General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: ENGL 100W: Writing Workshop   GE Area: Z

Results reported for AY16-17   # of sections: 6   # of instructors: 5

Course Coordinator: Tom Moriarty   E-mail: Thomas.moriarty@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Noelle Brada-Williams   College: H&A

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, by the department chair, to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, with an electronic copy to the home college by September 1 of the following academic year.

Part 1

To be completed by the course coordinator:

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

SLO 2: Students shall be able to explain, analyze, develop, and criticize ideas effectively, including ideas encountered in multiple readings and expressed in different forms of discourse.

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

Coursework includes extensive instruction and practice in reading literary texts in a variety of genres. Coursework also includes instruction and practice in producing critical essays on multiple texts, essays in which students are required to explain, analyze, develop, and criticize ideas effectively.

We asked instructors to collect one extended written assignment from your class, one that requires students to write in response to at least two texts (primary and/or secondary).

A Satisfactory paper adequately explains, analyzes, develops, and/or criticizes ideas from multiple sources to define the critical conversation and to “get readers on the same page.” Gleans useful examples and evidence from criticism and from the literary text, but not at the same level as a Good paper.

Papers were scored using the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good (Exceeds Standard)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (Meets Standard)</th>
<th>Un satisfactory (Does Not Meet Standard)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skillfully explains, analyzes, develops, and/or criticizes ideas from multiple sources</td>
<td>Adequately explains, analyzes, develops, and/or criticizes ideas from multiple sources to</td>
<td>Research/selection of evidence is so minimal or irrelevant or inappropriate to the subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to develop both a coherent conversation about the subject and convincing explications of the texts.

Skillfully integrates ideas from research and primary texts to engage readers.

define the critical conversation and to “get readers on the same page.”

Gleans useful examples and evidence from criticism and from the literary text, but not at the same level as a Good paper.

being studied that the critical conversation & argument are not clearly defined or not credibly developed

Lacks paraphrases/quotes, or uses quotation so illogically or inappropriately (given the argument/occasion) that the argument is seriously flawed.

Quantitative DATA
Assessment totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Fails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSESSED</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Analysis of the Results

The results indicate that the majority of students – 77% – performed satisfactorily or above on this assessment. 23% of our students, however, failed to meet the standard.

Compared to last year’s numbers, the number of students failing to meet our standard jumped 20%.

One instructor noted, “Two of papers who failed the assignment (C- or lower grades) did so because one did not use the language of literary analysis as required in the assignment; the other student has significant technical deficiencies in her writing and she admitted she wrote the paper the night before it was due. The lowest grade was given to a paper by a student who had not attended the classes during which we discussed the play.”

(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.)

We plan to explore ways to improve students’ use of sources in their writing. All instructors will be asked to experiment with methods for addressing this weakness and we will share the results with each other.

Next year, we will be assessing SLO 3: Students shall be able to organize and develop essays and documents for both professional and general audiences (write for varied audiences). We look forward to seeing how they do on this very important skill.

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 (SLOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?