General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: ENGL 100W: Writing Workshop

Results reported for AY: 15-16

GE Area: Z

# of sections: 5  
# of instructors: 5

Course Coordinator: Tom Moriarty

E-mail: Thomas.moriarty@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Shannon Miller

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 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:

What SLO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?
We assessed SLO/GELO #1: Students shall be able to produce discipline-specific written work that demonstrates upper-division proficiency in:
• language use
• grammar
• clarity of expression

We repeated this assessment in order to synchronize with the university’s GE Assessment calendar.

What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?
We asked instructors to collect an extended written assignment from their class and score it using a common rubric. We also asked instructors to write a short qualitative analysis of their results.

An assignment met our standard if it had the following characteristics:
• Satisfactory voice that communicates the writer’s understanding of the topic/issue; fulfills expectations; some redundant or imprecise diction, and some issues with clarity, but shows developing competency with the language of English Studies texts.
• Solid sentence-writing skills; some variation of sentences to accommodate development of points.
• Competent in grammar and mechanics. Errors do not obscure meaning or undermine authority.

Quantitative DATA
Assessment totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Standard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSESSED</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Analysis of the Results

The results indicate that the majority of students – 74% -- performed satisfactorily or above on this assessment. 26% of our students, however, failed to meet the standard, which is surprising, considering that all of these students are English majors and this assessment looked at their basic sentence-level writing skills.

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

One instructor noted that, in general, her students’ feedback on this assignment was that they wanted to write the kinds of papers that they were used to writing (eg, the ones in their heads) and their grades suffered because they failed to conform to the prompt’s requirements. She also added that two of the students who failed are non-majors taking the course; most of the students in this category used the rhetorical strategy of summary instead of critical analysis of from; one major lacks the technical skills to write a passing essay.

Another instructor wrote: “It is disappointing to see that many students who have passed the WST can still not write grammatically correct English. Their work is riddled with sentence, grammar and mechanics errors. They may have good ideas and competent research, but fail to express them in appropriate diction.”

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’ sentence-level competence. 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 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. We look forward to seeing how they do on an outcome that moves beyond sentence-level correctness.

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?

Yes

(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 SLOs for writing.

**Oral Presentations**

The Department encourages instructors of the course to incorporate oral presentations to enhance student learning; the evaluation of oral presentations depends on the instructor and may be rated A, B, and C based on content, organization, delivery, and interaction.

**Writing**

Students receive frequent and thorough feedback on their writing during throughout the course. Instructors conduct essay-writing as well as library research workshops as components of their classes; the writing center has also been used as a means to help students improve their writing skills.