General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: ENGL 100W: Writing Workshop
GE Area: Z

Results reported for AY: 14-15
# of sections: 3
# of instructors: 3

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 assessed 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

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Standard</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSESSED</td>
<td>34</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 6% of students failed to meet the standard. About half the students met the standard, which means their writing, on a sentence level, is adequate, while another 41% write quite well on a sentence level.

One instructor noted that she included only the students who finished the course. She had 6 drop or fail to submit a final essay. Among those who completed the class, all students were able to write clearly and use a proper academic tone. Those 7 who exceeded the objective also excelled in grammar and punctuation. The 10 who met the objective still had some persistent errors in punctuation, particularly comma use, word choice, and agreement.

The other instructor noted that students who do not meet the standards fail largely on the first and third points on the scoring guide: inability to command the new vocabulary of literary analysis and argument and to produce the precision of word choice this sort of textual description and analysis requires, and inability to control syntax to weave together observation and research, summary and analysis, into coherent, clear sentences. Students are generally able to present evidence but have not yet controlled words and syntax to produce clarity of argument.

In short, we learned that students have trouble with sentence-level issues that undermine the clarity of their arguments.

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.

In order to align our assessment schedule for this course with the University’s GE Assessment Calendar, we will be assessing the same SLO again next year.

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.
General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

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

Results reported for AY: 14-15  # of sections: 8  # of instructors: 6

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 assessed 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

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>38</th>
<th>22%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Standard</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSESSED</td>
<td>169</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.

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.

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.

In order to align our assessment schedule for this course with the University’s GE Assessment Calendar, we will be assessing the same SLO again next year.

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?

(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.