General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: English 2: Critical Thinking and Writing      GE Area: A3

Results reported for AY 2015-2016 # of sections 48 # of instructors 25

Course Coordinator: Richard McNabb E-mail: richard.mcnabb@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Shannon Miller College: Humanities & Arts

Instructions: Each year, the department will prepare a brief (two page maximum) report that documents the assessment of the course during the year. This report will be electronically submitted to <curriculum@sjsu.edu>, by the department chair, to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, with an electronic copy to the home college by October 1 of the following academic year.

Part 1

To be completed by the course coordinator:

(1) What GELO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?

GELO #5: Students will be able to distinguish and convey inductive and deductive patterns as appropriate, sequencing arguments and evidence logically to draw valid conclusions and articulate related outcomes (implications and consequences).

(2) What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?

How achieved: Instructors lectured, held class discussions, and assigned exercises on deductive and inductive reasoning.

How assessed: Students were administered a common exam asking them to (1) diagram the logic of an argument by stating the main premises and conclusion; (2) label the argument as inductive or deductive; and (3) comment on the validity of the premises and conclusion and identify any logical weaknesses, fallacies, or counter-claims.

Results: A random sampling of exams from all 48 sections was scored, roughly 12 exams per section (representing 50% of each class enrollment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Diagram Type of Reasoning</th>
<th>Evaluation-Validity</th>
<th>Evaluation-Assessment</th>
<th>Total Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>61% (97)</td>
<td>49% (78)</td>
<td>62% (100)</td>
<td>31% (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>61% (237)</td>
<td>64% (248)</td>
<td>70% (270)</td>
<td>34% (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
<td>61% (334)</td>
<td>60% (326)</td>
<td>68% (370)</td>
<td>33% (181)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results:
Analysis:

- Roughly 40% of students who correctly identified the type of reasoning could not adequately explain why the argument was deductive or inductive, leading me to believe it wasn’t necessarily an informed decision.
- Although 68% of students could evaluate the validity of the premises and conclusion, half of them could not (or did not) comment on the weaknesses by pointing out logical fallacies or refuting the premises and assumptions.
- Of those students who incorrectly diagramed the argument, roughly 45% were able to evaluate the validity of the actual (real) argument—i.e., not the incorrect premises/conclusion with which they diagramed the argument. This represents more meaningful data for the First-Year Writing Program’s learning objectives. It is less important for students to be able to diagram an argument into premises and conclusions as it is for them to recognize and assess the evidence a writer uses to argue a point.

(3) What modifications to the course, or its assessment activities or schedule, are planned for the upcoming year? (If no modifications are planned, the course coordinator should indicate this.)

No curricular modifications are planned. A series of professional development workshops are scheduled in AY 2016-2017 for instructors to share lesson plans and best practices. Assessment norming sessions will also continue.

Part 2

To be completed by the department chair (with input from course coordinator as appropriate):

(4) Are all sections of the course still aligned with the area Goals, Student Learning Objectives (GELOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?

**YES.** Each semester, the course coordinator reviews all of the syllabi to ensure alignment with the GE course guidelines.

(5) If this course is in a GE Area with a stated enrollment limit (Areas A1, A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z), please indicate how oral presentations will be evaluated with larger sections (Area A1), or how practice and revisions in writing will be addressed with larger sections, particularly how students are receiving thorough feedback on the writing which accounts for the minimum word count in this GE category (Areas A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z) and, for the writing intensive courses (A2, A3, and Z), documentation that the students are meeting the GE GELOs for writing.

Each essay is required to go through at least one revision under the direction of the primary instructor. For an essay to receive full credit, students must submit all drafts.