Discipline Outcome

Students will write multi-paragraph, college-level compositions that demonstrate competence in writing and developing a Thesis

Assessment Author(s)

Chris Nordquist

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:

A sample of fall 2016 thesis-driven research essays will be scored by faculty using the faculty developed CCR Program Analytic Rubric measuring 6 course competencies on a scale of 1-5.
Discipline Outcomes 2-6: Thesis, Support, Organization, Grammar, Information Management, & Documentation

Goal: 60% of CCR students score a 2.75 or better on the six discipline outcomes.

Measure: Analytic Rubric graded

After the fall semester, full-time and adjunct faculty gather to score a sampling of randomly selected CCR out of class processed research essays. These CCR 092 & 094 samples are submitted as part of the English 121 assessment and score by CCR and English 121 faculty normed to the English 121 GT Outcomes. We have continued to use six separate categories to assess the essays because these are the key elements of academic writing that we teach in CCR and ENG 121. The out of class argument essay requires students to demonstrate skill in critically reading and summarizing a college-level text, then taking a position in response to the text and supporting this position with reasons and evidence, including source support, and documenting sources accurately. The English 121/CCR scoring guide helps faculty scorers evaluate the essay responses and assign scores on the basis of the comprehension demonstrated via the summary, the effectiveness of the position developed, the clarity and appropriateness of the support used, the organization of the essay, and the language skills displayed, and integration and documentations of sources. Essays are scored twice by CCR and ENG faculty, after an intensive norming session, to ensure consistency in the scores for each category. The CCR and English Departments have continued using the same rubric to score our final timed writing essays for several years, refining the descriptive criteria in each category to assist us in our norming.

Training: CCR and English faculty who score the final set of 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 (3) 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 is 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.

Because of the 2014 statewide Developmental Studies redesign, CCR and transfer faculty work even more closely to help students prepare for college-level writing in ENG 121 and other GT courses. The transition from a co-requisite to co-requisite model means more underprepared students are taking GT courses including English 121 in their first semester. In addition, the concurrent enrollment program serves a significant number of ACC English 121 students. The collaboration and cooperation among transfer, CE, and CCR faculty has been critical in communicating and maintaining the GT standards and raising the level of performance across all segments. The norming and scoring sessions allow all CCR faculty to develop a clearer understanding of what constitutes college-level writing, reading, and thinking. The outcomes and rubrics used for CCR, CE, and transfer courses are closely aligned in outcomes and descriptive language.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

20

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

60% of students will score a 2.75 or better on the faculty scoring of the 6 criteria of the rubric.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Using the 5 point rubric scale, 3 represents adequate college-level writing. A 2.75 represents minimal entry-level college readiness.

Measure 1 Results:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 2 Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Percentage Meeting Benchmark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal: 60% meet</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) How did unit/department 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?

Through the scored essays of academic year 2016, we see that our students are meeting or near meeting the benchmark in all categories. Student performance, as demonstrated, were adequate. These results reflect the focus the department has established over the past few years, particularly during the CCR redesign transition, to work on getting our students proficient in academic reading and essay writing. Our teachers and our students alike should be congratulated for their hard work. The department will continue to hold strategic curriculum roundtables with fulltime and adjunct faculty. The true victory here in our third year of assessing CCR is that faculty adjustment to immediate college readiness needs is occurring and more students are demonstrating readiness and accomplishing GT credit in the first and second semesters. The summary report is shared with all English, CCR, and CE 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. Many faculty share the data with their students as well as the training materials so students see samples of high-level college writing. Additionally, more faculty are using the CCR/121 rubric on more of the essay assignments and consequently students are getting clear, consistent repetition of outcomes and feedback.

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.

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 would have to rate overall performance on the CCR discipline outcomes as outstanding for CCR 092 and adequate for CCR 094. CCR 092 sections are limited, but the sample submitted to the assessment pool showed excellent performance. The CCR 094 sample of essay returned less than satisfactory results in most outcomes. The integration of reading and writing into a single co-requisite course is no doubt a challenge for both faculty and students. CCR faculty seek to help students immediately develop a fresh understanding of what it means to be an effective college reader. This means most students move from entering as passive readers focused only on understanding to critical readers that recognize the context, audience, purpose, and arguments being made. The goal is to get CCR students to read more efficiently, effectively, and critically and use the reading skill to inform their own writing. CCR students are necessarily applying the reading and summary writing in other courses and this instruction and practice is proving to be “just-in-time” for most students and overwhelming for some. Reading more effectively is only one part of this continuous CCR instruction. Teaching students to communicate their comprehension in the form of summary is also a very sophisticated critical thinking exercise. The act of distilling the text to the “gist” or essence and make it accessible to other readers takes significant repetition. This outcome is introduced day 1 in all CCR courses and carried through semester with final demonstration on the end of term, timed summary and response essay.

CCR faculty would rate the performance of the Thesis outcome as adequate and trending the right way. CCR 092 & CCR 094 students are demonstrating solid gains in their ability to move beyond the predictable positions and attempt to put forward a more thoughtful, original thesis. Additionally, students are gaining understanding of a well-constructed thesis statement. The grammar emphasis in CCR courses, particularly subordination, coordination, and parallelism, assist students’ ability to craft their thesis. The Thesis discipline outcome has been a point of emphasis for CCR and English faculty and the gains in performance are showing. Faculty are teaching to this discipline outcome more intentionally as a result of assessment activities; as a consequence, more students are demonstrating this competency at a much higher level.

CCR faculty would rate the performance of the Support outcome as adequate and trending the right way. CCR 092 & CCR 094 students are demonstrating solid gains in their ability to show more of their thinking and support their claims with the right stuff – specific evidence followed by critical thinking in the form of analysis, evaluation, and argumentation. Additionally, students are gaining understanding of how to integrate relevant, credible source support and connecting that supporting evidence to their central focused point. The discipline outcome of support in developing an essay is one of the most challenging aspects of writing for developing writers. Most CCR student writers do not go far enough in showing their thinking and do not understand what it takes to develop a point. The criteria of support has been a point of emphasis for the CCR and English department faculty training and consequently student practice. This outcome area of support is also one of the key distinguishing features of English 122 expectations for critical thinking and development of a focus.
Discipline Outcome

Students will demonstrate comprehension of a college-level text, including the authors thesis and arguments, and communicate that understanding through a well-written summary.

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:

Students will actively and critically read an article and write a summary that demonstrates accurate and complete comprehension of the text and writer's argument. Students will also demonstrate adequate summary writing skill to include clear paraphrasing of the key ideas, attribution to author, precise verb choices to indicate author's purpose and strategy.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

50

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

60% of student samples will score a 3 or higher on the CCR five-point Analytic Rubric criteria Comprehension.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

3 represents minimal college-level comprehension as agreed upon by the English and CCR faculty.
Discipline Outcome
Students will write multi-paragraph, college-level compositions that demonstrate competence in appropriate Documentation style

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
Students will be assessed on their ability to accurately follow MLA or APA guidelines for formatting an essay and citing information both in-text and end of text.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
50

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

The benchmark for this outcome is that 60% of student samples will score a 3 or higher on the five-point CCR Analytic Rubric criteria Documentation.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Level 3 represents adequate demonstration of the competency and minimal college-level skill.

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

While proper MLA formatting and citation are important, these aspects are covered more extensively in ENG 121 & 122. We know CCR students are in immediate need of these skills in their co-requisite GT course and other courses. We are reasonably pleased with the results of the students’ abilities to research and utilize sources although much work needs to still be done to help students understand how to avoid plagiarism and integrate & cite information ethically and skillfully. Since we significantly missed the benchmark of 60% competency in Information Management, the department will continue to meet and discuss strategies to help our students improve in this area.

Discipline Outcome

Students will write multi-paragraph, college-level compositions that demonstrate competence in selecting and incorporating Research

Measure 1 Type:

Direct
Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:

Student essays will be assessed on the quality of source choice, relevence of source support, and effectiveness of source integration. Specifically, students should demonstrate skill in locating and evaluating sources including the ACC library databases. Additionally, students should demonstrate skill in integrating sources by using effective attributive phrases as well as demonstrating decisions regarding when to quote, paraphrase, and summarize.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

50

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

The benchmark for this outcome is that 60% of students will score a 3 or higher on the CCR Analytic Rubric criteria- Information Management.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Level 3 represents adequate or minimal college-level competency as agree upon by English and CCR faculty.

Learning Outcome

Information Management: Students will write multi-paragraph, college-level compositions (essays) that demonstrate competence in integrating research/source information and documenting source use correctly.

Assessment Author(s)

Chris Nordquist

Measure 1 Type:

Direct
Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:

Students will be assessed on their ability to locate relevant sources from a range of locations, evaluate the information, and integrate the information skillfully. More specifically, student writing should demonstrate the use of ACC Library resources in addition to information located through popular search engines. Also, student writing should demonstrate the information has been evaluated for credibility, recency, and most important, relevance to writer's purpose and audience. Finally, student writing should show command of source attribution and decisions regarding when to quote, paraphrase, or summarize information.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

50

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

The benchmark for this measure is that 60% of student samples will score at least a 3 or higher on the CCR Analytic Rubric criteria Information Management.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

This benchmark of 3 represents adequate, minimal college-level performance of the competency. 60% success is reasonable goal for underprepared students in a co-requisite, GT paired course.

Measure 1 Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Information management</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Rubric Graded Essay</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>3 years</th>
<th>60% of students earning a 2.75 or better on a 5-point scale</th>
<th>45%</th>
<th>does not meet benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Documentation</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>60% of students earning a 2.75 or better on a 5-point scale</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>does not meet benchmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure 2 Results:

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

While proper MLA formatting and citation are important, these aspects are covered more extensively in ENG 121 & 122. We know CCR students are in immediate need of these skills in their co-requisite GT course and other courses. We are reasonably pleased with the results of the students’ abilities to research and utilize sources although much work needs to still be done to help students understand how to avoid plagiarism and integrate & cite information ethically and skillfully. Since we significantly missed the benchmark of 60% competency in Information Management, the department will continue to meet and discuss strategies to help our students improve in this area.

Learning Outcome

Communication: Students will write multi-paragraph, college-level compositions (essays) that demonstrate competence in producing focused, organized and clear writing.
Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:

Student writing should demonstrate an overall ability to compose an essay that focused, developed, and readable. Moreover, students should show control in advancing a thoughtful point (thesis) and sustaining that point in an organized, clearly-written manner.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

50

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

The benchmark for this competency is 60% of students average a 3 or higher on all seven CCR Analytic Rubric criteria. This composite score represents a more holistic, overall rating of the writing level. A 3 level essay represents adequate, minimal college-level writing as agreed upon by the English and CCR faculty. CCR courses are assessed holistically every semester and analytically every fall. Our department’s assessment process is an important tool to help drive pedagogy in the CCR classroom. Our assessment of students’ reading and writing encourages classroom practices that complement effective ways of teaching critical reading and writing and of becoming an effective college writer. Because faculty (full-time and adjunct) 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 CCR department, and therefore faculty design essay assignments with these learning outcomes in mind. Essay assignments ask students read a text critically, recommituate their comprehension in the form of a summary, and develop a thoughtful and focused response that incorporates and documents source information. This task shows students and faculty aspiring to succeed in meeting the state’s General Education guidelines and ACC’s Student Learning Outcomes.

Our assessment process assures that CCR students will have their writing evaluated by more than one reader and assures that assessment measures support what is taught in the classroom. The process also assures opportunities for faculty to come together to discuss all aspects of assessment to include: the design of the instruments; the standards to be employed; the interpretation of the results; and possible changes in curriculum suggested by the process and results. Although our assessment does value the readily accessed, surface features of language—on grammatical correctness or on error, it also focuses on the appropriate rhetorical choices that critical readers and writers should make at the college-transfer level. Our assessment is designed to measure what students do well in Communication (SLO), Information Management (SLO), and seven discipline specific outcomes. Over the years, our Department has worked on diagnosing student basic skills strengths and weaknesses; however, with the Statewide CCR redesign, that assessment focused more on immediate college-readiness needs including comprehension, research, and 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 co-requisite GT classes;
3. Evaluate and describe overall student achievement;
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of our instructional program

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

This benchmark is in line with English 121 college-level standards.
Measure 2 Type:
Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 2 Description:
Students are holitically assessed on their overall writing ability at the beginning and end of each term using a common prompt and task for both the CCR and English department. Student pre and post writing samples are scored holitically using a department rubric and faculty pre and post scores are reported for assessment purposes.

Measure 2 Sample Size:
150

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
the benchmark for this measure is that 60% of student samples will score a 4.5 or higher on th post test.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
This benchmark of 4.5 out of 9 represents minimal college-level writing.

Measure 1 Results:

CCR - Student Learning Outcome 1: Communication:
Communication is one of ACC’s SLOs, and obviously the CCR department is a major stakeholder in this SLO. We’ve been measuring students’ ability to communicate for years using the timed summary response essay.

Benchmark: 60% of student score a 4.5 or higher on the end of semester summary response timed writing.

Measure: Holistic Rubric graded
For analysis of this SLO, we used the holistic score of the timed writing which considered a student’s ability to read a text and respond to the argument in a focused, developed, and clear manner. Using the 9-point holistic rubric and the timed situation gives us a broader view of the essay writing. We assess this SLO every semester through this measurement tool. At the beginning and end of each semester, transfer, CCR, and CE full-time and adjunct faculty gather for a 3.5 hour norming and scoring session. Faculty bring 8 randomly selected, course-coded hard copy student essays to the session. Following a rigorous and healthy norming session, faculty score the approximately 250 student samples. At the end of each term, faculty report pre & post scores. This scoring activity functions primarily as training and community building in the department; however, we are able to glean assessment data as well.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Average</th>
<th>Post Average</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Meet 4.5 Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCR 092</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR 093</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR 094</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

Results are in line with each of the 3 years of CCR Assessment.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
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 of CCR 092 as exceptional and CCR 094 as adequate. The department will continue to share strategies for assisting underprepared students in succeeding in college-level courses.