Program / Discipline Assessment Report  Academic Year 2008-2009

Program/Discipline: ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
Responsibility: Lindsay Lewan

Discipline's Mission Statement:

The mission of the English Department is to provide world-class education in composition courses at the freshman and sophomore level for both full-time and part-time students in career and transfer programs (including the Core Curriculum Program), as well as for students seeking personal development. To meet the needs of the people in its service area, the Department provides traditional and alternative delivery modes and instructional strategies and technology appropriate to course objectives. It continually assesses student academic achievement for the purpose of ongoing improvement in student learning.

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?

Program’s Curriculum and Teaching Strategies

Our Department’s assessment process is an important tool to help drive pedagogy in the classroom. Our assessment of students’ writing encourages classroom practices that complement effective ways of teaching writing and of becoming a college writer. Because faculty are directly involved in the assessment process, from designing the rubric to scoring the final essays, they are very familiar with the specific learning outcomes of the department, and therefore faculty design essay assignments with these learning outcomes in mind. Essay assignments ask students to form and articulate opinions about some important issue, with time to reflect, to talk to others, to read on the subject, to revise to insure that students are aspiring to succeed in meeting the state’s General Education guidelines.

Our assessment does not focus primarily on the readily accessed, surface features of language—on grammatical correctness or on error, on what is wrong rather than on the appropriate rhetorical choices that writers should make at the college-transfer level. Our assessment is designed to measure what students do well in Communication, Critical Thinking, and Qualitative Reasoning.

Our assessment process assures that students will have their writing evaluated by more than one reader, assures that assessment measures and supports what is taught in the classroom, assures opportunities for faculty to come together to discuss all aspects of assessment: the design of the instruments; the standards to be employed; the interpretation of the results; possible changes in curriculum suggested by the process and results.

Over the years, our Department has worked on diagnosing student strengths and weaknesses in writing high-level essays. The assessment process helps us in the following ways:

1. Plan instructional strategies to address student strengths and weaknesses;

2. Certify student readiness for entry into and exit from classes;

3. Evaluate and describe overall student achievement;

4. Evaluate the effectiveness of our instructional program.
1. **Historical Context** (looking at academic year 2007-08)

   - **Scoring Rubric:** The English Department developed four categories on the essay scoring rubric, one for each learning outcome that we teach in English 121 in relation to writing a college essay: *Thesis, Support, Organization, Grammar/Mechanics*. Each learning outcome is related to critical thinking. Essays are scored twice by ENG faculty, after a norming session, to ensure consistency in the scores for each category. The ENG Department has continued using the same rubric to score our final out-of-class essays for several years, refining the descriptive criteria in each category to assist us in our norming.

   - **Training:** English faculty who score the final set of ENG 121 essays spend time norming the scoring by practicing on sample essays and discussing the scoring criteria for each competency listed on the rubric before they being asked to score essays on their own. Establishing agreement on what constitutes a score of “Proficient” is fundamentally important to the process. During each norming session, we address the language of the rubric, the ease of use of the rubric, and the effectiveness of the rubric. Each essay had two readers, with a third reader for scoring discrepancies of two or more points difference (if one score was below a “3” and one score above). Sample essays demonstrate the level of proficiency for each of the scores on the rubric, and faculty discuss these scores at great length so that we reach consensus before we score the set of final essays.

   - **Rubric Categories:** We have continued to use four separate categories to assess the essays, because these are the key elements of academic writing that we teach in ENG 121. The rubric has been easier to use as an assessment tool with four categories vs. the original three. Essay assignments require students to demonstrate skill in taking a position on an issue (stated in the thesis) and supporting this position with reasons and examples. This scoring guide helps faculty scorers evaluate the essay responses and assign scores on the basis of the effectiveness of the position developed, the clarity and appropriateness of the support used, the organization of the essay, and the language skills displayed.

   - **Low scores for "Organization":** In the 2007-08 academic year, the English Department was discouraged by the low number of students earning the Proficient scores for Organization (55%). This competency typically is the lowest scoring of the four competencies on our rubric.

   - **More students achieving scores higher than “3” (proficient):** During the 2007-08 academic year, a significant number of students achieved scores of 4 and 5 in all three areas—Thesis, Support, and Grammar. In the academic year 2007-08 students earned the highest percent of scores of “4 & 5” in *Thesis* (30%).

   - **Proficient scores for Thesis and Grammar:** In 2007-2008 the competency with the most students achieving scores of "proficient" (3) or higher was *Thesis* (79%). We hope to maintain this high level for the Thesis and increase the number of 3's, 4's and 5's in all other areas for this academic year, 2008-09.

   - **Writing Center support:** Our ACC Writing Center is available to students for tutoring during the entire academic year. We are hoping that this writing support may contribute to higher scores on this year’s essays than on the essays from previous years. The Department will continue to track which writing competencies our students ask for help with when they work with their tutors. Faculty can then coordinate further with the Writing Center tutors by being aware of which competency measures lowest on student end-of-semester essays and can recommend more tutorial assistance with that writing skill.
# Assessment Overview

**Discipline/Program Name**: ENG Department  
**Assessment Year**: 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thesis</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Rubric Graded Essay</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>70% of students earning a “3” or better</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Weak: Misses Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Rubric Graded Essay</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>70% of students earning a “3” or better</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Weak: Misses Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Rubric Graded Essay</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>70% of students earning a “3” or better</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Weak: Misses Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grammar</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Rubric Graded Essay</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>70% of students earning a “3” or better</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Weak: Misses Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue book diagnostic writing</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Pre and Post writing</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Post writing score increase by 2 or more points</td>
<td>Scores increased by an average of 3.18 pts.</td>
<td>Strong: Exceeds Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG090 - ENG121 Retention</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Analysis of Institutional Data</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>70% of returning students who pass ENG121</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Strong: Exceeds Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the Learning Outcome That You Have Measured</td>
<td>GE, Discipline or Other</td>
<td>Pre-Post Test, Judged Competition, Embedded Questions, Rubric Graded Essay</td>
<td>Number of Students Assessed</td>
<td># of Years This Outcome Has Been Assessed</td>
<td>Measurement Standard</td>
<td>Report the Results of Your Data Analysis</td>
<td>Strong: Exceeds Benchmark Neutral: Meets Benchmark Weak: Misses Benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Involving our faculty directly in the development and assessment of student writing provides an opportunity for faculty development and curriculum reform since inevitably both occur when instructors discuss assessment which relates directly to their classrooms and to their students. Faculty meet to review the assessment
outcomes each year, and based on these outcomes, the Department schedules roundtable discussions to address classroom practices that will encourage student learning in each of our identified outcomes. We focus on those areas the show the most deficiency. Student learning in the areas of Thesis, Support, and Grammar continue to hold steady at high levels of proficiency. However, we continue to work with helping students improve their skills in all four areas of writing and hope that we reach our benchmarks of at least 70% earning a “3” or higher in each of the four competencies this year.

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?

We plan to have transfer faculty work closely with developmental faculty to help students prepare for college-level writing in ENG 121.

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.)

The summary report is shared with all English faculty at specifically scheduled assessment meetings; the report is posted on the ACC Website for open access for advisory committees or key stakeholders such as faculty, students, and alumni. Faculty often report changes in their teaching and in their own assessment approaches. In particular, they indicated changes in their expectations for students’ responsibility for their own learning and assessment, in their goals for instruction, and in their use of explicit performance criteria to evaluate student work.

**Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary**

**Previous Academic Year: 2008-09**

| Outcome #: 1 | **Outcome Title:** Students will write multi-paragraph, college-level compositions (essays) that demonstrate competence in the following four critical-thinking areas: Thesis, Support, Organization, Grammar/Mechanics. |
**Outcome Type:** ENGLISH General Ed Communication; Critical Thinking

**Outcome Description:**

### English 121 Program Assessment Rubric
Arapahoe Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5—Excellent</th>
<th>4—Very Good</th>
<th>3—Proficient</th>
<th>2—Developing</th>
<th>1—Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong></td>
<td>● Has controlling idea that contains insight</td>
<td>● Has controlling idea that attempts insight</td>
<td>● Has controlling idea clearly stated or implied</td>
<td>● Controlling idea not clearly stated or implied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Support** | ● Topic Sentences clearly distinguished from thesis  
● All paragraphs adequately supported with evidence relevant to thesis, sophisticated, not trite  
● Essay shows unity | ● Topic sentences clearly distinguished from thesis  
● All paragraphs adequately supported with evidence relevant to thesis, not platitudinous  
● Essay shows unity | ● Topic sentences distinguished from thesis  
● Most paragraphs adequately supported with evidence relevant to thesis  
● Essay shows unity | ● Some topic sentences missing or not clearly distinguished from thesis  
● Paragraphs not adequately supported, (irrelevant or insufficient evidence)  
● Essay not entirely unified | ● Support for thesis missing or seriously inadequate  
● Topic sentences missing or simply repeat thesis  
● Essay lacks unity |
| **Organization** | ● Order is logical for essay’s purpose  
● Transition techniques are smooth and varied | ● Order appropriate to purpose  
● Transitions varied, may not always be most appropriate | ● Order appropriate  
● Transitions may be simplistic or mechanical | ● Order inappropriate  
● Missing transitions, weak coherence | ● Disorganized, or order not clear  
● Essay and paragraphs generally lack coherence |
| **Grammar/Mechanics** | ● Any errors in standard mechanics, grammar, or syntax are insignificant | ● Errors in standard mechanics, grammar, or syntax are relatively minor | ● No major errors in standard mechanics, grammar, or syntax, but errors are noticeable (too many for an out-of-class essay) | ● Errors in standard mechanics, grammar, or syntax interrupt train of thought | ● Errors in standard mechanics, grammar, or syntax interfere with meaning |

**Benchmark for success**

Our goal is a benchmark of at least 70% of students scoring at or above a "3" level in each competency—which is college-level “Proficient” as defined on the scoring rubric developed by English faculty. We determined the benchmark of 70% after discussing at length what a reasonable expectation for student success would look like. Although we strive for a 100% success rate, various obstacles hinder that outcome. A more realistic rate of success became our goal, and this goal has been reached in most outcomes each year we have measured our outcomes.

**Description of assessment process:**

Students from all sections of English 121 submit a copy of their final, out-of-class essay for the department to assess. Students indicate whether they have taken ENG 090 (developmental English) at ACC, and the essays written by these students are put into a separate pile so that we can compare scores as a way of examining success in our Developmental English curriculum by comparing the percent of proficient or higher scores in this group as compared to those in the non-ENG 090 group. A sampling of the rest of the essays (students who did not take Developmental English) is then randomly selected from the remaining group of essays. Fall semester for this past academic year resulted in 225 essays being assessed. Of these randomly selected essays, 50 students indicated that they had taken ENG 090 at ACC.

We use the ENG Department’s holistic rubric, which is a 5-point scale, to evaluate the four key stated learning outcomes of ENG 121. On our scoring rubric, developed internally by the English faculty, and refined over a five-year period, the 5-point scale counts a "3" as being "proficient" in each of the four learning outcomes: **Thesis, Support, Organization, and Grammar/Mechanics**.

Faculty refer to these preestablished criteria to determine the score for each competency in each essay. The reader awards the score that best represents the overall quality of a response. Here quality is defined by the criteria given for each point in the Department’s scoring guide and illustrated by sample essays that exemplify performance at each score point. In determining a score, the reader does not enumerate or selectively weigh particular features of the writing but, rather, makes a summary assessment of the whole.
### Materials for Scoring
- A scoring guide (rubric) that explains the criteria for each score point
- Sample student essays intended to provide solid illustrations of each score point
- Explanations of how the sample student essays fit the scoring guide criteria
- Rangefinders, which are sample student essays intended to demonstrate that some variation is possible in each score point

### Results

The scores for Thesis indicate that we reached our benchmark of at least 70% of students able to write a proficient thesis if the student tested into ENG 121 and did not take ENG 090 (76% of these students earned a 3, 4, or 5). However, only 42% students who took ENG 090 earned a 3, 4, or 5 on their final essay in this competency. The total number of students earning a "proficient or better was 68%. The large number of scores of 1 and 2, 58% of students who took ENG 090, needs to be addressed.

The scores are represented in a bar chart titled "Thesis Scores 2008-09" with the following data:
- "1 & 2":
  - Completed 090: 24%
  - Did not Take 090: 32%
  - Total Students: 58%
- "3":
  - Completed 090: 46%
  - Did not Take 090: 34%
  - Total Students: 80%
- "4 & 5":
  - Completed 090: 44%
  - Did not Take 090: 8%
  - Total Students: 52%
For this competency, only 38% of students who took ENG 090 scored a 3, 4, or 5 on our scale. In contrast, 66% of students who did not take ENG 090 scored a 3 or higher on the scale. That is nearly equal to the number of students who earned a 1 or a two and who had taken ENG 090. The total number of students who earned a 3 or higher for this competency was only 60%.
For Organization, 66% of students who took ENG 090 earned only a 1 or a 2 for this competency, which means just over a third of this group earned a 3 or higher. In addition, more than a third (33%) of non-ENG 090 students earned only a 1 or a 2, suggesting this is the competency that we still must address to help students improve. Only 50% of our total students earned a 3, 4, or 5.
Seventy-four percent of students who tested into ENG 121 scored a 3, 4, or 5 for this competency, so this population did achieve our benchmark. Forty six percent of students who took ENG 090 achieved a 3, 4, or 5. This leaves over half of this population scoring a 1 or a 2 for this competency.
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?

Last year (2007-08) was the first year that the English Department compared the scores of students who had taken ENG 090 to those students who had not. The comparison of scores for each competency (from the last two academic years) for the total number of students can be seen in the following tables:

### Total percent of Students earning a “3, 4, or 5” on each essay competency: 2006-07 and 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>2007-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Mechanics</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total percent of Students earning a “3, 4, or 5” on each essay competency: 2007-08 and 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>2007-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Mechanics</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percent of students who successfully wrote a proficient, or better, thesis declined by 11% when compared to last year’s scores, and we did not meet our benchmark of 70%. The score for support score declined 6% from last year and was also below the benchmark of 70%. While we still did not meet our benchmark for organization, the percent of students who earned a proficient or better increased by 5%. The scores for grammar proficiency remained unchanged at 68%, close to our benchmark. Our goal will continue to be reaching a benchmark of 70% of students earning a “3” or better score in each of the four competencies.

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

This information will be presented to the English Department, including all faculty/instructors from ENG 030 through ENG 122, to discuss strategies for improvement in each area. In addition, we will have “best practices” roundtables during the semester to offer suggestions for classroom practices and assignments. We will continue using the same method of assessment next year to see if scores have improved to achieve or surpass the benchmark.

Issues in terms of curriculum, teaching strategies for department discussion:

1. Discuss scores being so unequal in terms of students who took ENG 090 vs. students who tested into ENG 121 to address preparing ENG 090 students for ENG 121.
2. Work on shortcomings noted by faculty who scored the student essays:
   - Use of correct MLA format (reference the Hacker handbook) beginning with the first essay of the semester
   - Concerns about Narrative/Descriptive essays or reports vs. Analytical/Argument essays.
3. Essay topic selection: See samples of students’ final essays and which topics have led to low scores. (Also, help students understand how the title can help writers focus their essays).
4. General discussion about the causes for the decline in these scores? What can we do to improve scores, quickly, this year!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: 2</th>
<th>Outcome Title: “Blue Book” Pre and Post Writing: Students will demonstrate the ability to write a multiparagraph essay using standard conventions (thesis, support, organization, and grammar) that responds to a reading prompt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outcome Type** | **Discipline** English  
General Ed Communication; Critical Thinking; |
| **Benchmark for success** | We will compare pre and post blue book scores of our ENG 121 students to see if those scores have gone up. Our benchmark for the end of semester blue book score is to have **70% of ENG 121 students raise their composite score by 2 or more points.** The score from the 9-point scale (which is the scores of two readers, added together for a maximum of 18) from the beginning of semester diagnostic (blue book) essays will be compared to the end of semester blue book scores of students who have completed ENG 090 and those who tested into ENG 121 with the appropriate SS and REA scores on our CPT. |
| **Description of assessment process:** | At the beginning of each semester, students in ENG 121 write an in-class diagnostic essay (referred to as the “blue book” essay) which is holistically scored on a 9-point scale modeled on the Educational Testing Service’s AP essay scoring guide and is modified specifically to assess our students’ competencies in the four learning outcomes we have identified. Students then write an end of semester blue book essay which is scored using the same 9-point scale. After extensive norming using sample essays and the 9-point scale, two ENG faculty read each blue-book essay and assign a score. Therefore, students can earn a score ranging from 2-18. The Department measured students’ pre and post “blue book” scores and will use these scores as a second method of assessment. We will compare the scores of ENG 090 students’ final blue book essay to the entry scores of students who tested into ENG 121 and did not take ENG 090 to see how closely aligned these scores are. |

**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:

- **a. Summary**—Complete, accurate, concise.

- **b. Focus of agreement and/or disagreement**—The writer must establish a clear position on the issue. Agreement/disagreement...
sample size?

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.

c. 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.)

The post test scores of our students in ENG 121 did increase by an average of 3.18 points, so we did achieve our benchmark.

What did the department learn?
The post test scores of our students in ENG 121 did increase by an average of 3.18 points, so we did achieve our benchmark.

Student performance summary
Since the average scores for the post test show an increase, we are encouraged by the results. For next year, if we can get the data, we will compare scores of students who took ENG 090 to those who did not take ENG 090 to see if the scores are equivalent or to determine if one group demonstrates a more significant increase in average scores at the end of the semester.

Outcome #: 3
Outcome Title: Retention Information
Outcome Type (choose by bolding): Discipline/Program
Outcome Description: Since Retention is a College goal, the English Department is tracking data for our students enrolled in ENG 121.

Benchmark for success
Before we determine a benchmark, we would like to examine the patterns of enrollment to track the averages.
We examined the enrollment data for all students enrolled in ENG 121, and we looked at retention data for all students as well as for students who had taken ENG 090. In addition, we examined data for students who had taken ENG 060, 090, and then 121 to see the rates of retention for each group. The total enrollment in ENG 121 during Fall 2008 was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Took ENG090 in Fall</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Fall ENG090 Students Taking ENG121 in Spring</th>
<th>% Return</th>
<th>Returners Who Pass</th>
<th>% Returners Who Pass</th>
<th>% Orig. Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For three years our fall enrollments have remained fairly consistent, and the spring percent of students enrolling into ENG 121 after taking ENG 090 has also remained consistent in the past two years. Our benchmark of ENG090 students who then pass ENG 121 is 70%, so we exceeded our expectations for two years in a row.
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)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

This is the second year we have tracked this data, and our benchmark is to have 70% of all students pass ENG 121, whether they took Developmental English or not. The current numbers indicate that the success rate in ENG 121 for students who completed both ENG 060 and ENG 090 (72.1%) is a bit higher than the success rate for students who tested into ENG 121, and it is significantly higher than the success rate for students who took only ENG 090 (64.2%).

The department will continue to work with all composition faculty to ensure that the progression from ENG 060 and ENG 090 builds the skills necessary to succeed in ENG 121. (See comments in earlier sections).

Part 2: Current Academic Year Assessment Plan
Current Academic Year: 2009-10

Intended Learning Outcomes (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
We will continue to measure the same four learning outcomes: Thesis, Support, Organization, Grammar/Mechanics.

Assessment Method(s) (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
We will continue to measure the final out-of-class essay from ENG 121 and the pre- and post-blue book essays from ENG 121 students.

Benchmarks (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
Our benchmarks will remain the same.

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

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 (Tom DeMoulin: tom.demoulin@arapahoe.edu). If you have any questions about the process, please contact the chairperson.