## Assessment Overview

**Discipline/Program Name**: English & Reading College Preparatory Studies (Developmental Studies)  
**Assessment Year**: 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strength of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Communication & Critical Thinking | Discipline | Pre-Post Assessment | 1,313 | 9       | Student scores increased by +2.5 over the semester | ENG060: +2.6  
ENG090: +2.5 | Strong |
| 2. Reading Comprehension & Skills Proficiency | Discipline | Pre-Post Assessment | 770   | 2       | 70% proficiency in each course | Benchmark exceeded in all cases | Strong |
| 3. Retention & Success Rates | SLO | Institutional Research | 2,083 | 3       | 72% student success rate | ENG030:79%  
ENG060:71%  
ENG090:68%  
REA030:80%  
REA060:68%  
REA090:64% | ENG: Neutral to Strong  
REA: Neutral to Weak |
| 4. N/A | | | | | | |

Describe the Learning Outcome That You Have Measured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strength of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SLO, Discipline or Other | Pre-Post Test, Judged Competition, Embedded Questions, Rubric Graded Essay | Number of Students Assessed | # of Years This Outcome Has Been Assessed | Measurement Standard | Report the Results of Your Data Analysis | Strong: Exceeds Benchmark  
Neutral: Meets Benchmark  
Weak: Misses Benchmark |

Recommendation: Complete this Assessment Overview Table after you have completed your Assessment Summary in the following template.
Program / Discipline Assessment Report

Program/Discipline: Liberal Arts and Professional Programs: College Preparatory Studies English & Reading
Responsibility: Michelle Van de Sande: Overall Report & Reading    Leah Regin-Roper: English Data

Program/Discipline's Mission Statement:
The College Preparatory Studies Program’s mission in a learning-centered college is to provide basic academic skills to prepare students for success and retention in transfer level core courses and vocational programs. The College Preparatory Studies Program is committed to improving student learning through continuous assessment which guarantees student access to quality education, job readiness, and personal growth and satisfaction. The purpose is simply to “develop” students to a point whereupon they are ready and able to succeed in college transfer and career and technical courses.

Program/Discipline's Assessment History:
By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, how has it previously affected your program's curricula and/or teaching strategies?

- By having a beginning-of-semester and an end-of-semester in-class summary/response essay examination or College Preparatory Studies classes have become more academically rigorous because faculty and instructors understand the importance of scores improving over the course of the semester, as do students.
- Over the past six years, the faculty of College Preparatory Studies has responded to assessment data from September 2004 that found that students’ skills of summarization were weak. We revised curriculum to increase the number of formal summaries to a minimum of five and promoted more consistency in grading criteria in all levels of composition instruction. Beginning fall 2006, ENG 090 courses requires a minimum of 5 summaries, ENG060 courses requires 3 summaries, and REA090 faculty and instructors emphasize summary writing in activities for reading comprehension.
- College Prep and transfer-level course faculty and instructors continue to meet together at the beginning and end of each term to score pre-and post-writing blue book assessments. Blue Book assessments contain a summary and a response to a college-level published article. Many College Prep faculty and instructors conduct mid-semester blue book assessments to prepare students for the end-or-semester post-writing assessment.

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, what changes to student learning have been noted?

- Student success and retention has increased due to an increased confidence in writing skills gained through the College Prep courses. The BlueBook provides evidence for the students and the department of the increased abilities. Likewise reading students see an increased score on their post-assessment.
- High academic standards are implemented in all College Preparatory Studies courses. Students realize that they must achieve a grade of 70% or higher to move on to the next course in the sequence. Students are exposed to the pre-assessments in both reading and English during the first week of class.
- Students understand that they are able to transfer their reading and writing abilities to read and understand a college-level textbook and to write an essay in another transfer-level course.

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?
• Students that fall below the minimum the minimum cut-off score of 25 needed to be referred to an Adult Basic Education program outside our school. We do not have the systems in place to help these students succeed at the college level.
• After the pre-assessment in both English and reading some students needed to move up to the next level or down to a lower level based upon their scores. This helped benefit the students by placing them in the class where they can have the most success.
• Several students that took the lowest level English or reading course (030) placed in a higher level course, but these students want to build their confidence and refresh skills and remained in the lowest level courses. Often, once the skills and confidence increased, they skipped the next course in the sequence (060) and took the final course (090)

Who receives information about your department's assessment and why? (Please note if you plan on altering either of these items for the coming year.)

This report is shared with all faculty and instructors in our College Preparatory Studies department. It is also shared with our College Preparatory Task Force. Sharing with the College Preparatory Task Force was added this year.

Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary

Previous Academic Year: 2010-11

Please duplicate or remove the tables on the following pages for each outcome you have assessed. If you have assessed five outcomes in the last year, use/create five tables. (For your convenience, four tables have been generated, two Discipline/Program related and two Student Learning related.)

(To select an entire table, hover over part of the table; an icon should appear with four arrows in the table’s upper-left corner ... click on it. You can also drag over all the cells of the table to select it.) Once selected, choose Edit>Copy, click in the space immediately following the table, and choose Edit>Paste.

Last year we used the same 3 methods to assess our College Preparatory Studies program and added persistence data to our retention data:
1. Blue Book diagnostic pre and post assessment
2. Reading pre and post assessment
3. Retention and persistence data generated from Institutional Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: Communication/Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Outcome Title: “Blue Book” Pre and Post Writing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type</strong> (choose one): Discourse/Program □ SLO □ Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If <strong>Student Learning Outcome</strong> (choose one): Communication □ Society and Culture/Diversity and Global Awareness □ Problem Solving/Critical Thinking □ Quantitative Reasoning □ Technology □ Interpersonal Skills/Leadership and Teamwork □ Aesthetics □ Values and Ethics □ Information Management □ Personal Development and Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Description:</strong> Students will demonstrate the ability to write a multiparagraph essay using standard conventions (thesis, support, organization, and grammar) that responds to a reading prompt in a timed setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

**Description of assessment process:**

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

**Assessment Method:** 9-point rubric

Blue Book--Pre and Post Writing Scoring Guide

Your score should reflect your judgment of the essay's quality as a whole. Students have only an hour to read and write, so remember to evaluate it as a first draft. Read supportively and reward them for what they do well.

9 – 8 The upper-range responses satisfy the following criteria:

- **Summary**—Complete, accurate, concise.
- **Focus of agreement and/or disagreement**—The writer must establish a clear position on the issue. Agreement/disagreement with the author's point of view may be complete or partial, but the writer must establish and maintain the focus of his or her argument.

- **Support for agreement/disagreement**—Support should provide relevant, concrete, and distinctive examples or
reasons from the writer’s experience or general knowledge. The writer may also provide an analysis of the summarized article.

d. **Style and coherence**—Upper range papers demonstrate clear style, overall organization, consecutive thought, often a strong voice. They contain few errors in usage, grammar, or mechanics.

7 This score should be used for papers that fulfill the basic requirements for 9-8, but have less development, support and analysis.

5 – 6 Middle range papers omit or are deficient in one of the four criteria:

a. **Summary**—Summary absent, inaccurate, incomplete, or inadequate.

b. **Focus of Agreement/disagreement**—What the writer is agreeing/disagreeing with is not clear or is not related to the main issues of the summarized essay.

c. **Support**—Writer only asserts or counter-asserts; writer’s examples are highly generalized or not distinguishable from examples given in the article; analysis of the debate maybe fallacious, irrelevant or thin.

d. **Style and Coherence**—These papers are loosely organized or contain noticeable errors in usage, grammar, or mechanics.

4 This grade should be used for papers that fulfill the basic requirements of 6-5 grade but are slightly weaker or seem off topic. (Different from addressing a minor point in the original.)

3 – 2 Lower range papers are deficient in two or more of the criteria—typically they have no summary and no support. Often these papers are preachy, clichéd, or platitudinous OR they have serious development, organization, or coherence problems.

Papers with serious, repeated errors in usage, grammar, or mechanics OR papers with significant focus or coherence problems that seriously disrupt communication must be given a 2.

1 This grade should be given to a paper with overwhelming problems.

**Note:** An essay written in fluent, stylistic prose may be scored one point higher than the guide would normally permit.
Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

In ENG 090, the exit class from college preparatory studies, students’ average score on the Pre test was 7.376 and on the Post test was 9.916, so we exceeded our benchmark which was to have the average score increase by at least 2 points. The average score increased by 2.6 points. Last year the average score increased by 2.5 points, showing that we are in a similar range as last year and are continuing to exceed our benchmarks as a department.

It is also worth noting how close the end-of-semester scores for ENG 060 are to the beginning-of-semester scores for ENG 090. The easy answer is that the students are picking up where they left off in ENG 060, but because many students test directly into ENG 090, this is not the entire answer. We think this data also shows that we are properly placing students who test into ENG 090. Overall, students who take ENG 060 and students who test into 090 are showing very similar scores, making the classes feel like a strong pipeline between one another.

Student performance summary
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

Since the average scores for the post test show an increase of more than 2, we are encouraged by the results. It is particularly interesting to note that students at the end of ENG 090 are testing slightly higher than students at the beginning of ENG 121 (see chart below). Students are beginning ENG 121 with an average score of 9.358 and are ending ENG 090 with an average score of 9.916.
We believe this shows that students continuing to transfer-level classes from our college preparatory department are at least as prepared for success as students who are testing into ENG 121.
**Outcome:** Reading Proficiency  

**Outcome Title:** REA 030, 060, & 090 – Pre and Post Assessments

**Outcome Type** (choose one):  
- [x] Discipline/Program  
- [ ] SLO  
- [ ] Other

If **Student Learning Outcome** (choose one):  
- [ ] Communication  
- [ ] Society and Culture/Diversity and Global Awareness  
- [ ] Problem Solving/Critical Thinking  
- [ ] Quantitative Reasoning  
- [ ] Technology  
- [ ] Interpersonal Skills/Leadership and Teamwork  
- [ ] Aesthetics  
- [ ] Values and Ethics  
- [ ] Information Management  
- [ ] Personal Development and Responsibility

**Outcome Description:**  
Students in all levels of reading classes are tested in the beginning (pre) and at the end (post) of the semester via a standardized reading diagnostic that breaks reading skills into categories related on the reading level per section.

**Benchmark for success**  
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.  
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

Students should reach a benchmark of 70% or above in each skill area, at the end of the semester. Scores reveal that most students enter the semester at or below 70% proficiency – this is the reason they test into the class. If students test at an average of 70% or more, this will demonstrate appropriate student academic growth.

**Description of assessment process:**  
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review)?  
2) How do these methods show students are learning?  
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?  
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1.) In the fall and spring semesters, reading 030, 060, and 090 students are given a pre and post reading assessment. The pre and post assessment measure the same skill areas.  
2.) If the post assessment results show a higher score for the post assessments as compared to the pre assessment, this shows an increase in student growth and understanding.  
3.) This is an assessment that is given each semester.  
4.) There are approximately 60-030 students’ scores, 350-060 students’ scores, and 600-090 students’ scores collected each semester during the academic year.
Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

REA 030 PRE AND POST TEST SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>83.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REA 060 PRE AND POST TEST SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.16</td>
<td>73.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

REA030
1.) Students in REA030 showed substantial growth. The scores surpassed the set benchmark of 70%.
2.) The data shows that the pre and post test scores were slightly lower than the previous year (69/88); however, there was a significant increase in the amount of REA030 students taking the assessment.

REA060
1.) Students in REA060 showed significant growth. The scores slightly passed the set benchmark of 70%.
2.) The data shows that the pre and post test scores were higher than the previous year (64/71).

REA090
1.) Students in REA090 showed higher than average growth. These scores strongly surpassed the set benchmark of 70%.
2.) The data shows that the pre and post test scores were almost equal to the previous year (62/80).

Student performance summary
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

1.) The reading department would classify these results as average to strong. The REA030 results showed a slight decline, but the number of students in the course tripled. The REA060 results slightly surpassed the benchmark. The REA090 results showed a constant level of improvement over the pre-test that was equal to the previous year.
2.) The reading department plans to continue focus on these specific academic skills measured in each of the assessments. The skills will be measured on the pre and post test, and they will be assessed throughout the semester through formative and summative classroom assessments. We will continue to hold department planning, skill development and best practices workshops for each reading course.
prefix. These workshops will help inform progress and keep all instructors on the same track with progress. We will focus on an identified weakness in reading skills as measured in the test. Critical reading remains on the lower end of REA060 and REA090 assessments. It is not measured at the REA030 level. Since this is an identified skill students need for transfer level courses, the emphasis will take place through supplemental online learning for students and workshops for instructors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: <strong>Success Rates</strong></th>
<th>Outcome Title: <strong>Student Success Rates: Personal Development and Responsibility</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type</strong> (choose one): [ ] Discipline/Program  [X] SLO  [ ] Other</td>
<td><strong>Outcome Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If <strong>Student Learning Outcome</strong> (choose one): [ ] Communication  [ ] Society and Culture/Diversity and Global Awareness  [ ] Problem Solving/Critical Thinking  [ ] Quantitative Reasoning  [ ] Technology  [ ] Interpersonal Skills/Leadership and Teamwork  [ ] Aesthetics  [ ] Values and Ethics  [ ] Information Management  [X] Personal Development and Responsibility</td>
<td>Students demonstrate a growth in Personal Development and Responsibility by succeeding in ENG030, 060 and/or 090 AND/OR REA030, 060, and/or 090. In order to be successful in any of these courses, students must be responsible and successful in College Preparatory Studies classes that they experience and grow in person development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Benchmark for success**  
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.  
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure? | The English/Reading Department has set an overall success rate goal of 72%, and is meeting this benchmark in ENG at the 030, 060, and 121. ENG090 success rates are 1% below this goal; however, the rates are trending upward. Targeted instructor professional development efforts are planned for February. Faculty concur that fall 2011 030 success rates are an anomaly, and are not sustainable.  
The English/Reading Department has set an overall success rate goal of 72%, and is meeting this benchmark in Reading at the 030 and 090 levels. REA 060 success rates are 1% below this goal; however, the rates are trending upward. Targeted instructor professional development efforts are planned for February. Faculty note that students enrolled on 060 and 090 reading courses are generally taking other classes at the College; thus, their course load is higher and the level of difficulty is greater. This could be impacting the success rates in 060. |
| **Description of assessment process:**  
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review)?  
2) How do these methods show students are learning?  
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?  
4) How many students made up the sample size? | Institutional Research data provided below. |
Results
What were the results of the assessment process?
(List results for each method, if more than one were used.)
As the College continues to adjust to the increased demand for college preparatory courses, faculty and administration remain concerned about student success rates and persistence to the next course in the sequence. College preparatory students in the CCCS hold an average success rate of 70%. At ACC the overall institutional average success rate is 74%. The charts below depict four-year success rate trends for ACC students in specific college preparatory classes.

**What did the department learn?**
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

**Student performance summary**
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?

1.) “Success” for students in college preparatory classes is best determined by success in the next course in the sequence more so than the pass rate per class. This makes Reading students
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2)</th>
<th>particular difficulty to track (there is no college-level course required in Reading).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.)</td>
<td>ENG 030 classes are only 2 credit hours. Students who test into these courses often need extra class time and supplemental instruction. Since these classes are only scheduled for 50 minutes, the instructors are available and remain in the classroom to work with students for an additional 25 minutes to provide additional instruction for any students that need/want to stay (and are thus remunerated for one additional credit hour). ENG and REA 030 success rates trending up, and faculty report that the number of students who stay for the extra hour is significant (Note: in most cases, the instructor simply teaches for the entire 75 minutes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>All college preparatory faculty, instructors, and instructional deans meet together each semester for facilitated meetings that focus on best practices, questions pertaining to the college preparatory student population, goal and progress review, and best classroom practices for teaching and assessment. The meetings are planned and facilitated by Reading/English faculty member, Michelle Van de Sande.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>This spring, a conference-style full-day of professional development is planned for faculty in college preparatory AAA, ENG, and REA faculty and instructors. Participants will be remunerated through the CCCS collaborative TAA grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>The ENG and REA college prep faculty continue to make use of a faculty Wiki, which was created last year. The Wiki serves as a storage place for shared assessments, assignments, and instructional tools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2: Current Academic Year Assessment Plan

- Two or more instruments of measuring an objective may provide greater clarity and validity, but only one is required. The department or program makes the decision. The Program Assessment committee and deans are available for consultation.

- In the past, some programs have been identified purely by prefix or in some cases by the type of section offered. Sometimes, a very limited pool of students have been available for such a program to assess, or the program lacks full-time faculty to plan, assess, and report outcomes. If your program has such difficulties, please contact either the Program Assessment committee’s chair or your School’s Program Assessment committee representative. We will work with you to find a solution.

- CTE programs with external accreditation may use the accreditation report to in addition or in lieu of these forms, please contact the Program Assessment committee representative if this format is desired. In absence of this contact, these forms are expected.

- Outcomes are to be measured annually. Exceptions are made with VPI approval for outcomes that clearly need a less (or more) frequent review.

Outcome minimums

- At least two outcomes are to be program/discipline-related.

- At least two outcomes must be chosen from the new Learning Outcomes for Student and Employee Enrichment (page 11). One Learning Outcome should be continued from the prior year to develop a historical trend. Learning Outcomes must be assessed and reported annually, regardless of the frequency of reporting for other outcomes.

- Both outcomes above are classified as "student learning" outcomes, requiring benchmarks and analysis. It is strongly recommended that you use the table provided in Part 1 of this report for this function. Definitions and examples of these outcomes are provided in Appendix A at the end of this document. Your Program Assessment committee is available to assist.

- An assessment report is requested annually.
Current Academic Year: 2011-2012

Intended Learning Outcomes (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
The College Preparatory Studies Department will continue to measure the same learning outcomes.

Assessment Method(s) (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
The College Preparatory Studies Department will continue to measure the same assessment methods.

Benchmarks (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
The College Preparatory Studies Department will continue to use the same benchmarks.

Have you submitted a separate budget worksheet? (Choose by bolding; for information about this worksheet, please refer to the specific budgeting e-mail sent by the committee chairperson.)

Yes    No

Please submit this report (including both last year's summary and this year's plan) in a Word document to the Program Assessment committee chairperson (Cheyne Bamford: cheyne.bamford@arapahoe.edu). If you have any questions about the process, please contact the chairperson.