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 rubics 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: 2.90 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
The 2011 assessment results indicate that the 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 just never specifically stated in the report.

1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area II: Humanities

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

   SLO 11: Students will understand and appreciate the arts and aesthetics as ways of knowing and engaging with the world.

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].

   see attached report

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

   see attached report

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?]

   see attached report

6. **Additional Comments:**

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

7. **Committee Comments**

   Mean of rubric score = 3.33 (out of 4) Report never mentions SLOs Insufficient exam time