

Subject Area Committee Name: PHL

Contact Person:

<i>Name</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
Hannah Love	hannah.love@pcc.edu

Only one assessment report is required this year. Document your plan for this year's assessment report(s) in the first sections of this form. This plan can be consistent with the Multi-Year Plan you have submitted to the LAC, though, this year, because PCC is engaging in a year-long exploration of our core outcomes and general education program, SACs are encouraged to explore/assess other potential outcomes. Complete each section of this form. In some cases, all of the information needed to complete the section may not be available at the time the report is being written. In those cases, include the missing information when submitting the completed report at the end of the year.

- Refer to the help document for guidance in filling-out this report. If this document does not address your question/concern, contact [Chris Brooks](#) to arrange for coaching assistance.
- Please attach all rubrics/assignments/etc. to your report submissions.
- **Subject Line of Email:** Assessment Report Form (or ARF) for <your SAC name> (Example: ARF for MTH)
- **File name:** SACInitials_ARF_2016 (Example: MTH_ARF_2016)
- SACs are encouraged to share this report with their LAC coach for feedback before submitting.
- Make all submissions to learningassessment@pcc.edu.

Due Dates:

- **Planning Sections of LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: November 16th, 2015**
- **Completed LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: June 17th, 2016**

Please Verify This Before Beginning this Report:

This project is not the second stage of the assess/re-assess process (if this is a follow-up, re-assessment project, use the LAC Re-assessment Report Form LDC. Available at: http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/learning-assessment/LDC_Assessment_Templates.html)

1. Outcome

1A. PCC Core Outcome or Exploratory Outcome: Scientific Reasoning (Exploratory Outcome)

1B. Briefly describe the outcome your SAC will be assessing this year.

Our SAC will be assessing Scientific Reasoning. Though it may seem novel for PHL to investigate scientific reasoning as an outcome, at its core this is a particular type of critical thinking. Though a scientific discipline might create a more technical rubric, our definition of Scientific Reasoning includes capacities such as crafting a clear and supportable hypothesis, appropriately using methods of reasoning and evidence to test and support said hypothesis, and identifying a further question for future research.

CHANGE IN PLANS: Although we followed the general approach listed above, it is important to note that we had far fewer sections participating in the project itself.

1C. Briefly describe how this outcome is/might be important/useful to your students.

In a world where scientific findings are increasingly presented as the strongest type of evidence to support a claim, yet where science is also politicized and rejected on ideological grounds, philosophical study is essential. The scientific method itself arises from the history of philosophy, and in all of our courses we cover the problem of induction and the limits of reason. This outcome is important for our students for the following reasons: it provides tools to analyze scientific research from a critical perspective, it encourages students to draw distinctions between legitimate scientific research vs. pseudoscientific claims, and enables scientific literacy skills in a world increasingly filled with and driven by data.

2. Project Description

2A. Assessment Context

Check and complete all the applicable items:

Course based assessment.

Course names and number(s): PHL 191, 195, 201, 212 (the project will also be open to other courses where the instructor incorporates the scientific method into their content even if that course is not one of the four listed).

CHANGE IN PLANS: As noted elsewhere in the report, we had fewer sections participating. We ended up with only 3 sections fully participating (one taught by a full-time instructor, two taught by part-time instructors) as well as selected artifacts from a fourth section (taught by a part-time instructor). All four sections were DL courses.

Expected number of sections offered in the term when the assessment project will be conducted: 17

Number of these sections taught by full-time instructors: 5

Number of these sections taught by part-time instructors: 12

Number of distance learning/hybrid sections: 6

Type of assessment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): Essay/Exam/Written work

Are there course outcomes that align with this aspect of the core outcome being investigated? Yes No

If yes, include the course outcome(s) from the relevant CCOG(s): I say yes and no to the extent that we already incorporate scientific reasoning into existing PHL courses. Yet since this is an exploratory outcome, we do not have clear course outcomes aligned with it.

Common/embedded assignment in all relevant course sections. An embedded assignment is one that is already included as an element in the course as usually taught. Please attach the activity in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

Common – but not embedded - assignment used in all relevant course sections. Please attach the activity in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

Practicum/Clinical work. Please attach the activity/checklist/etc. in an appendix. If this cannot be shared, indicate the type of assessment (e.g., supervisor checklist, interview, essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

External certification exam. Please attach sample questions for the relevant portions of the exam in an appendix (provided that publically revealing this information will not compromise test security). Also, briefly describe how the results of this exam are broken down in a way that leads to nuanced information about the aspect of the core outcome that is being investigated.

- SAC-created, non-course assessment.** Please attach the assessment in an appendix. If the assessment cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):
- Portfolio.** Please attach sample instructions/activities/etc. for the relevant portions of the portfolio submission in an appendix. Briefly describe how the results of this assessment are broken down in a way that leads to nuanced information about the aspect of the core outcome that is being investigated:
- Survey**
- Interview**
- Other.** Please attach the activity/assessment in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, please briefly describe:

In the event publically sharing your assessment documents will compromise future assessments or uses of the assignment, do not attach the actual assignment/document. Instead, please give as much detail about the activity as possible in an appendix.

2B. How will you score/measure/quantify student performance?

- Rubric** (used when student performance is on a continuum - if available, attach as an appendix – if in development - attach to the completed report that is submitted in June)
- Checklist** (used when presence/absence rather than quality is being evaluated - if available, attach as an appendix – if in development - attach to the completed report that is submitted in June)
- Trend Analysis** (often used to understand the ways in which students are, and are not, meeting expectations; trend analysis can complement rubrics and checklist)
- Objective Scoring** (e.g., Scantron scored examinations)
- Other** – briefly describe:

2C. Type of assessment (select one per column)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct Assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative | <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect Assessment |

If you selected 'Indirect Assessment', please share your rationale:

Qualitative Measures: projects that analyze in-depth, non-numerical data via observer impression rather than via quantitative analysis. Generally, qualitative measures are used in exploratory, pilot projects rather than in true assessments of student attainment. Indirect assessments (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.) do not use measures of direct student work output. These types of assessments are also not

able to truly document student attainment.

2D. Check any of the following that were used by your SAC to create or select the assessment/scoring criteria/instruments used in this project:

- Committee or subcommittee of the SAC collaborated in its creation
- Standardized assessment
- Collaboration with external stakeholders (e.g., advisory board, transfer institution/program)
- Theoretical Model (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy)
- Aligned the assessment with standards from a professional body (for example, The American Psychological Association Undergraduate Guidelines, etc.)
- Aligned the benchmark with the Associate's Degree level expectations of the Degree Qualifications Profile
- Aligned the benchmark to within-discipline post-requisite course(s)
- Aligned the benchmark to out-of-discipline post-requisite course(s)
- Other (briefly explain:)

2E. In which quarter will student artifacts (examples of student work) be collected? If student artifacts will be collected in more than one term, check all that apply.

- Fall Winter Spring Other (e.g., if work is collected between terms)

2F. When during the term will it be collected? If student artifacts will be collected more than once in a term, check all that apply.

- Early Mid-term Late n/a

2G. What student group do you want to generalize the results of your assessment to? For example, if you are assessing performance in a course, the student group you want to generalize to is 'all students taking this course.'

All students in the identified courses (PHL 191, 195, 201, 212, and other instructor-dependent sections).

CHANGE IN PLANS: Not all sections of those four courses participated, so generalizing results to all sections of those courses may not be appropriate.

2H. There is no single, recommended assessment strategy. Each SAC is tasked with choosing appropriate methods for their purposes. Which best describes the purpose of this project?

- To measure established outcomes and/or drive programmatic change (proceed to section H below)

To participate in the Multi-State Collaborative for Learning Outcomes Assessment
 Preliminary/Exploratory investigation

If you selected 'Preliminary/Exploratory' (most often a 'pilot study'), briefly describe why you opted to do a pilot study, along with your rationale for selecting your sample of interest (skip section H below). For example: "The SAC intends to add a Cultural Awareness outcome to this course in the upcoming year. It is not currently taught in most sections of this course. 2 full-time faculty and 1 part-time faculty member will field-test 3 different activities/assessments intended to measure student attainment of this proposed course outcome. The 3 will be compared to see which work best."

This is exploratory to the extent that Scientific Reasoning is an exploratory outcome. Assessment work this year will give insight into the formation of this potential outcome, as well as enable testing of a rubric which we can (potentially, if permitted) revise and use in a re-assessment project.

2I. Which will you measure?

 the population (all relevant students – e.g., all students enrolled in all currently offered sections of the course)

 a sample (a subset of students)

If you are using a sample, select all of the following that describe your sample/sampling strategy (refer to the Help Guide for assistance):

 Random Sample (student work selected completely randomly from all relevant students)

 Systematic Sample (student work selected through an arbitrary pattern, e.g., 'start at student 7 on the roster and then select every 5th student following'; repeating this in all relevant course sections)

 Stratified Sample (more complex, consult with an LAC coach if you need assistance)

 Cluster Sample (students are selected randomly from meaningful, naturally occurring groupings (e.g., SES, placement exam scores, etc.))

 Voluntary Response Sample (students submit their work/responses through voluntary submission, e.g., via a survey)

 Opportunity/Convenience Sample (only a few instructors are participating in a project taught via multiple sections, so, only those instructors' students are included)

The last three options in bolded red have a high risk of introducing bias. If your SAC is using one or more of these sample/sampling strategies, please share your rationale: CHANGE IN PLANS: Some instructors did not participate (they felt the rubric would not be appropriate for their class assignments). We ended up with some sections where instructors submitted all artifacts from the section, and others where instructors submitted artifacts they felt best fit the rubric.

2J. Briefly describe the procedure you will use to select your sample (including a description of the procedures used to ensure student and instructor anonymity). For example:

“We chose to use a random sample. We asked our administrative assistant to assist us in this process and she was willing. All instructors teaching course XXX will turn-in all student work to her by the 9th week of Winter Quarter. She will check that instructor and student identifying information has been removed. Our SAC decided we wanted to see our students’ over-all performance with the rubric criteria. Our administrative assistant will code the work for each section so that the scored work can be returned to the instructors (but only she will know which sections belong to which instructor). Once all this is done, I will number the submitted work (e.g., 1-300) and use a random number generator to select 56 samples (which is the sample size given by the Raosoft sample size calculator for 300 pieces of student work). After the work is scored, the administrative assistant will return the student work to individual faculty members. After this, we will set up a face-to-face meeting for all of the SAC to discuss the aggregated results.”

We will use a random sample. Hannah Love, the assessment coordinator, will collect student work, remove identifying information, and code it. She will use a random number generator to select artifacts for assessment.

CHANGE IN PLANS: Because we had fewer sections participating, we used either all artifacts from participating sections or a select group of instructor-chosen artifacts (those which best fit the rubric).

2K. Follow this link to determine how many artifacts (samples of student work) you should include in your assessment: <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html> (see screen shot below). Estimate the size of the group you will be measuring (either your sample or your population size [when you are measuring all relevant students]). Often, this can be based on recent enrollment information (last year, this term, etc.):

If total enrollment is around 425 in the 17 identified sections, the sample size will be 203.

CHANGE IN PLANS: Because fewer sections participated in the project, we ended up scoring a total of 69 artifacts.

Raosoft Sample size calculator

What margin of error can you accept?
5% is a common choice

10 %

The margin of error is the amount of error that you can tolerate. If 90% of respondents answer yes, while 10% answer no, you may be able to tolerate a larger amount of error than if the respondents are split 50-50 or 45-55. **Use 10% and 90% in these boxes.**
Lower margin of error requires a larger sample size.

What confidence level do you need?
Typical choices are 90%, 95%, or 99%

90 %

Confidence level is the amount of uncertainty you can tolerate. Suppose that you have 20 yes-no questions in your survey. With a confidence level of 95%, you would expect that for one of the questions (1 in 20), the percentage of people who answer yes would be more than the margin of error away from the true answer. The true answer is the percentage you would get if you exhaustively interviewed everyone. **Enter the total number of students currently enrolled in all sections of the courses you are assessing here.**
Higher confidence level requires a larger sample size.

What is the population size?
If you don't know, use 20000

105

How many people are there to choose your random sample from? The sample size doesn't have to be much larger than 20,000.

What is the response distribution?
Leave this as 50%

50 %

For each question, what do you expect the results will be? If the sample is skewed highly one way or the other, the population probably is, too. If you don't know, use 50%, which gives the largest sample size. See below under **More information** if this is confusing. **Measure this many students.**

Your recommended sample size is

42

This is the minimum recommended size of your survey. If you create a sample of this many people and get responses from everyone, you're more likely to get a correct answer than you would from a large sample where only a small percentage of the sample responds to your survey.

3. Project Mechanics

3A. Does your project utilize a rubric for scoring? Yes No

If 'No', proceed to section B. If 'Yes', complete the following.

Multiple raters should always be used in SAC assessment projects that utilize rubrics or checklists. SACs have several options for ensuring that ratings are similar across each rater. The most time consuming option is for all raters to collectively rate and discuss each artifact until they reach 100% agreement on each score (this is called **consensus**). In most cases, SACs should consider a more efficient strategy that divides the work (a norming or calibrating session). During a norming session, all raters participate in a training where the raters individually score pre-selected student work and then discuss their reasons for giving the scores they chose. Disagreements are resolved and the process is repeated. When the participants feel they are all rating student work consistently, they then independently score additional examples of student work in the norming session (often 4-6 artifacts). The ratings for these additional artifacts are checked to see what percentage of the scores are in agreement (the standard is 70% agreement or higher). When this standard is reached in the norming session, the raters can then divide-up the student work and rate it independently. If your SAC is unfamiliar with norming procedures, contact [Chris Brooks](#) to arrange for coaching help for your SAC's norming session.

Which method of ensuring consistent scoring (inter-rater reliability) will your SAC use for this project?

Agreement – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming session

If you are using agreement, describe your plan for conducting the “norming” or “calibrating” session:

Raters will meet and go through an initial norming process before scoring the coded artifacts.

Consensus - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each score

Though rarely used at PCC, some SACs might occasionally use the consistency measure for determining the similarity of their ratings. Consistency is generally only recommended when measuring student improvement – not for showing outcome attainment (which explains its rarity). See the Help Guide for more information. Check here if you will be using consistency calculations in this assessment.

Consistency* – raters’ scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise agreement – and then briefly describe your plan:

3B. Have performance benchmarks been specified?

The fundamental measure in educational assessment is the number of students who complete the work at the expected/required level. We are calling this SAC-determined performance expectation the ‘benchmark.’

Yes (determined by faculty consensus – all instructors who currently teach the course)

Yes (determined by only some of the instructors who currently teach the course)

Yes (determined by alignment with an external standard: e.g., standards published by the discipline’s professional organization)

Yes (determined by post-requisite course expectations within PCC)

Yes (determined by post-requisite course expectations for transfer institution)

Yes (other). Describe briefly:

No

If yes, briefly describe your performance benchmarks, being as specific as possible (if needed, attach as an appendix):

If no, what is the purpose of this assessment (for example, this assessment will provide information that will lead to developing

benchmarks in the future; or, this assessment will lead to areas for more detailed study; etc.)?

Part of our work is not only to articulate the outcome itself, but also to develop benchmarks for our courses in connection with this potential outcome.

3C. The purpose of this assessment is to have SAC-wide evaluation of student work, not to evaluate a particular instructor or student. Before evaluation, remove identifying student information (and, when possible remove instructor identifying information). If the SAC wishes to return instructor-specific results, see the Help Guide for suggestions on how to code and collate. Please share your process for ensuring that all identifying information has been removed.

Our assessment coordinator will ensure that all names and section identifiers are removed from any artifacts prior to scoring.

3D. Will you be coding your data/artifacts in order to compare student sub-groups? Yes No

If yes, select one of the boxes below:

student's total earned hours previous coursework completed ethnicity other

Briefly describe your coding plan and rationale (and if you selected 'other', identify the sub-groups you will be coding for:

3E. Ideally, student work is **evaluated** by both full-time and adjunct faculty, even if students being assessed are taught by only full-time and/or adjunct faculty. Further, more than one rater is needed to ensure inter-rater reliability. If you feel only one rater is feasible for your SAC, please consult with an LAC coach prior to submitting your plan/conducting your assessment.

Other groups may be appropriate depending on the assessment. Check all that apply.

- PCC Adjunct Faculty within the program/discipline
- PCC FT Faculty within the program/discipline
- PCC Faculty outside the program/discipline
- Program Advisory Board Members
- Non-PCC Faculty
- External Supervisors
- Other:

End of Planning Section – Complete the remainder of this report after your assessment project is complete.

Beginning of End of Year Reporting Section – complete the following sections after your assessment project is complete.

4. Changes to the Assessment Plan

Have there been changes to your project since you submitted the planning section of this report? Yes No

If so, note the changes in the planning section above.

5. Results of the Analysis of Assessment Project Data

5A. Quantitative Summary of Sample/Population

How many students were enrolled in all sections of the course(s) you assessed this year? Only certain sections participated in the project; we received 69 artifacts. There were a total of 349 students enrolled across all sections of PHL 191, 195, 201, and 212 (but not all sections participated).

If you did not assess in a course, report the number of students that are in the group you intend to generalize your results to.

How many students did you actually assessed in this project? 69

Did you use a recommended sample size (see the [Sample Size Calculator](#) linked to above)? Yes No

If you did not use a recommended sample size in your assessment, briefly explain why:

We ended up with far fewer participating sections, so did not have enough to meet the recommended sample size had we assessed all sections of all four identified courses.

5B. Did your project utilize a rubric for scoring? Yes No

If 'No', proceed to section C. If 'Yes', complete the following.

How was inter-rater reliability assured? (If help is needed, please contact your SAC's LAC coach.)

- Agreement** – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming session
- Consensus** - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each score
- Consistency** – raters' scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise agreement
- Inter-rater reliability was not assured.**

If you utilized agreement or consistency measures of inter-rater reliability, report the level here:

We scored as follows: each criteria received a score of 1-4, and there were three criteria included in our rubric. If two raters were more than one number apart (for example, one gave a 2 and one gave a 4) for one or more criteria, we re-scored those artifacts. Of the 69 scored artifacts, there were 13 that required rescoring. On that measure, we had an initial level of 81% rater agreement. However, even in those cases it would be possible for an artifact's final total score to vary from rater to rater (for example, one rater's total could be a 4 while another rater's total could be 7).

Measuring another way, there were 12 artifacts where each scorer generated exactly the same score for all three criteria (so only 17% exact agreement).

5C. Brief Summary of Your Results

*In most cases, report the numbers of students who attain your benchmark level and the numbers who do not. **Do not average these numbers or combine dissimilar categories (e.g., do not combine ratings for communication and critical thinking together).** If your project measures how many students attain the overall benchmark level of performance, report the summary numbers below (choose one):*

- 1. If you used frequencies (the actual number who attained the desired level(s) and the actual number who did not), report those here for each of your criteria for this learning outcome. For example, "46 students attained the benchmark level over-all in written communication and 15 did not. Our SAC used 5 criteria within this rubric: 46 student achieved the benchmark level in idea expression (15 did not); 54 achieved the benchmark level for use of standard English (10 did not); etc."*

We did not identify a benchmark as part of the project (thus far). But of the three criteria, here are the attainment score numbers (cases where both raters agreed):

Hypothesis: all 69 artifacts achieved a 2 or higher, and 41 achieved a 3 or higher (28 did not).

Method: 59 artifacts achieved a 2 or higher (10 did not), and 23 achieved a 3 or higher (46 did not).

Further Questions: 28 artifacts achieved a 2 or higher (41 did not), and 16 achieved a 3 or higher (53 did not).

2. *If your project used percentages of the total to identify the degree of benchmark attainment in this project, report those here for each of your criteria for this learning outcome. For example, “75% of 61 students attained the benchmark level over-all in written communication. Our SAC used 5 criteria within this rubric: 75% of students achieved the benchmark level in idea expression; 89% achieved the benchmark level for use of standard English; etc.”*

5D. *Attach a more detailed description or analysis of your results (e.g., rubric scores, trend analyses, etc.) as an appendix to this document. Appendix attached? Yes No*

5E. *What did the SAC learn about your students’ attainment of your important benchmarks from this assessment? For example, “We are pleased that most of our students are using standard English in their writing, but want to improve our students’ ability to express ideas clearly....”*

Although we have not yet had a chance to discuss these results as a SAC, the process of generating the rubric illustrated that different instructors approach scientific reasoning differently. For some, the rubric clearly captured what they do in their courses; for others, the rubric did not fit. Therefore, to set a benchmark level for scientific reasoning would first require more consensus and clarity around what that means for us as a SAC as well as individual instructors. That said, the results suggest that our students are strongest at creating hypotheses and have the most room for improvement when it comes to generating further questions.

5F. *Do the results of this project suggest that academic changes might be beneficial to your students (changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.)? Yes No*

If you answered ‘Yes,’ briefly describe the changes to improve student learning below. If you answered ‘No’, detail why no changes are called for.

More consistency around the SAC's approach to scientific reasoning, especially in the four courses identified as most appropriate for that outcome, could be helpful for students and instructors. It is clear as part of the assessment project that while scientific reasoning is a meaningful part of several of our courses, how that shows up in the classroom and in assignments varies. That said, since this is an exploratory outcome we may not seek to implement any changes in that per se.

If you are planning changes, when will these changes be fully implemented?

5G. Has all identifying information been removed from your documents? (Information includes student/instructor/supervisor names/identification numbers, names of external placement sites, etc.) Yes No

6. SAC Response to the Assessment Project Results

6A. Assessment Tools & Processes: Indicate how well each of the following worked for your assessment:

Tools (rubrics, test items, questionnaires, etc.):

very well some small problems/limitations to fix notable problems/limitations to fix tools completely inadequate/failure

Please comment briefly on any changes to assessment tools that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome).

As mentioned, the particular rubric we created did not fit well with all sections of courses involving scientific reasoning (although it did fit quite well with some). Given that, the rubric would need revision.

Processes (faculty involvement, sampling, norming, inter-rater reliability, etc.):

very well some small problems/limitations to fix notable problems/limitations to fix tools completely inadequate/failure

Please comment briefly on any changes to assessment process that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome).

Ideally more sections would participate in submitting artifacts; that might be helped with a more universally appropriate rubric.

7. Follow-Up Plan

7A. How will the changes detailed in this report be shared with all FT/PT faculty in your SAC? (select all that apply)

email phone call workshop
 campus mail face-to-face meeting other

no changes to share

If 'other,' please describe briefly below.

7B. Is further collaboration/training required to properly implement the identified changes? Yes No

If 'Yes,' briefly detail your plan/schedule below.

If the SAC decides to re-assess this outcome in 2016-2017, we will need more discussions around the outcome and therefore the rubric.

7C. Re-assessment is a critical part of the overall assessment process. This is especially important if academic changes have been implemented. How will you assess the effectiveness of the changes you plan to make?

follow-up project in next year's annual report

in a future assessment project

on-going informal assessment

other

If 'other,' please describe briefly below.

Since next year will be a second exploratory/experimental year, I do not yet know whether the SAC will decide to re-assess this particular potential core outcome. If we do, we will likely have some discussion around the rubric, the outcome, and therefore course assignments to generate appropriate artifacts for next year's project.

7D. SACs are learning how to create and manage meaningful assessments in their courses. This development may require SAC discussion to support the assessment process (e.g., awareness, buy-in, communication, etc.). Please briefly describe any successful developments within your SAC that support the quality assessment of student learning. If challenges remain, these can also be shared.

Our SAC had some excellent discussions as a group when creating the rubric itself, and some lively exchanges around the relationship between the current core outcome of Critical Thinking and this potential core outcome of scientific reasoning. And although the raters were a small group (composed of both full- and part-time faculty), those of us in attendance there also had some good discussion around how this shows up in our courses and whether identifying a method can or should be equivalent to utilizing a method in an argument.

