General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

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

Results reported for AY: 15-16                                           # of sections: 7   # of instructors: 4

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 repeated our assessment of 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></th>
<th>Exceeds Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Fails</th>
<th>TOTAL ASSESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Analysis of the Results

The results indicate that the vast majority of students performed satisfactorily or above on this assessment. Only 7% of students failed to meet the standard. Most students met the standard, which means their writing, on a sentence level, is adequate.

Compared to last year, a full 10% more students were rated as Exceeds Standard. That increase came almost entirely from the Meets Standard category, which fell 10%.

Instructors noted that the majority of students were able to improve upon their competencies from ENGL 1A and 1B. Most students had a clear grasp of grammar and a general understanding of language use. The difficulty for many was in the area of clarity of expression.

One instructor noted that in her particular section, English is the second of third language for approximately two-thirds of the students, and many of those grew up in homes where little English was spoken. Many recently transferred to SJSU, and as can be expected with a night class, most work between 20 and 40 hours per week. While this semester was challenging for my students and for me, all students except one ultimately met or exceeded expectations for this GELO. I am proud of them.

Other instructors noted that most students could write clearly at the sentence level, but they struggled with paragraph unity, coherence, cohesion, and transitions. Common errors: dangling/misplaced modifiers, faulty predication, tone, and shifts in tense/point of view/mood. Many of them had issues of audience/tone, particularly for business writing.

And others noted that their 100WB course is front-loaded with mini-reviews of grammar/mechanics topics based on student work. By the point in the semester when students completed this assignment, all students were able to exceed or meet the standard. A handful of those who met the standard needed further guidance on specific aspects diction, grammar, and/or mechanics. However, in no case did the errors in the assessed proposal obscure meaning or undermine authority.

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.