General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: Engineering 100w GE Area Z and R

Results reported for 2017 # of sections 27/29 # of instructors Spring--12; Fall--14

Course Coordinators: Barbara Murphy-Wesley and Stacey Knapp  Email: stacey.knapp@sjsu.edu

Director Ping Hsu  College: Engineering

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? 100w Faculty assessed AREA Z SLO 4 in Fall 2017 and AREA Z SLO 1 in Fall and Spring 2017. (This is an off year for AREA R due to a higher number of SLOs in Area Z.)

Students shall be able to:

SLO 1: produce discipline-specific written work that demonstrates upper-division proficiency in:
  - language use
  - grammar
  - clarity of expression

SLO 4: organize and develop essays and documents according to appropriate editorial and citation standards

Results AREA Z SLO 4
Faculty assessed the Team Proposal assignment; 162 proposals were assessed.

We had a 95% success rate, with 28 % of students exceeding the standard

Average score of 22 out of 25
Seven 100w faculty and Coordinator Knapp completed this program-wide assessment using the calibrated Canvas Outcomes rubric with performance indicators.
Faculty Approved Area Z SLO 4 Rubric with Performance Indicators

In fall 2017, faculty met/reviewed/approved this rubric:

**AREA Z SLO 4**

Organize and develop essays and documents according to appropriate editorial and citation standards (APA).

**Exceeds = Yes, and**

Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of 1) APA style in-text citations and Reference list and 2) editorial devices, such as headings and illustrations, to create a professional document.

**Meets = Yes**

Demonstrates consistent use of 1) APA style in-text citations and Reference list and 2) editorial devices, such as headings and illustrations, but the document may have a few areas that need improvement in order to attain the quality of a professional document.

**Does Not Meet = No, but**

Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and research attribution, but the document still requires major revision in order to attain professional quality.

During our faculty meeting to discuss/calibrate the rubric, several faculty shared materials and teaching tools that they use to develop both formative and summative assessments for this outcome. Several faculty added a ‘formative’ annotated bibliography assignment to their courses as a result of this discussion to better focus students on this important aspect of the course.

**Proposed Changes**

Due to the high results for AREA Z SLO 4, we have no further changes to pursue for this outcome. However, Coordinators highly recommended faculty adopt explicit source integration instruction into their courses, such as requiring an “annotated bibliography” or “quote sandwich” assignment. Both of these materials were shared and posted on the faculty WIKI.

**100w Area Z SLO 1 Spring 2017 Assessment**

Every semester the 100w program administers an Exit Exam that all students are required to take in order to pass the course. We utilize this exam to assess AREA Z SLO 1. The exam is worth 20% of the course grade and scored on a scale of 1-12. A score of six or below is considered not satisfactory and students who earn a 6 receive a 0 for 20% of their grade. In Fall 2017, 611 students took the exam, up from 555 in spring 2017.
### Results AREA Z SLO 1 Outcomes by Exit Exam Score (scale of 1-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Exceeds 9 and higher</th>
<th>Meets 7-8</th>
<th>Does Not Meet 6 and below</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart shows the number of students by score/program percentage. “Developing” is the lowest passing score (7). “Meets Standard” is the standard set by faculty (8). “Exceeds” includes scores from 9-12. Students with 6 or lower “did not meet” standard.

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

**Summary**

Over the past five years the number of 100w sections has more than doubled, from 11 in 2012/13 up to 27 in 2016/17. Failure rates have dropped from 9% in 2014 to approximately 2% in F2016/S17. Although
failure rates remained low (6% in F2017), the Average Exit Exam score was only 8.39 in F2017 (down from 9 in F16/S17). One related program change in fall 2017 was that Coordinator Murphy-Wesley developed a system to distribute faculty Exit Exam prompts. This system regulates the instructions, including the time, for the exam and ensures blind-scoring as only course and student IDs are used on the Exam prompts. This change may have impacted overall program average by inadvertently decreasing the amount of time students are given to write their exams. Due to growing complexity of faculty prompts and the high number of ESL students, Coordinator Knapp will discuss modifying the Exit Exam time limitations with Coordinator Murphy-Wesley and faculty. See chart here: https://create.piktochart.com/output/24535596-new-piktochart

Lowest Performing Students Results Analysis

During a faculty meeting AREA Z SLO 1 and 4 results were reviewed and discussed. Faculty were pleased with the high success rates for SLO 4, but pointed out that even though only 6% of 100w students who attempted, did not meet the standard for AREA Z SLO 1 — faculty pointed out the more concerning aspect of this data was the number of students who earned a “developing” score of “7.” Although a “developing” score technically “meets standard,” faculty agreed that students earning a “7” may face future challenges. In fall 2017, just over 20% of students scored 7 or lower on the Exit Exam. For the past four semesters, data showed an encouraging trend of a greater number of students scoring in the “Exceeds” category (9 and higher). This semester’s results shifted the focus to the challenges of moving “7”s into the “8” or higher categories.

(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.

The 100w program hired two new faculty in 2017: Quentin Hancock and Christina Peters.

To improve these outcomes, faculty agreed that more sentence-level support should be provided in the program to help these lower-performing students achieve greater growth through the semester. Indeed an examination of students scoring under 8 on the Exit Exam showed that the vast majority of these students came in with low or non-passing incoming scores indicating a high number of ESL students in this category. To meet the new program objective, faculty expressed full support for the S2018 “pilot” writing lab collaboration between two 100w faculty and Peer Connections and/or the Writing Center to provide weekly open-labs with one-on-one tutoring support. Faculty also shared information about Criterion, a SJSU-Sponsored grammar support software, and Grammarly, an open-source tool. Although software can help to some extent, faculty overwhelmingly supported the idea of adding “satellite” one-on-one tutoring hours in the Engineering building to better support “at risk” students. Despite faculty concern, it is important to note that in F17 more than 91.49% of students met or exceeded the standard as established by the Board of Undergraduate Studies.

Coordinators launched a pilot 100w “open” writing lab study S2018 to test the efficacy of this supplemental instruction model. Coordinator Knapp attended a CSU-Funded full day Supplemental Instruction training in August in order to learn how to scale this model. Results of this pilot project will be featured in the 2019 GE assessment report.
Describe the progressive changes and the status in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes and Goals</th>
<th>Status Update (what’s being done and results observed)</th>
<th>Date reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Matters Flipped Hybrid Training Developed</td>
<td>Training occurs in Oct and November. Faculty are paid $500 by WAC</td>
<td>Developed 2017 Launched Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of QM Quality Matters 100w Hybrid launched</td>
<td>Two faculty, Christina Peters and Barbara Murphy-Wesley, agreed to “pilot” the QM certified 100w course and provided feedback</td>
<td>Fall 2018 Coordinator Knapp created Chart to explain course to faculty <a href="https://create.piktochart.com/output/31160604-2018-innovation-report">https://create.piktochart.com/output/31160604-2018-innovation-report</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hybrid Writing Lab first partnership with Writing Center Fellows program developed | 1. Pilot Study: Peer Fellow Added to Hybrid 100w  
2. Three sections of 100w are now served by three Writing Fellow also now holds office hours on Mondays in Engineering Success Center | 1. Launched Spring 2017 (Two sections)  
2. Updated F2018 (Three Sections) |
| Partner with Peer Connections                       | Pilot Study: “Open writing lab” Two Peer Connections Tutors Added to “open” Writing Lab in support of two Hybrid 100w sections and one 200w section. | Spring 2018                                                                   |
| Develop Ongoing Partnership with Peer Connections and Writing Center | Coordinator Knapp attended CSU-funded Supplemental Instruction training (Aug 2018) in Peer Connections | Ongoing meetings with Peer Connections staff and Writing Center Director support ongoing collaboration. |
| Exit Exam Prompts Standardized                      | Coordinator Murphy-Wesley merged student IDs and exam numbers for standardized Exit Exam Instructions                  | Fall 2017                                                                     |
| All Hybrid Sections have access to supplemental instruction via “writing lab” support | Ongoing Program Support—the “Open” writing lab consistently provides one-on-one tutoring support for 100w students from 12-5 on Thursdays. | By Fall 2019 the supplemental instruction hybrid model will be a stable and regular component of the 100w program and consideration of additional “open labs” discussed. |
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.

(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.

Faculty utilize Canvas for feedback on all Formal Assignments and weekly lab reports.