General Information

1. Name / Number of Course / Sequence:
   ENGL 1100/17-ENGL 1120/27: English Composition I/II; Honors Writing Seminar I/II

2. SLO(s) being assessed:
   Student will...

3. Department: English

4. Department Representative: Michelle Sidler

5. AGSC Content Alignment: Area I: Written Composition

Assessment Information

6. Assessment Method: [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO – not grading for the course as a whole was conducted.]

   For SLO 6, a rubric has been constructed that identifies key measures and offers evaluative categories for those measures. The rubric lists 7 measures that relate to the measures identified in SLO 6, and scores on the rubric range from 5 (highest, most achieved) to 1 (lowest, least achieved). A random sampling of students' third papers was rated in relation to the SLO 6 rubric, which includes an assessment of students' abilities in relation to elements of the composing process (see rubric for more detail).

   For SLO 1, a rubric has been constructed that identifies key measures and offers evaluative categories for those measures. The rubric lists 5 measures that relate to the measures identified in SLO 1, and scores on the rubric range from 5 (highest, most
achieved) to 1 (lowest, least achieved). A random sampling of students' fourth papers has been rated in relation to the SLO 1 rubric, which includes an assessment of students' abilities in relation to 2-3 key information literacy outcomes. (See rubric for more detail.)

(A brief description of Papers 3 and 4 is attached to this form. More detailed information can be provided, if requested.)

SLO 6 assessment was conducted by the Composition Committee, which is comprised of professorial faculty, Instructors, and Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) and chaired by the Director of the Composition Program. After the results were analyzed, we discussed ways to improve curriculum. (See below.)

SLO 1 assessment was conducted by members of the Library Instruction staff and overseen by the Director of Bibliographic Instruction. After the results were analyzed, the staff discussed ways to improve students’ information literacy, and the Director of Bibliographic Instruction related that information to the Director of Composition Program. (See below.)

7. Findings: [What assessment data did each assessment method produce?]

Attached are data charts of findings for each SLO. (Note that the Composition Program has been performing assessment of SLO 1 and 6 in ENGL 1120 for the past three years, which will be discussed later in this report.) Here is a breakdown of the results from 2010 only:

ENGL 1100 and ENGL 1120 Assessment: SLO 6

For ENGL 1100, mean results for the 7 measures identified on the SLO 6 rubric range from 2.51 to 3.23 (out of a scale of 5):

Rhetorical Situation 3.03
Thesis 2.63
Organization & Coherence 2.90
Argument 3.23
Sources 3.07
Style 2.86
Grammar, Punctuation, Proofreading 2.51

For ENGL 1120, results for the 7 measures identified on the SLO 6 rubric range from 2.72 to 3.12 (out of a scale of 5).

Rhetorical Situation 3.14
Thesis 3.14
Organization & Coherence 3.21
Argument 3.26
Sources 3.05
Style 3.24

Grammar, Punctuation, Proofreading 3.8

ENGL 1120 Assessment: SLO 1

For ENGL 1120, results for the 5 measures identified on the SLO 6 rubric range from 2.51 to 3.23 (out of a scale of 5).

Students will document citations via a works cited or bibliography so that sources may be found easily 2.55

Students will find appropriate scholarly sources 2.45
Students will find appropriate scholarly sources using the library’s subject databases using the library’s subject databases 2.10
Students will evaluate appropriate scholarly resources 3.45
Students will integrate appropriate scholarly sources 2.49

8. How did you or will you use the findings for improvement: [What questions / issues/ concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

ENGL 1100 and ENGL 1120 Assessment: SLO 6
The 2010 results are disappointing, especially regarding the “Thesis” measure and the “Grammar, Punctuation, Proofreading” measure. The low score for “Grammar, Punctuation, Proofreading” is largely the result of wording on the rubric, which allows for virtually no errors. The Committee decided that this expectation was too high, and we have adjusted the rubric for next year’s assessment. The low score on “Thesis” results largely from the range of writing assignments used by Composition teachers, some of which do not explicitly require or emphasize a thesis. The Composition Committee plans to work with teachers to develop more standardized assignments.

We are also disappointed in the overall scores for ENGL 1120. Although scores increased between 2008 and 2009, they fell between 2009 and 2010. We attribute this decrease to fewer training sessions and pedagogical support in 2010 compared to 2008 and 2009. We plan to re-establish the previous level of training and support.

ENGL 1120 Assessment: SLO 1

The most disappointing measures were those related to students finding appropriate scholarly sources using library databases. The cause for these lower scores is composition teachers’ unwillingness to assign and encourage research in scholarly databases. The Composition Program, in collaboration with the library instructional staff, will offer training sessions to encourage this curriculum.

More positively, we are pleased to see scores for SLO 1 rise overall between 2009 and 2010. As composition teachers increasingly collaborate with the Instructional Library Staff and integrate information literacy principles into their classes, we believe these numbers will continue to rise.

9. Additional comments: [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

We will continue to conduct assessment using this method during 2011 and 2012. We may also add a performative assessment component for each SLO, wherein we evaluate students’ use of technology in real time. We recognize that engagement with technology is integral to both outcomes, but it cannot be accurately represented through assessment of student papers.

10. Core Curriculum General Education Committee Comments:
Thank you for your strong efforts to document and improve your students’ learning. As you move forward, you should consider the following: how can you expand departmental discussion about the results and encourage faculty to revise their pedagogy in response to your assessment? You should also consider more closely the conclusion that the rubric for one measure was inaccurate: is it possible that the results are, in fact, accurate? If you know they are inaccurate, then you seem to be using another, unstated assessment method to make that determination. Perhaps greater faculty buy-in to addressing the SLOs is needed.