General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: ENGL 100WB: Written Communication: Business          GE Area: Z

Results reported for AY16-17        # of sections: 18        # of instructors: 6

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 workplace documents written in a variety of genres. Coursework also includes instruction and practice in producing documents that include research from multiple sources, reports 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 use 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 issue at hand and to “get readers on the same page.” Gleans useful examples and evidence from research – both primary and/or secondary – 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>Unsatisfactory (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 define</td>
<td>Research/selection of evidence is so minimal or irrelevant or inappropriate to the subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to develop a coherent and engaging document.

Skillfully integrates ideas from research – both primary and/or secondary – to accomplish writer’s goal and engage readers.

the issue at hand and to “get readers on the same page.”

Gleans useful examples and evidence from research – both primary and/or secondary – but not at the same level as a Good paper.

being studied that the issue and argument are not clearly defined or not credibly developed.

Lacks paraphrases/quotes, or uses quotation so illogically or inappropriately (given the argument/purpose of the document) that the document 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>41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSESSED</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Analysis of the Results
The results indicate that almost all of our students – 99% – performed satisfactorily or above on this assessment. Only 1% of our students failed to meet the standard.

One instructor noted, “Students managed to write the final draft for submission and a grade with little trouble meeting or exceeding the GELO requirements to explain, analyze, develop, and criticize ideas effectively. The most challenging skill for students to master was summarizing the ideas of others before criticizing them. I tried a collaborative essay prior to the writing of the position paper, which helped them “listen” to each other. I asked them to transfer this listening skill to the texts they read.”

Another wrote, “This section is one of the few 100WB classes in which all students produced average to good or excellent analytical essays. I could tell that most worked especially hard to correctly cite all their sources both in-text and references or works cited. This particular class was always very responsive to my comments and to those of their peers. Most left with a good understanding of the importance of revision, whether for cover letters, informal emails, press releases, or longer reports, such as the one submitted for this assessment. However, there was a wide range for those in the “meets” category for this assignment. For some, I would have liked to have seen more specific details (development) on practices instead of summaries of company-written policy as well as more information from sources that contradicted company-biased sources with regard to company-related controversies (criticism).”

(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.)

Our students are doing a good job with this SLO. Kudos to our instructors. We will share ideas to keep making incremental improvement, however.

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?