General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title ______ENGL 100W______     GE Area ___________Z____________

Results reported for AY ______2013/2014______ # of sections ____6____ # of instructors ______4____

Course Coordinator: ______Adrienne Eastwood_________     E-mail: Adrienne.Eastwood@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: __Shannon Miller_________________ College: __Humanities and Arts______________

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?

GE SLO 3: “Students shall be able to organize and develop essays and documents for both professional and general audiences, including appropriate editorial standards for citing primary and secondary sources.”

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

Specific Assignments: All instructors of ENGL 100W in the period under review used a final research essay of one sort or another to assess SLO 3 (ATTACHMENT B). These assignments required library research, facility with primary and secondary source materials, and the use of proper MLA standards for citation.

Exactly what students had to demonstrate on assignment to show achievement of the SLO: Students needed to write clearly and effectively for an academic audience, develop and express an academic argument, conduct research on a particular primary text, and incorporate secondary material into their essays using correct MLA formatting.

How assignment was scored (rubric) Breakdown of grade assigned to show how this particular SLO was targeted: A scoring rubric including SLO specific criteria was used by Professors Eastwood and Baer. Professors English and Stork used overall grades for their research essays.
Qualitative analysis: For both semesters, a significant number of students scored either “excellent” or “good” in demonstrating their ability to develop essays, present arguments for an academic audience, write clearly and effectively, conduct library research, and present their findings using MLA guidelines (the standard for study in Literature). Those who failed to perform satisfactorily tended to either miss some of the finer points of MLA documentation or failed to adjust their writing style to suit an academic audience.

In Fall of 2013, Professors Stork and English noted that of the 43 students, 31 scored in the EXCELLENT/GOOD category, 7 were SATISFACTORY and 5 were UNSATISFACTORY. Professor Baer broke SLO 3 into three general areas that were assessed separately. Those were: 1) Clear sense of audience and purpose; 2) Tone, voice, and vocabulary, and 3) MLA proficiency (SEE ATTACHMENT A for Baer’s report). Overall, of 23 students, 6 students scored EXCELLENT/GOOD in all categories, 15 were SATISFACTORY, and 2 were UNSATISFACTORY.

In Spring of 2014, Professor Stork used an overall assessment method and found that of her 20 students, 16 scored in the EXCELLENT/GOOD category, 2 were SATISFACTORY, and 2 were UNSATISFACTORY. Professors Eastwood and Baer broke the SLO into three target areas that were assessed separately (as before). Of their 41 students, the scores were broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Specific criteria</th>
<th># of students who scored EXCELLENT-GOOD</th>
<th># of students who scored SATISFACTORY</th>
<th># of students who scored UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear sense of audience and purpose</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tone, voice, vocabulary</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MLA documentation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of the different methods for data collection, a significant number of students met the requirements generally identified in GE SLO-3. While the results are skewed because some instructors (Baer and Eastwood) collected data specific to target areas, others (English and Stork) did not use this method.

(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.)

Next year, our goal is to standardize the collection and recording of assessment data for all instructors of ENGL 100W. The rubric created by Professor Baer and provided here as Attachment A will serve as a guideline for all instructors, and assessment data will be collected so that SLO specific content and skills are targeted by all instructors.
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?

They do, and the adjustments proposed for this year will likely make the assessment more effective.
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**Part 1**

To be completed by the course coordinator:

**(1) What SLO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?**

SLO 3: Students shall be able to organize and develop essays and documents for both professional and general audiences, including appropriate editorial standards for citing primary and secondary sources.

Note: This is the same SLO assessed in AY12-13 per approved GE assessment schedule for this course.

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

For our assessment, faculty measured student work (on several assignments, including the final given Fall 2013) using a rubric. Over 80% of students were able to demonstrate the ability to write to different audiences by explaining terms, changing diction and syntax, and organizing information differently and appropriately based on audience needs. However, this number is down from last year’s assessment. This could be because we have different faculty teaching the course and these faculty have set higher standards, or this could be some other anomaly. The percentage who failed this assignment is slightly higher than the percentage of students who receive a C- grade or lower (and have to repeat the course). That is, students might fail the assessment but pass the class.

The following table shows the breakdown of the assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Fails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw #</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(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.)

We have no planned changes other than ensuring new GE guidelines are followed and submitting a new assessment schedule.

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?

All sections are in compliance. No actions are planned, though the hiring of a new Writing Across the Curriculum Director is likely to improve assessment and outcomes in these and other 100 courses.