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ENGLISH

STUDENTS WILL WRITE MULTI-PARAGRAPH, COLLEGE-LEVEL COMPOSITIONS THAT DEMONSTRATE COMPETENCE

Measure 1
Type: Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1
Description: Analytical measures were utilized for reporting all seven of the discipline outcomes.

Rubric refined to include seven key criteria on a 5 point scale:

Comprehension, thesis, support, organization, grammar, information technology

Sample size- 35

Pre & Post – Week 2 and Week 14 of term

2 page reading prompt

Timed, in-class summary and response essay (75 min)

Faulty uploaded 3-5 random samples to designated slots in a D2L assessment sand

Norming session - Faculty norm via 3 rangefinder sample essays followed by discus

Faculty scored remotely via D2L

Two reads – double blind & scores recorded via an Excel spreadsheet

Scores transferred to master spreadsheet & results totaled
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>5 (Excellent)</th>
<th>4 (Very Good)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>- Accurate and profound understanding of topic and thesis</td>
<td>- Mostly accurate comprehension of topic thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Uses terms and principles from the text in fresh ways</td>
<td>- Uses terms and principles from the text in accurate ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>- Well crafted</td>
<td>- Clearly attempt original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Original</td>
<td>- Attempt original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>- Sophisticated evidence and support relevant to thesis</td>
<td>- All supporting evidence and relevant to thesis (rarely platitude)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Topic sentences clearly distinguished from thesis</td>
<td>- Topic sentences clearly distinguished from the thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Well-crafted unity</td>
<td>- Unified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>- Order is logical</td>
<td>- Organized order is times ineffecti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Smooth, varied, subtle transitions</td>
<td>- Effective transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>- Few to no errors</td>
<td>- Minor errors occur sporadically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>- Source material incorporated gracefully and accurately.</td>
<td>- Most so material incorporated smoothly and accurately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>- Source material powerfully</td>
<td>- Most so material advance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measure 1

**Sample Size:** 35

1) **Describe the benchmark for this measure.**

Students should demonstrate competency in forming a thoughtful thesis statement, that thesis. The desired benchmarks are an overall average of 3 out of 5 and a score of at least 60% of students scoring at or above an average.

2) **What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?**

We determined the benchmark of 60% after discussing at length what a reasonable obstacles hinder that outcome. A more realistic rate of success became our goal, an

### Measure 2

**Type:** Direct

**Other**

### This Discipline Outcome was:

Met benchmark

### Measure 1 Results:

The percent of students earning a “3” (Proficient) or better on Thesis was 68% which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Pre-Post/Timed Writing Rubric Scored</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Pre-Post/Timed Writing Rubric Scored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source integration and documentation</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Pre-Post/Timed Writing Rubric Scored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support**

**Source integration and documentation**

**Discipline**

- Pre-Post/Timed Writing Rubric Scored: 35
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The department fell slightly short of the 70% of students meeting a 3 or higher on the assessment.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

The results in the area of thesis are down about 10% from previous years of analysis.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department

Missed benchmark
rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

The department rates the performance in the area of Thesis and Support as adequate.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

These results will inform classroom instruction and faculty discussion of what constitutes should be pulled from the assessment artifacts and presented to faculty as example.

Further Action:

Further Action Planned

Describe the action plan:

Faculty workshops on thesis development
Continue faculty discussion and training via the pre & post scoring sessions and roundtable discussions

Target Date for implementation of the action

08/19/2015

Priority

Medium
### Students Will Write Multi-Paragraph, College-Level Compositions That Demonstrate Competence in Writing Analysis and Argument in Support of a Thesis and Demonstrates Competence in Critical Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1 Type:</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubric-graded report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measure 1 Sample Size: | 35 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.</th>
<th>The benchmark for this objective is 3.0 out of 5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please select</td>
<td>Met benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Discipline Outcome was:</th>
<th>Met benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1 Results:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

   The unit performance was below the desired 70% benchmark; however, the average of 3.0 in this criteria shows basic competence.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

   The previous year was not assessed analytically, but holistically, and therefore nor comparable.

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year

   The department regards the results of this outcome to be acceptable.

---

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

None
in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

**Further Action:** Further Action Unnecessary

**Person/ Group responsible for action**

Chris Nordquist

**Target Date for implementation of the action**

01/30/2015

**Priority**

Low

---

**STUDENTS WILL WRITE MULTI-PARAGRAPH, COLLEGE-LEVEL COMPOSITIONS THAT DEMONSTRATE COMPETENCE IN STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION**

**Measure 1 Type:** Direct

Please select

**Measure 1 Description:**

Please select

---

**Measure 1 Results:**

55% of samples met the 3.0 benchmark.

Samples scored on this criteria a 2.9 - Just under the benchmark of 3.0
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The department performance in this area fell slightly short of the benchmark goal.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

Previous terms not measured analytically, but holistically and results are similar.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Missed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

No affect.
3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

**Further Action:**

Further Action Unnecessary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS WILL WRITE MULTI-PARAGRAPH, COLLEGE-LEVEL COMPOSITIONS THAT DEMONSTRATE COMPETENCE IN GRAMMAR AND MECHANICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Discipline Outcome was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surpassed benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure 1 Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The performance slightly exceeded the benchmark. 70% of students met the 3.0 benchmark with an overall average of 3.2 in this criteria.

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of

The performance on this discipline object rated as minimally adequate college-level.
strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary

STUDENTS WILL WRITE MULTI-PARAGRAPH, COLLEGE-LEVEL COMPOSITIONS THAT DEMONSTRATE COMPETENCE IN SELECTING AND INCORPORATING RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Author(s)</th>
<th>Chris Nordquist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Type:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Description:</td>
<td>Students will write a summary and response to a reading prompt in a timed situation. This writing opportunity will be offered pre-term and post-term. Students will be evaluated via a rubric with seven criteria and 5 levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Sample Size:</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.</td>
<td>The benchmarks for this objective are An overall average 3.0 out of 5 70% of sample score a 3.0 or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?</td>
<td>Beginning College Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Discipline Outcome was: Missed benchmark

Measure 1 Results: The benchmarks of 3.0 on average and 70% meet benchmark were not obtained. Students scored on average a 2.7 in the area of source integration and only 56% met the benchmark of 3.0 or higher.

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark? The performance fell short of the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable? Previous years did not measure this outcome.

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning? The department rates student performance in regards to source integration and documentation as inadequate, or at a beginning college-level at best.
Further Action: Further Action Planned

Describe the action plan: More precise training of faculty and students.

Person/Group responsible for action: Chris Nordquist

Target Date for implementation of the action: 01/30/2015

Priority: Medium

STUDENTS WILL WRITE MULTI-PARAGRAPH, COLLEGE-LEVEL COMPOSITIONS THAT DEMONSTRATE COMPETENCE IN APPROPRIATE DOCUMENTATION STYLE

Assessment Author(s): Chris Nordquist

Measure 1 Type: Direct

Please select

Measure 1 Description: Students will write a summary and response to a reading prompt in a timed situation. This writing opportunity will be offered pre-term and post-term. Students will be evaluated via a rubric with seven criteria and 5 levels.

Measure 1 Sample Size: 35

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure. The benchmark for this outcome is an overall average of 3.0 out of 5 and a 70% accomplishment rate.
This Discipline
Outcome was:

Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1
Results:

An average of students exceeded the benchmark of 3.0 by scoring 3.2. 70% of students met the 3.0 of greater benchmark.

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The performance surpassed the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

Not measured

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

the department rates the performance on this outcome as neutral as it is just over the benchmark and should be much higher by the end of English 121.
Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary

FEEDBACK

No Data

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT: STUDENTS WILL WRITE MULTI-PARAGRAPH, COLLEGE-LEVEL COMPOSITIONS THAT

Measure 1
Type: Direct

Measure 1
Description: Analytic Measure – sample size- 35

Pre & Post – Week 2 and Week 14 of term

2 page reading prompt/ Timed, in-class summary and response essay (75 min)

Faulty upload 3-5 random samples to designated slots in a D2L assessment sandbox

Rubric refined by faculty to include seven key criteria on a 5 point scale:

- Comprehension
- Thesis
- Support
- Organization
- Grammar
- Information Technology

Norming session - Faculty norm via 3 rangefinder sample essays followed by discussion

Faculty scored remotely via D2L/ Two reads – double blind & scores recorded via a master spreadsheet

Scores transferred to master spreadsheet & results totaled

In scoring this outcome, faculty looked for how effectively a student-writer integrated summarizing source information. Faculty were trained to look at source integration in see if the information is relevant to the writer's purpose. Additionally, faculty looked for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>5 (Excellent)</th>
<th>4 (Very Good)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| -准确而深刻的理解主题和论点
-使用文本中的词和原则
| -大部分准确
-理解主题
-使用术语和原则

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Thesis** | • Well crafted  
• Original  

| **Support** | • Sophisticated evidence and support relevant to thesis  
• Topic sentences clearly distinguished from thesis  
• Well-crafted unity  

| **Organization** | • Order is logical  
• Smooth, varied, subtle transitions  

| **Grammar** | • Few to no errors  

| **Information Management** | • Source material incorporated gracefully and accurately.  
• Source material powerfully supports thesis  

| **Documentation** | • Virtually flawless MLA/APA format and documentation  
• No documentation omissions  

| **Accuracy** | in fresh ways  

| **Support** | • All supp relevant thesis (r platitudi  
• Topic sentences clearly distinguished from the  
• Unified  

| **Organization** | • Organiz order is times ineffecti  
• Effective transitio  

| **Grammar** | • Minor e occur sporadic  

| **Information Management** | • Most so material incorpor smoothl accurate  
• Most so material advance thesis  

| **Documentation** | • Minor e MLA/AP format  
• No docume omissio  

**Measure 1**  
Sample Size: 35

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.  
The average score benchmark for this outcome is 3.0 out of 5  
The % of samples that meet benchmark is 60% meet or exceed benchmark.  
Our goal is a benchmark of at least 60% of students scoring at or above a “3” level faculty.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?  
Minimum college-level writing standard

**Measure 2**  
Type: Direct

Please select

**Measure 2 Description:** No 2nd measure for this outcome.

This Learning Outcome was: Missed benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Management</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Pre-Post/Timed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We did measure how well students citing sources both in text and end of text and all management, it is part of how students manage information in writing. Students need the area of source documentation by the end of term.
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The performance mostly met the benchmark.

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment?

The department rates the results as minimally acceptable.
**Further Action:**  Further Action Unnecessary

**Communication:**

College Level Essay with Research. Students will write multi-paragraph, college-level essays that demonstrate competence in the following four critical-thinking areas: thesis, analysis and argument, organization, and grammar/mechanics for a variety of purposes and audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Type: Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Rubric-graded report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Analytic Measure – sample size - 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre &amp; Post – Week 2 and Week 14 of term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 page reading prompt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed, in-class summary and response essay (75 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulty uploaded 3-5 random samples to designated slots in a D2L assessment sand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric refined to include seven key criteria on a 5 point scale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension, thesis, support, organization, grammar, information technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norming session - Faculty norm via 3 rangefinder sample essays followed by discussion of range.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty scored remotely via D2L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two reads – double blind &amp; scores recorded via an Excel spreadsheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores transferred to master spreadsheet &amp; results totaled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Sample Size: 180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Sample Size: 180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

Our goal is a benchmark of at least 60% of students scoring at competency—which is college-level Adequate as defined on the English faculty. We determined the benchmark of 60% after discussing what a reasonable expectation for student success would look like.
Rubric-graded report

Holistic Measure – sample size-180

Pre & Post-term norming and scoring session

a holistic rubric refined to include 4 key criteria on a 9 point scale:

Comprehension/Focus of Agreement/Support/Style and Coherence

Faculty in attendance at scoring session are to bring 8 hard copy samples from each

Pre & Post Scoring sessions included 20 paid faculty instructors – 9 FT/11 adjunct

Faculty norm via rangelinder sample essays followed by discussion of why each sam

Faculty score and record 1st and 2nd reads and compile an average and post at top

Faculty report pre & post scores to department chair at semester end.

Pre and Post Writing Scoring Guide

Your score should reflect your judgment of the essay’s quality as a whole read and write, so remember to evaluate it as a first draft. Read support 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 Agreement/disagreement

with the author’s point of view may be complete or partial, but the writer focus of his or her argument.

c. Support for agreement/disagreement—Support should provide relevant examples or reasons from the writer’s experience or general knowledge analysis of the summarized article.

d. Style and coherence—Upper range papers demonstrate clear style, o

consecutive thought, often a strong voice. They contain few errors in u

mechanics.

7 This score should be used for papers that fulfill the basic requirements development, support and analysis.

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

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

b. Focus of Agreement/disagreement—What the writer is agreeing/disagree or is not related to the main issues of the summarized essay.
c. Support—Writer only asserts or counter-asserts; writer's examples are not distinguishable from examples given in the article; analysis of the text is fallacious, irrelevant or thin.

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

4 This grade should be used for papers that fulfill the basic requirements slightly weaker or seem off topic. (Different from addressing a minor point)

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

Papers with serious, repeated errors in usage, grammar, or mechanics or significant focus or coherence problems that seriously disrupt communication receive 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 a paper that would normally permit.

---

Measure 2
Sample Size:

35

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

Our goal is a benchmark of at least 60% of students scoring at or above a "5" level—Adequate as defined on the scoring rubric developed by English faculty. We determine this by discussing at length what a reasonable expectation for student success would look like.

This Learning Outcome was:

Met benchmark

Measure 1
Results:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Meet 2.75 benchmark</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Meet 3.0 benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 121</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 121/094</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure 2
Results:
1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Met benchmark

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary