

SUNY Fredonia
General Education Learning Outcomes
Assessment Report
2011-2012

Subcommittee Information		
General Education Category:	Written Communication	
Subcommittee Chair:	Name: Kirstin Hanley	Dept: English
Subcommittee Members:	Name: Dawn Eckenrode	Dept: Reed Library, General Education Committee Liaison
	Name: Marissa Cope	Dept.: Institutional Research and Planning
	Name: Anne Fearman	Dept: English
	Name: Susan Spangler	Dept: English
Semester(s) In Which Data were Collected:	Spring 2012	
Report Written By:	Kirstin Hanley	
Report Date:	May 25, 2012	

Course Information					
Please provide the following information for each of the courses that are part of the curriculum for this outcome during the semester(s) of data collection:					
Department	Subject Code	Course Number	Faculty Name	# of Students Enrolled	Were assessment data collected in this course?
English	ENGL	100.21	Betty Barnard	19	yes
		100.15	Benjamin Blood	20	yes
		100.3,6,12	Kenton Brown	57	yes

		100.13	Colin Craig	20	yes
		100.9,14	Anne Fearman	39	yes
		100.5,8	Heidi Frame	42	yes
		100.23	John Glovack	18	yes
		100.4	Jennifer Golabek	16	yes
		100.16	Katrina Hamilton-Kraft	18	yes
		100.17	Jacqueline Herbert	20	yes
		100.22,24	Doug Johnston	40	yes
		100.11,18,19	Daniel Laurie	57	yes
		100.01	Susan McGee	19	yes
		100.10	Kristen Niemi	20	yes

Assessment of Learning Outcome 1	
Outcome 1:	Students will demonstrate their abilities to produce coherent texts within common college-level forms.
Assessment Method	A twenty-percent sample of ENGL 100 students' research papers were examined and assessed based on a committee-approved rubric for each learning outcome. A

	<p>group of six scorers determined whether each paper was “exceeding,” “meeting,” “approaching,” or “not meeting” Learning Outcome 1 based on shared expectations established during a spring norming meeting. These levels of performance were approved and utilized for the 2008 assessment as well.</p> <p>Please see the attached rubric. Criteria for Outcomes 1 and 2 were adapted from the SUNY-approved rubric utilized in 2008. Criteria for Outcome 3—assessed for the first time this cycle—were developed by Dawn Eckenrode and the subcommittee.</p>
<p>Evaluation Process</p>	<p>Papers were evaluated by six volunteers from among the composition faculty with subcommittee chair acting as a second reader. Each paper was scored according to the subcommittee’s rubric and assigned a performance level of “exceeding,” “meeting,” “approaching,” or “not meeting” standards. Dawn Eckenrode developed a data-collection tool through Survey Monkey that allowed for accurate data input and tallying of results.</p> <p>To ensure consistency of evaluation, scorers attended a norming meeting in March. We discussed expectations for Gen Ed assessment in this category, how to interpret and apply the rubric, and how to assess papers that posed particular challenges. Prior to assessment, each paper was assigned an ID number; identifying information pertaining either to the student or the instructor was removed. In the instance that a difference of opinion could not be resolved, Scott Johnston, chair of the 2008 assessment committee, agreed to act as third reader.</p>
<p>Timing</p>	<p>Student papers were photocopied and assigned ID numbers over the course of the Spring 2012 semester as individual instructors collected and submitted them. The entire twenty-percent sample was compiled by the end of finals week (Friday, May 11).</p>
<p>Student Participation</p>	<p>Our sample is comprised of twenty percent of students taking ENGL 100 during the spring semester, totaling eighty-four (84) students. To ensure a random and representative sample, Marissa Cope assigned ID numbers to all ENGL 100 students and then selected four from each Spring section. I then collaborated with instructors to collect data for twenty-one (21) sections. ENGL 100 instructors were asked to collect <i>at least one draft and one revision</i> of a research paper from each student in the sample. As they collected papers, instructors were asked to submit them to the English department secretary who oversaw photocopying and the assigning of ID numbers to papers. For assessment purposes, identifying information was removed and papers were free of teacher comments or grades.</p>

Assessment Results	Exceeding: 27% Meeting: 61% Approaching: 8% Not Meeting: 4%
Level of Attainment	Please see attached rubric.
Comparison to Previous Results	Results for Learning Outcome 1 show a slightly higher percentage of students Exceeding and Meeting standards. Last cycle's scores were as follows: Exceeding (21%), Meeting (63%), Approaching (14%), and Not Meeting (2%)

Assessment of Learning Outcome 2

Outcome 2:	Students will demonstrate the ability to revise and improve such texts.
Assessment Method	Scorers engaged in a comparative analysis of drafts and revisions of each student's research paper based on rubric criteria that also reflected criteria established for Outcomes 1 and 3. This analysis determined the extent to which students were meaningfully and effectively engaging in writing as a process. It also evaluated how well students are being supported through various stages of drafting and revision. Shared expectations for rubric assessment of Outcome 2 were discussed during our Spring norming meeting.
Evaluation Process	See Learning Outcome 1
Timing	See Learning Outcome 1
Student Participation	See Learning Outcome 1

Assessment Results	Exceeding: 24% Meeting: 55% Approaching: 17% Not Meeting: 4%
Level of Attainment	Please see attached rubric.
Comparison to Previous Results	Results are comparable, with a slightly higher percentage of students meeting standards. The previous cycle's results were as follows: Exceeding (28%), Meeting (43%), Approaching (24%), Not Meeting (4%).

Assessment of Learning Outcome 3 (delete this table if not applicable)

Outcome 3:	Students will research a topic, develop an argument (or topic), and organize supporting details.
Assessment Method	Scorers assessed revisions of research papers using the approved rubric criteria for Learning Outcome 3, with drafts serving as a point of reference for gauging argument/topic development and the integration of research. Shared expectations for rubric assessment of Outcome 3 were discussed during our Spring norming meeting.
Evaluation Process	See Learning Outcome 1
Timing	See Learning Outcome 1
Student Participation	See Learning Outcome 1
Assessment Results	

	<p>Exceeding: 18%</p> <p>Meeting: 63%</p> <p>Approaching: 18%</p> <p>Not Meeting: 1%</p>
Level of Attainment	Please see attached rubric.
Comparison to Previous Results	No basis for comparison. Learning Outcome 3 was not assessed in previous cycle.

Conclusions

What are the three most important conclusions drawn from your data about attainment of student learning outcomes within the category?

- The strong integration of writing process pedagogy among composition faculty had a positive impact on student learning. The wide range of pre-writing, drafting, and revision assignments students responded to undoubtedly contributed to the high percentages of meeting and exceeding standards for all three outcomes.
- The fact that students seem well-prepared to meet or exceed standards for Learning Outcome 3 (assessed for the first time this cycle) suggests that ENGL 100 instructors are effectively integrating instruction in research methods into their courses and that Reed Library staff are supporting students and faculty through this process as well (through instructional sessions, guiding individual students' research, etc.).
- Though the overall results for Outcomes 1 and 2 are slightly better than the previous cycle, our numbers could improve if students had access to other support mechanisms on campus (see recommendations) to assist them with sentence and paragraph-level issues in their writing. ENGL 100 is a course that simultaneously plays an integral role in students' success in future courses yet cannot possibly cover every aspect of what it

	<p>means to write effectively in an academic setting in fifteen weeks. For this reason, it might be useful to go the route of many similar campuses by developing a writing program designed to offer students individualized instruction and support for the writing process across disciplines.</p>
<p>What factors make it difficult to draw conclusions about student learning in this category?</p>	<p>While the collection of both draft and revision papers allowed us to successfully determine students' improvement for learning outcome 2, it would be useful to have data that shows what skills students are bringing with them when they enter the course. Students' writing skills should be assessed when they enter their respective programs and then later in ENGL 100 (see below).</p>
<p>What are your recommendations for improving the process of assessment of student learning in this category?</p>	<p>Students' writing should be assessed by means of placement essays or some other form of substantive evaluation upon entering the university. It would be useful to compare this data to students' work at the end (or, near the end) of fifteen weeks of instruction in ENGL 100. In fact, this seems like the only fair way of determining what ENGL 100 has helped students to do. For example, a student writer may "not meet" standards in a particular category but still have improved his/her skills from the time he/she was admitted to SUNY Fredonia.</p>
<p>What are your recommendations for improving student learning in this category?</p>	<p>Especially with increased enrollment of international students, the institution has a responsibility to provide additional support for student writers on campus such as a faculty/staff directed writing center, a 4th credit writing-intensive component for ENGL 100, and/or designated sections for students who need additional support in basic written communication skills (such as the English Department's recently-added ESL Emphasis course).</p>
<p>Please share any other comments the subcommittee may have.</p>	

Written Communication Rubric – 2011-2012

Learning Outcome #1: Students will demonstrate their abilities to produce coherent texts within common college-level forms.

<p>Not Meeting Standards (0)</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Approaching Standards (1)</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Meeting Standards (2)</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Exceeding Standards (3)</p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Writer fails to present a controlling purpose or thesis; consequently it is difficult to identify exactly what the thesis is. ● The paper moves from an unsatisfactory introductory paragraph to an ending that does not serve as a conclusion, thus conveying the sense that much of what has been presented is unresolved. ● Sentence structure is often awkward and transitions are ineffectual and/or abrupt or simply missing. ● Diction, tone, and word choice are not appropriate for the subject or for the implied audience. ● Mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, and documentation, if needed) disrupt reading and often obscure meaning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Writer presents a wandering, vague, or unfocused controlling purpose or thesis. ● The paper moves awkwardly from a weak introduction to a conclusion that does not adequately represent the body of the paper. ● Basic paragraphing exists, but often fails to support or even recognize a central idea, and the use of evidence and examples is inadequate. ● Sentence and paragraph transitions are often unclear, awkward, indirect, and/or illogical. ● Tone and diction are often inconsistent and/or inappropriate for the subject and its implied audience. ● Mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, and documentation, if needed) are not well executed and may, at times, obscure meaning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Writer presents an identifiable and focused controlling purpose or thesis. ● The paper moves coherently and logically from a satisfying introduction to a solid conclusion. ● Paragraphs fit within this structure and present examples and evidence to support the ideas presented. ● For the most part, sentences are well constructed and transitions are sound—though the sequence of ideas may occasionally be awkward. ● The paper exhibits some degree of control over the tone and diction appropriate for the subject and its implied audience. ● Mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, and documentation, if needed) are mostly accurate and paragraph transitions are sound, but the sequence of ideas may occasionally be awkward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Writer presents an easily identifiable, focused, original, and thought-provoking controlling purpose or thesis. ● The paper moves coherently, logically, and even creatively from an engaging introduction to a well-demonstrated conclusion. ● Paragraphs fit within this structure coherently and present pertinent examples and evidence to support central and subsidiary ideas. ● Sentence structure displays sophistication and variety; transitions add to the logical development of the topic. ● The paper exhibits a solid command of word variety and a tone and diction appropriate for the subject and its implied audience. ● Mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, and documentation, if needed) are nearly flawless.

Comments:

Learning Outcome #2: Students will demonstrate the ability to revise and improve such texts.

<p>Not Meeting Standards (0) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Approaching Standards (1) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Meeting Standards (2) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Exceeding Standards (3) <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Writer demonstrates a lack of ability to revise at the level of content or structure. ● Either changes do not improve these features or are focused almost solely on mechanics. ● There is no meaningful change from draft to revision paper. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Writer demonstrates a lack of ability to revise in any substantial way. ● Whatever revision has been done has not been sufficient to improve the content, focus, structure, clarity, and coherence of an earlier draft. ● Revision may be limited to sections of the essay. ● Revision demonstrates a lack of awareness of how even small changes can affect the entire paper. ● Mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, and documentation, if needed) have either not improved significantly or appear to be the only focus of the revision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Writer demonstrates the ability to revise by refining the content, sharpening the focus, and improving structure, clarity, and coherence. ● Refining content may include clearer presentation of evidence, shifting of emphasis to foreground the most relevant material, providing improved transitions that keep the focus evident, and reworking the introduction or conclusion as well as rewriting individual sentences. ● The mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, and documentation, if needed) are mostly accurate and rarely impede meaning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Writer demonstrates clear evidence of an ability to revise by altering content and approach, by reorganizing material, or by clarifying and strengthening the coherence of ideas. ● Alterations may include the addition of new material, the deletion of unhelpful material, the substitution of more relevant material for less relevant material, the strengthening of transitions, introductions, and conclusions, and the rewriting of individual sentences. ● The mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, and documentation, if needed) of the final revision are nearly flawless.

Comments:

Learning Outcome #3: Students will research a topic, develop an argument (or topic), and organize supporting details

<p>Not Meeting Standards (0)</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Approaching Standards (1)</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Meeting Standards (2)</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Exceeding Standards (3)</p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bibliography is absent or contains a limited number of resources which lack credibility or relevance to the topic of research. • Writer does not provide supporting evidence for topic presented, or the supporting information selected is irrelevant to the thesis being presented. • Writer fails to make connections among concepts. • Writer fails to provide attribution to sources of information. • Writer does not reference sources with accuracy or consistency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the most part, bibliography demonstrates the use of information sources appropriate to the topic of research. Some sources referenced may lack relevance or credibility. • Writer generally selects information that provides evidence for the topic and integrates sources into the content in a manner that supports the purposes of the research. • Writer attempts to organize ideas and evidence based on the overall purpose of the paper. • Writer attempts to make connections among concepts and demonstrates some comprehension of supporting evidence. • Writer selects an appropriate documentation style and attempts to cite sources, perhaps inconsistently. • Writer may or may not use quotations appropriately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bibliography demonstrates the use of a variety of information sources appropriate to the topic of research (e.g., scholarly articles, popular press, multimedia, interviews, datasets, books, etc...), and most sources referenced are reliable, valid, accurate and timely. • Writer selects information that provides evidence for the topic and integrates sources into the content in a manner that supports the purposes of the research. • Ideas and evidence are organized based on the overall purpose of the paper. • Writer analyzes the structure and logic of supporting arguments or method and/or articulates interrelationships among concepts and combines them into useful primary statements with supporting evidence. • Writer selects an appropriate documentation style and uses it consistently to cite sources. • For the most part, writer uses quotations appropriately, restates textual concepts in his/her own words, and generally references sources consistently and accurately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bibliography demonstrates the skillful use of a variety of information sources appropriate to the topic of research (e.g., scholarly articles, popular press, multimedia, interviews, datasets, books, etc...), and all sources referenced are reliable, valid, accurate and timely. • Writer selects information that effectively provides evidence for the topic and skillfully integrates sources into the content in a manner that supports the purposes of the research. • Ideas and evidence are adeptly organized based on the overall purpose of the paper. • Writer thoroughly analyzes the structure and logic of supporting arguments or methods and/or effectively articulates interrelationships among concepts and combines them into useful primary statements with supporting evidence. • Writer carefully selects an appropriate documentation style and uses it consistently to cite sources. • Writer uses quotations appropriately, restates textual concepts in his/her own words, and references sources consistently and accurately.

ID # _____

	Attempts to summarize and reference sources.		
--	--	--	--

Comments: