



Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011_12

Department English

Representative Dr. Kevin Roozen

Course Name / number ENGL110 / 1107, ENGL 1120/1127

1. AGSC Content Area of Alignment: Area I: Written Composition

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

SLO 1: Students will be information literate.

SLO 6: Students will write effectively.

3. Assessment Method(s):

[Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

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 and fourth papers for ENGL 1100 and third papers for ENGL 1120 has been rated in relation to the SLO 6 rubric (see attached 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 for ENGL 1120 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 attached rubric for more detail.) 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. (See below.) SLO 1 assessment was conducted by members of the Library Instruction faculty and overseen by the Libraries Instruction Coordinator. After the results were analyzed, library faculty discussed ways to improve students' information literacy, and the Instruction Coordinator related that information to the Director of Composition Program. (See below.)

4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?

SLO 6: ENGL 1100 and ENGL 1120 Assessment
ENGL 1100 Paper 3 For ENGL 1100 Paper 3, mean results for the 7 measures identified on the SLO 6 rubric range from 3.03 to 3.64 (out of a scale of 5): Rhetorical Situation: 3.30 Thesis: 3.05 Organization & Coherence: 3.64 Argument: 3.03 Sources: 3.27 Style: 3.23 Grammar, Punctuation, Proofreading: 3.36
ENGL 1100 Paper 4 For ENGL 1100 Paper 4, mean results for the 7 measures identified on the SLO 6 rubric range from 2.72 to 3.27 (out of a scale of 5): Rhetorical Situation: 2.95 Thesis: 2.91 Organization & Coherence: 3.07 Argument: 2.72 Sources: 2.88 Style: 3.09 Grammar, Punctuation, Proofreading: 3.27
ENGL 1120 Paper 3 For ENGL 1120 Paper 3, results for the 7 measures identified on the SLO 6 rubric range from 3.08 to 3.59 (out of a scale of 5). Rhetorical Situation: 3.21 Thesis: 3.22 Organization & Coherence: 3.31 Argument: 3.08 Sources: 3.27 Style: 3.33 Grammar, Punctuation, Proofreading: 3.59
SLO 1: ENGL 1120 Assessment
For ENGL 1120 Paper 4, results for the 5 measures identified on the SLO 6 rubric range from 2.41 to 3.84 (out of a scale of 5). Document Sources: 2.98 Scholarly Sources: 2.80 Subject Databases: 2.41 Evaluate Sources: 3.84 Integrate Sources: 2.94

5. 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?]

SLO 6: ENGL 1100 and ENGL 1120 Assessment
ENGL 1100 The 2011 assessment results indicate that the



Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011_12

Department English

Representative Dr. Kevin Roozen

Course Name / number ENGL110 / 1107, ENGL 1120/1127

ENGL 1100 curriculum is successful in enhancing student learning in regard to students' abilities to identify and address a given rhetorical situation (item 1), generate a thesis (item 2), organize their essays (item 3), write with sources (item 5), and attend to the stylistic elements of their prose (items 6 and 7). We are enthusiastic about the gains we see in regard to the 2010 results, and we attribute the increase in the scores on those measures to the increased attention to the preparation of GTAs and to increased support for GTAs and faculty teaching composition we provided in 2011. We plan to continue enhancing the preparation and support provided to composition teachers. On the other hand, the 2011 assessment results suggest that the curriculum needs to be strengthened to better support students' abilities to craft an argument (item 4). The relatively low score for this measure could be the result of the range of writing assignments used by Composition teachers, some of which do not explicitly require students to make an argument. The Composition Committee plans to work with teachers to develop assignments that explicitly ask students to make and support an explicit argument. We also plan to address this need by developing a more coherent curriculum focused on argument and rhetorical principles and working toward more consistency across sections of ENGL 1100.

ENGL 1120 Compared to the 2010 results, the 2011 assessment results indicate that the ENGL 1120 curriculum is successful in strengthening students' abilities to identify and address a rhetorical situation (item 1), design a thesis (item 2), organize their essays (item 3), write with sources (item 5), and attend to the stylistic and mechanical aspects of their writing (items 6 and 7). We note, though, that while the 2011 results indicate substantial gains when compared to the 2010 results, when compared to the 2008 and 2009 results, the 2011 results indicate slight decreases in many of the measures and only modest gains in others. While we are enthusiastic about the increases indicated in the 2011 results, we also note that enhancing students' abilities to construct an argument (item 4) continues to be a challenge for the present ENGL 1120 curriculum. We plan to address this by increasing the ENGL 1120 curriculum in regard to emphasizing rhetorical principles and argument.

SLO 1: ENGL 1120 Assessment We are encouraged by the 2011 assessment results for SLO 1. The 2011 results indicate that our efforts to enhance students' information literacy are improving students' abilities to document sources (item 1), locate scholarly sources (item 2), use subject databases (item 3), evaluate sources (item 4), and write with sources (item 5). We anticipate that these scores will continue to rise as composition teachers continue to collaborate with the Instructional Library faculty and integrate information literacy principles into their ENGL 1120 courses.

6. 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 for SLO 1 and SLO 6 using this method during 2012. In order to make the assessment process more efficient, we plan to collect digital copies of students' papers and archive them on a Sharepoint site. This should decrease the amount of time devoted to collecting, compiling, copying, and distributing paper copies of student work. We are also considering whether having teachers use the assessment rubric for SLO 6 to evaluate student papers and then provide those results would be a more efficient way to conduct assessment of a larger sample of student work. 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.

7. Committee Comments

Mean of rubric score = 3.77 (out of 4) The faculty has identified with the help of the collected data deficiency in students ability to "craft an argument (item 4)". The manner in which they plan to revise the curriculum to improve student performance in this item has been addressed in one sentence in the report. Based on the fact there are two assessment committees, I do not doubt that a large sample of student work was evaluated. It is



Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011_12

Department English

Representative Dr. Kevin Roozen

Course Name / number ENGL110 / 1107, ENGL 1120/1127

just never specifically stated in the report.

SLO 6 Rubric: Written Communication

5	4	3	2	1
<p>Rhetorical Situation The essay addresses the rhetorical situation (the assignment) in innovative, creative, and perceptive ways; the writer's credibility is exemplary.</p>	<p>The essay addresses the rhetorical situation (the assignment) beyond mere competency; the writer's credibility is strong.</p>	<p>The essay addresses the rhetorical situation (the assignment) adequately.</p>	<p>The essay only begins to meet the assignment requirements, indicating the writer's inability to address the rhetorical situation. Writer's credibility is suspect.</p>	<p>The essay fails to address the assignment and shows an obvious minimal lack of effort or comprehension of assignment purpose.</p>
<p>Thesis The thesis is argumentative, insightful, and crystal clear.</p>	<p>The thesis is promising but may be slightly unclear, or somewhat lacking in insight or originality.</p>	<p>The thesis may be unclear and contain many vague terms, appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new; provides little around which to structure the paper.</p>	<p>The thesis is difficult to identify; may be a bland restatement of an obvious (non-debatable) point. The main idea is barely recognizable and is wholly ineffective, confused or too general.</p>	<p>There is no thesis (or thesis is unclear, unsuitable to assignment, and does not adequately address assignment topic and rhetorical situation); there is no central main idea.</p>
<p>Organization and Coherence Overall structure, organization, and paragraph construction are appropriate to the assignment and an academic audience. All ideas in the paper flow logically. Transitions show originality and sophistication.</p>	<p>Overall structure, organization, and paragraph construction are appropriate to the assignment and an academic audience, though may be less evident and understandable in some places. Most ideas in the paper flow logically. Transitions are adequate but may be unclear or missing at times.</p>	<p>Overall structure, organization, and paragraph construction are readable, somewhat appropriate to the assignment and an academic audience, though may be a bit awkward in some places. The paper does not always flow logically and make sense. Transitions are formulaic and may be few or weak.</p>	<p>The paper lacks coherence, providing no discernible argument; ideas do not flow logically and do not make sense. Overall structure, organization, and paragraph construction are difficult to read, or inappropriate for audience. Transitions are confusing or nonexistent.</p>	<p>The writing is very difficult to understand owing to major problems with organization and structure.</p>
<p>Argument The argument is extensive, identifiable, reasonable, and sound. The essay demonstrates mastery of rhetorical appeals and ample consideration of counterargument(s) that could be raised against thesis.</p>	<p>The argument of the paper is respectably sound and well developed. Essay demonstrates some mastery of appeals, and admirably engages counterargument(s) that could be raised against thesis.</p>	<p>The argument of the paper is clear, adequately developed, and usually makes sense. Essay demonstrates some attention to and understanding of appeals, and evidences some consideration of counterargument(s) that could be raised against thesis.</p>	<p>The argument of the paper is often unclear, inadequately developed. Essay demonstrates unpredictable attention to and slim understanding of rhetorical appeals, and evidences insufficient consideration of counterargument(s) that could be raised against thesis.</p>	<p>No discernible argument; no attention to rhetorical appeals; no addressing of counterargument(s).</p>
<p>Sources The essay displays effective use of a variety of appropriate support/sources. The essay includes excellent integration and effective use of direct quotes, paraphrases, summaries, and citations of outside material according to assignment parameters.</p>	<p>Some evidence does not support main point, or may appear where inappropriate. Good integration and reasonable use of direct quotes, paraphrases, summaries, and/or citations of outside material into sentences according to assignment parameters.</p>	<p>Thesis/main points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate (often because there may be no clear point). The essay demonstrates inconsistent integration and use of direct quotes, paraphrases, summaries, and/or citations of outside material into sentences according to assignment parameters.</p>	<p>The support offered is weak, vague, unconvincing, inaccurate, irrelevant or too narrow in focus; there is a general failure to support statements or evidence seems to support no statement. Scant or no insightful connections to outside material made. Quotes, paraphrases, summaries, and reference are not integrated appropriately.</p>	<p>No support or evidence is displayed.</p>

<p>Style Overall writing style is striking and the purpose is distinguished by extraordinary depth and breadth of insight. The writer shows consistent awareness of audience/reader expectations as evidenced by voice, tone, and level of formality appropriate to assignment.</p>	<p>Content and overall writing style reflects admirable concern for the reader and the purpose. The writer largely shows awareness of audience/reader expectations as evidenced by voice, tone, and level of formality appropriate to assignment.</p>	<p>Content and overall writing style are somewhat appropriate for the audience but are not exceptionally engaging; the essay demonstrates meager awareness of audience/reader expectations as evidenced by voice, tone, and level of formality somewhat inappropriate to assignment.</p>	<p>Content and overall writing style is inconsistent, simplistic, and inappropriate for the audience. Little to no awareness of audience/reader expectations.</p>	<p>The essay has an unreadable style and/or voice or tone that alienates audience.</p>
<p>Grammar, Punctuation, Proofreading Sentence structure, grammar, and diction are excellent; correct use of punctuation; minimal to no spelling errors. Exemplary attention to conventions of standard written English.</p>	<p>Sentence structure, grammar, and diction are strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation often used correctly; some minor spelling errors.</p>	<p>Sentence structure, grammar, and diction have problems (usually not major); errors in punctuation; some major spelling errors indicative of careless proofreading.</p>	<p>Sentence structure, grammar, and diction have major problems (so many that the text is difficult to read – ie. awkward, vague); frequent major errors in punctuation; frequent and repeated major spelling errors indicative of careless proofreading.</p>	<p>The writing is very difficult to understand and displays major problems with proofreading and punctuation; substantial errors in grammar and mechanics that deviates significantly from conventions of standard written English.</p>
<p>Use of Technology Indication of strong proficiency with technology element as defined by assignment (ie. effective incorporation of commonly used research databases and web sources or masterful incorporation of technological creativity according to assignment).</p>	<p>Indication of respectable proficiency with technology element as defined by assignment (ie. effective incorporation of commonly used research databases and web sources or masterful incorporation of technological creativity according to assignment).</p>	<p>Some attempt made at using the technology element as defined by assignment (ie. incorporation of commonly used research databases and web sources or incorporation of technological creativity according to assignment).</p>	<p>Inadequate attempt made at using the technology element as defined by assignment (ie. incorporation of commonly used research databases and web sources or incorporation of technological creativity according to assignment).</p>	<p>Research and technology inappropriately incorporated (if at all) and is incorrectly documented.</p>

SLO 1: Information Literacy

AUBURN UNIVERSITY ENGL1120 Information Literacy Rubric for ENGL 1120 Paper 4 – Research Paper

Scholarly Sources

Students will find appropriate scholarly sources	5	4	3	2	1
	All citations within the bibliography are scholarly	The majority of citations within the bibliography are scholarly	Citations indicated both scholarly and popular sources used equally	The majority of citations within the bibliography are popular	All citations within the bibliography are popular

Students will find appropriate scholarly sources using the library's subject databases	5	4	3	2	1
	The majority of citations within the bibliography have been located through subject/discipline specific databases	The bibliography contains citations located through both subject/discipline specific databases AND general databases	The majority of citations within the bibliography have been located through a single general database	The majority of citations within the bibliography have been located through Opposing Viewpoints, CQ Researcher or newspaper databases	The majority of citations within the bibliography have been located through web pages or internet search engines

Students will find appropriate scholarly sources using the library's subject databases	5	4	3	2	1
	All citations within the bibliography evidence relevant and timely sources	The majority of citations within the bibliography evidence relevant and timely sources	Some citations within the bibliography evidence relevant and timely sources	Few citations within the bibliography evidence relevant and timely sources	None of the citations within the bibliography evidence relevant and timely sources

Students will integrate appropriate scholarly sources	5	4	3	2	1
	The essay includes direct quotes, paraphrases, summaries and citations from scholarly sources, all of which support the main thesis	The essay includes direct quotes, paraphrases, summaries and citations from scholarly sources, most of which support the main thesis	The essay includes direct quotes, paraphrases, summaries and citations from scholarly sources, some of which support the main thesis	The essay includes direct quotes, paraphrases, summaries and citations from popular sources, most of which support the main thesis	The essay includes direct quotes, paraphrases, summaries and citations from popular sources, few of which support the main thesis