General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title __KIN100W Writing Workshop__       GE Area __________Z________________________

Results reported for AY __2016-2017__       # of sections __10____       # of instructors ___6____

Course Coordinator: __Daniel Murphy__________       E-mail: __daniel.murphy@sjsu.edu__________

Department Chair: __Matthew Masucci__________       College: CASA____________________________

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?

Fall 2016 - GELO 5: Students shall be able to locate, organize, and synthesize information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose, and to communicate that purpose in writing.

Spring 2017 - GELO 1: Students shall be able to produce discipline-specific written work that demonstrates upper-division proficiency in: language use, grammar, & clarity of expression.

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

SLO#5: 5 sections (3 section assessed), 71 students assessed. 89% demonstrated average or higher achievement of this GELO; 64% demonstrated a high level of achievement.

Student mastery of GELO#5 was assessed by grading student performance on the “Outline” (10% of overall grade). Students researched and developed a detailed annotated outline built out of the annotated bibliography assignment. It included a minimum of 13 scholarly sources published within the past 10 years. The purpose of this assignment was to locate, organize, and synthesize academic research effectively in order to better develop a comprehensive framework for the scholarly research paper assignment. Students created hierarchical ordering of the major sections of an APA literature paper: title page, TOC, abstract, Introduction, methods, L1 headers, discussion, and ref page. It was required that students included the major points they intended to make, used complete phrasing, included key words, cited header designations, and placed references after sub-bullet points. Students synthesized information from a wide range of relevant sources, both print and electronic, relevant to the outline, which were balanced, and critically evaluated for credibility and objectivity. Students engaged in logical organization with unity developed from the thesis and clear connections among ideas. Student outlines were graded on proper grammar, spelling, structure, detail, bulleted, APA format and citation style, organization, clarity, punctuation, depth of detail, formatting, use of headers, use of sub-bullets, levels of headings, reference choices, and reference amount. Length was 3-5pp. The outline satisfied course learning objectives a, b, c, e, and f.

SLO#1: 5 sections (3 section assessed), 68 students assessed. 88% demonstrated average or higher achievement of this GELO; 46% demonstrated a high level of achievement.

Student mastery of GELO#1 was assessed by grading student performance on the “Scholarly Research Paper” (20% of overall grade; min 2,500 words), not including the title, TOC, abstract, and references
The final scholarly research paper involved the development of a focused and thoughtful research question and thesis that involved collection and synthesis of challenging significant research. Students synthesized information from a wide range of relevant sources, both print and electronic, relevant to the thesis, and critically evaluated these sources for credibility. Students engaged in logical topic organization with unity developed from the thesis and clear connections among ideas. Grading focused was, in part, placed on whether the cited researchers’ ideas were integrated smoothly with paraphrased and quoted material with all conclusions clearly supported by relevant, convincing evidence. Students were graded on how effectively they communicated the results of research to convey an original understanding (researcher’s voice) with clear, unified concluding ideas. Evaluation also criteria included: (a) development of clear thesis, research questions, objectives, and scope; (b) synthesis, critical analysis and application of the literature; (c) adherence to the assignment guidelines; (d) citations, references, and format; (e) syntax, grammar, and spelling; (f) originality and creativity. Detailed grading rubrics were provided on the course Canvas sites.

(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 course coordinator will continue to meet with all 100W course instructors to further discuss GELO realignment with preexisting assignments, or develop new assignments, to meet criteria of the new GELOs listed in University Policy S14-5. Across KIN 100W courses, the same assignments will continue to be used by all instructors to assess each GELO in order to improve coordination, analysis, and reporting of GELO data. GELO#5 under University Policy S14-5 was implemented in Fall 2014. An assessment schedule for the new GELOs was developed and implemented at the start of Fall 2014 semester. Data collection for the new GELOs began Fall 2014.

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

As mentioned above, the course coordinator will continue to work closely with G.E. committee members, the undergraduate committee chair, and KIN100W course instructors to align assignments with new GELOs. Formal and informal meetings are held to discuss best practices in the course and to ensure that all instructors meet the new guidelines established in S14-5. A detailed Canvas site is regularly maintained where course materials, GE data, and more are housed and accessed by all instructors and the Department Chair.

(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.

This Area Z course is offered in Fall/Spring semesters, with 5 sections offered per semester, has a maximum cap of 25 students per section. Students meet and exceed the minimum word count through an extensive series of research writing assignments including: Topic Proposal (1,500 words), Annotated Bibliography (4,500 words), Abstract (200 words); Problem Statement (1,200 words), Outline (1,200 words), Final Paper Rough Drafts x2 (2,400), Final Paper (3,600 words) for a minimum total of 14,600 words. In addition, all assignments (accompanied with detailed rubrics and supporting materials) are uploaded to Canvas and linked to Turnitin.com. To ensure student success, students are encouraged to use campus resources including Writing Center, Peer Connections, Library Services, & the CASA Student Success Center on a regular basis.
General Education Course Assessment Form

Course: **KIN 100W Writing Workshop**   Instructor: **Matt Crockett**   Section: **5**   Semester/Year: **Fall 2017**

(1) **Which GELOs were assessed during the semester?**

GELO #2 - 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) **How was this GELO assessed?**

(Note: Course grades or an overall exam grade do NOT provide evidence of student achievement of the GELO. Specific assignments (or parts of assignments), or responses to exam questions targeted at this GELO are examples of ways that student achievement on specific GELOs can be assessed.)

**Empirical Problem Statement:** Student achievement of GELO#2 was assessed using the Problem Statement (SLO #2, 5-10% of overall grade), wherein students developed a hypothetical empirical, fact-based research study based on a topic related to the overall thesis of their final literature review research papers. The main sections included: introduction, literature review, methods, results, and discussion. Length of the assignment was 4-6pp., with a min of 3 peer review references, including at least x1 .gov source, with a title and references page (approx.1000 – 1500 words). Students were expected to choose a topic in their sub-discipline of kinesiology. Evaluation criteria included: (a) development of clear sections, flow of sections, and hierarchy of sections; (b) adherence to the APA assignment guidelines; (c) citations, references, and format; (d) syntax, grammar, and spelling; (d) originality and creativity; and (e) relationship to final paper topic; and (f) how effectively they organized Level 1 through Level 3 headers. This assignment was shaped to teach students how to explain, analyze, develop, and criticize ideas effectively, including ideas encountered in multiple readings and expressed in different forms of discourse in kinesiology. Detailed grading rubrics, handouts, and guidelines were provided on the course Canvas sites.

(3) **What were the results of the assessment for this GELO(s)?**

- Students who average a B+ or higher on assessment activities are considered to have mastered the GELO at a high level.
- Students who average between a B and a C on assessment activities are considered to have mastered the GELO at an average level.
- Students who average a C- or lower on assessment activities are considered to have failed to master the GELO or to have achieved a marginal level of mastery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Assessed*</th>
<th>Number Achieving High Level (B+ or higher)</th>
<th>Number Achieving Average Level (B to C)</th>
<th>Number Achieving Marginal Level (C- or lower)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Should equal number of students achieving high, average, and marginal levels.

(4) **What lessons, if any, were learned from the assessment?**

Students completed the problem statement as their final assignment in the course, which allowed them to benefit from a semester of reading and writing about empirical research before designing their own experiment. Additionally, students benefited from an entire class period devoted to designing and conducting a very simple experiment in groups prior to completing their own problem statement. I randomly split the students into 3 groups and gave them loose instructions to design and conduct an original experiment to ascertain what type and/or intensity of exercise would produce the greatest improvement in cognitive function. I provided students with a brief research
prospectus and literature review on the relationship between exercise and cognitive function, and then allowed them flexibility to figure out how they would define their research question and design their study’s methodology. The lone requirement was that students had to use the Stroop color word test as their method of assessing cognitive function. The type and intensity of exercise, timing, number of subgroups, and other methodological considerations were up to each specific group. Students reported that the in-class exercise was not only fun (as they were able to practically apply their knowledge of kinesiology) but also helpful in teaching them how to approach a research question with critical thinking. As a result, scores on the problem statement were much better than in previous semesters, with every student receiving a solid “B” (84) or higher.

Based on this information, do you plan any modifications to the course, assignments, or teaching methodologies to help improve student achievement of this GELO? If no modifications are planned, indicate this.
(Note: For some GE courses, modifications to the course or assignments must be decided by all faculty teaching the course.)

No modifications are planned.