is a matter of detail. Your self-evaluation should provide some specifics about the nature of your work and what in your judgment you gained from doing it. This is your "report from inside," your own judgment of the meaning and purpose of your own work; you are the only person who is qualified to speak to that subject. So, speak to it!

The second thing is more general. Your self-evaluation should speak to the significance of this program within the context of your overall education: "How does this program fit into the whole?" You could address this by: relating the program to others you have taken, are taking, or plan to take; discussing how it has helped you to progress towards meeting one or more of the Expectations of an Evergreen graduate; relating it to future careers goals. You need not do *all* of these. The point, though, is to set this course in the context of *your own unique* education.

The challenge is to do these two things *concisely*. Think about people who may someday read your self-evaluation. They will have your *whole transcript* to review. They *will* be interested in reading your own words, but they will want to "get it" quick. So, say what you have to say briefly. A good rule of thumb: *Aim* for a self-evaluation that is as long as the description below. *Allow* yourself to write one that is twice as long, but no more than that.

Program Description (winter Only):

The goal of this half-time program was to develop students' understanding of the nature and place of work in human life. In winter quarter we studied the impact of industrialization in the 19th century on conceptions of work and on modes of working. We read Arendt's *The Human Condition*, Paine's *Common Sense*, Rodger's *The Work Ethic In Industrial America*, Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto* and selections from Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Gaskell's *North and South*, Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, Thoreau's *Walden*, Chekhov's *Uncle Vanya*, and selections from Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*. Students attended lectures on philosophy, history and literature, engaged in conceptual workshops, and participated in book seminars. Students wrote weekly brief summaries and submitted both a draft and a final version of a reflective essay. Students also worked in groups to prepare annotated bibliographies on topics of their own choice, and gave a presentation based on their research to the class. Award of credit and evaluation is based on attendance, participation in program activities and review of student portfolio containing all written work and research notes.

Credit Equivalencies:

- 3: World Literature: Work in the Nineteenth Century
- 3: Philosophy: Justice, Society, and Work
- 2: History: The Industrial Revolution

Program Description (fall and winter):

The goal of this half-time program was to develop students' understanding of the nature and place of work in human life. In fall quarter we studied some foundational texts from ancient western culture, including Homer's *Odyssey*; Genesis, Exodus, and the Book of Job from the Bible; selections from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*; and Epictetus' *Handbook*. Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* pushed us to examine an early modern conception of work. We also studied Arendt's *The Human Condition*, Carr's *What Is History?* and MacIntyre's *After Virtue* to establish a broad historical context. Students attended regular lectures on philosophy, history and literature, engaged in several conceptual workshops, and participated in two book seminars a week. Students maintained a reading journal, wrote brief summaries for each seminar and composed two integrative essays. Students also participated in several dramatic enactments of activities of work.

In winter quarter we focused on industrialization in the 19th century and examined its impact on conceptions of work and on modes of working. We continued our study of Arendt, and also read Paine's *Common Sense*, Rodger's *The Work Ethic In Industrial America*, Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto* and selections from Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Gaskell's *North and South*, Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, Thoreau's *Walden*, Chekhov's *Uncle Vanya*, and selections from Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*. Students attended regular lectures on philosophy, history and literature, engaged in several conceptual workshops, and participated in two book seminars a week. Students wrote weekly brief summaries and submitted both a draft and a final version of a reflective essay. Students also worked in groups to prepare annotated bibliographies on topics of their own choice, and gave a presentation based on their research to the class.

Award of credit and evaluation is based on attendance, participation in program activities, and review of student portfolio containing all written work and program notes.

Credit Equivalencies:

- 3: World Literature: Work and Society
- 3: Philosophy: Virtue and the Active Life
- 2: World History: Western Culture
- 3: World Literature: Work in the Nineteenth Century
- 3: Philosophy: Justice, Society, and Work
- 2: History: The Industrial Revolution

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent

Faculty Support of Student Transcript Self-Evaluations

Researcher: Stephen L. Beck, Adjunct Faculty (Philosophy)

Researcher’s Statement:

Purpose and Benefits: This study will examine the researcher’s methods of supporting students in writing their transcript self-evaluations within “Work and the Human Condition” in relation to the actual transcript self-evaluations that students write. Students’ transcript self-evaluations will be assessed with reference to accuracy, distinctiveness of student voice, relevance to Evergreen’s Five Foci and Six Expectations, and presentability as transcript documents. The purpose of the research is to evaluate the researcher’s own methods and practices of supporting students in writing their self-evaluations, so as to indicate ways to modify and improve those methods and practices.

Procedures: If you choose to be a part of this study, I will retain a copy from your portfolio of informal writing you have done reflecting on your developing understanding of program themes, in response to faculty prompts.

Specifically, I will retain copies of:

- your writing about your question on the first day of class;
- your writing done during the mid-term workshop;
- your writing done during the self-evaluation workshop at the penultimate class meeting;
- your draft self-evaluation.

I will also use your final self-evaluation for the quarter. If you are continuing in the program, this will be an interim self-evaluation; I will use your informal writing in subsequent quarters as well as your further self-evaluations, including your eventual transcript self-evaluation. If you are leaving the program, your final self-evaluation for the quarter will be your transcript self-evaluation. The use I will make of these documents will be limited to my own analysis of their content and selective anonymous quotation in a public document.

Risk/Stress/Discomfort: There should be no undue risk or stress as a result of participation. A final report will be presented and made public, through web or paper publication and public presentation. While no identifying information will be included in this report, it is conceivable that readers or listeners may recognize your voice in some quotations from your writing.

Other Information: Copies of all informal writings and notes about them will kept for three years. All identifying information from student participants will be removed from the report and appendices. Only unidentifiable raw data will be made available to faculty and staff at The Evergreen State College. The final report of this research will be a public document. Your participation will likewise be anonymous and unidentifiable in this public report, and any excerpts of work quoted therein will also be made anonymously.

Signature of Researcher

Date

Participant’s Statement:

The study described above has been explained to me. I voluntarily consent to participate in this activity. I have had an opportunity to ask questions. I understand that future questions I may have about the research or about my rights as a subject will be answered by the researcher.

Signature of Participant

Date

Appendix D: Content Analysis

I analyzed the content of self-evaluations by identifying the presence of the following in the self-evaluation.

- 1a. discussion of the student’s reasons for taking the program
- 1b. discussion of the student’s previous academic or work experience
- 1c. description of the student’s initial thoughts about work
- 2. description of the student’s current thoughts about work
- 3. description of a significant moment in the program
- 4. description of a significant idea or theme from the program
- 5a. description of an idea from a program text
- 5b. (If (5a) is absent) mention of a program text
- 6. description of an example of the student’s work
- 7. discussion of a skill or ability the student gained or improved upon
- 8. discussion of the personal significance of what the student learned
- 9. discussion of the social significance of what the student learned
- 10. the making of a connection between different areas of study within the program
- 11. the making of a connection between this program and past studies
- 12a. description of the student’s future plans for study or work
- 12b. (If (12a) is absent), general reference to future study or work

Here is the frequency of the above content in the self-evaluations.

Quarter (N)	1: Beginnings			2	3	4	5: Texts		6	7	8	9	10	11	12: Future				
	a: Reason for taking	b: previous experience	c: initial ideas of work	At least 1 of a-c	Current ideas of work	Significant moment	Significant theme	Describes a text	Mentions a text	Total (a+b) Example of own work	Skill/ability	Personal significance	Social significance	Connections w/in program	Connections to other programs	a: Describes future plans	b: Refers to future	Total (a+b)	
F (11)	2	3	4	7	7	5	6	7	2	9	3	4	7	3	1	0	2	6	8
W (5)	3	1	3	5	2	1	3	4	0	4	3	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	5
F/W (10)	4	0	4	7	7	1	7	6	2	8	6	4	8	7	5	1	6	2	8
F/W/S (7)	4	1	1	4	2	1	5	6	1	7	5	4	2	2	2	2	3	0	3
Total (33)	13	5	12	23	18	8	21	23	5	28	17	14	20	14	10	4	14	10	24

Appendix E: Grid of Responses to Survey on Self Evaluation Support

Question: During winter quarter, you were provided the following prompts for reflection on your work. Please indicate which of these, if any, were helpful to you *specifically in writing your self-evaluation*, and comment briefly on why.

	1 st Class Survey	Mid-Quarter Reflection	Self-Evaluation Workshop	Handout: "Self-Evaluations: Some Guidelines"	Did you use any other resources?
M	Valuable reference tool later in the quarter	I found it difficult to reflect in the 5 th week... perhaps students could be encouraged to write about any significant moments as they experience them.	It's really hard for me to share my ideas with others!! It wasn't helpful simply because I was so uncomfortable.	Always extremely helpful. By breaking the eval task down to smaller questions, it made it easier for me to see what was important to t me and how I could write about it.	I attended a writing center workshop, and it is helpful for more general information.
Additional Comment: I think what made your self-eval support truly successful was not only your experience in writing them, but the fact that we were given questions that directly related to our class. If only all faculty did that... it really reinforces our learning.					
O	The first class survey was helpful to me because it was a record of my original thoughts on the topics we covered during the quarter.	The reflection paper helped me pull together all the curriculum that I had accumulated over one and a half quarters. This was also an opportunity to incorporate my thoughts from others classes that I have recently attended.	I found that this workshop was useful to find out what others thought a self-evaluation should contain. This was also an opportunity to discuss what a completed self-evaluation should look like.	The guidelines were useful for me when I was working on my evaluation at home. By referring to this constantly to this guide I found it easier to stick to my evaluation theme.	I Found it helpful to lookup and download examples and guidelines for the self-evaluation. I will utilize the Writing Center next time. Everyone that I have talked with has informed me that the Writing Center is well worth the visit.
Q	was good at conceptualizing your initial views before they were reconfigured through additional perspective. Perhaps in Pointing out A part of your self you wish to improve.	A chance to look for connections between class themes and their relation to your preliminary ideas and thoughts you are formulating. In developing a more specific Aim.	A good measure at pointing our what was significant and to place it in context. good at integrating class ideas with your personal perceptions.	good and specific.	Interested reading others self evals to see what <u>interested me</u> .
T	This paper showed me where I was at the start of the class.	This paper showed me how far I had come from the start.	I think this might have helped me if I had not already written mine.	This gave me good ideas on what not to say & what to say.	No.

	1st Class Survey	Mid-Quarter Reflection	Self-Evaluation Workshop	Handout: “Self-Evaluations: Some Guidelines	Did you use any other resources?
V	This was extremely helpful for me because I hadn't really focus on the reasons that I wanted to take the class. It gave me an idea of what I wanted to get out of the experience.	Again, this enabled me to focus on everything I had learned, and to understand some of the reading. It also let me know what I needed to go back and read.	I really, really appreciated this workshop. I always have trouble writing my self-evaluation. I still had a problem, but it helped me focus on some of the information I had actually gleaned from this class.	This was probably the MOST valuable of the self-evaluation work we did. It is something I am keeping in my files for the future.	No, in all honesty I do not have the time to come to campus for anything but my classes. I would love to take advantage of these, but it's all I can do to work, study, and attend class.
X	This survey (specifically the question about “your opinions about work”) was useful because it reminded me of where my thinking was at the beginning of the quarter.	This reflection was also useful (because of the same question) and helped me see where I was at mid-quarter.	These two together helped me write my eval, by “warming up my thinking,” and the input of my classmates helped me see which points that I wanted to make needed more clarification.		I used the writing center to help edit my eval & they also gave me some good pointers as to what made sense and what didn't.
AE	Yes this was helpful. I was able to put down what my current thoughts were regarding the program contents. It got me thinking!	Yes, this was helpful. I was able to track how my thoughts changed in response to what I was learning.	Yes! I was able to organize my thoughts and reflect on what I had learned and what stood out for me.	Yes. I was able to organize my evaluation easier.	
AI	This was helpful with providing a starting point and in generating an accurate reflection of where I was upon entering the class.	This gave direction to how my ideas and opinions were taking shape and developing during the quarter. Very helpful.	Again, very helpful. Broke down the process of evaluation into a formula — provided important guidelines and structure to the evaluation writing process, but it did so in a free form was with emphasis on cherry picking the best of the draft/reflections.	This is a great tool/blueprint for writing evals and I will probably refer to it often for assistance with future evals.	I received further recommendations/ helpful advice from Stephen during our meeting.

	1st Class Survey	Mid-Quarter Reflection	Self-Evaluation Workshop	Handout: “Self-Evaluations: Some Guidelines	Did you use any other resources?
AK	This survey was not very helpful to me because I did not have a clear ideas of what I was going to learn or wanted specifically to get out of the quarter at the time.	It was difficult to answer the first question but I think it is an important one. It was helpful to compare essays and concerns that emerged from readings and activities. In my self-eval this helped me pinpoint <u>one</u> main topic that flowed through most of my work.	I found this workshop was very helpful especially in that it prompted memories of previous events from workshops, group activities, lectures, seminars, films and guest speakers. Once I had these written down I could follow my learning experience more accurately.	This proved handy to have during the eval process to refer to when I thought I might be forgetting something and to generally use for editing help.	I did read the program schedule/description a couple times. It is helpful to have the list of texts available.
AL	both of these were equally helpful in causing me to look at my progress throughout the quarter and reflect on what I had learned.		Mainly helped me to see what questions what I learned presented for the future.	kinda helped, but I used the evergreen website for help mainly.	Not really, no.