English Department Full Assessment Report
Undergraduate English Literature
Fall, 2017

Preamble

The English Department offers a broad range of courses on British, American and world literatures to its undergraduate majors. These classes demand that students read analytically and think critically, offer complex reasoning and interpretation, and organize their evidence and analysis into coherent arguments. English assessment efforts reveal that its majors are developing and refining their skills as they move through the BA/BS programs and that, in the end, they are consistently reaching the established goals.

Programs assessed in this report:
- English B.S./B.S.
- English General Education (excluding writing courses)

Learning Outcomes

English B.S./B.S. (source: http://www.ccsu.edu/english/undergrad/programOutcomes.html)

1. Students will closely read such literary genres as poetry, prose fiction, and drama in order to interpret them not only in terms of content, but also in terms of literary style. [READING LITERATURE]
2. Students will develop a substantive claim about works of literature. [THESIS]
3. Students will support a substantive claim about works of literature using literary-critical techniques. [DEMONSTRATION]
4. Students will quote primary sources effectively in support of a critical argument. [QUOTES]
5. Students will, when appropriate, effectively analyze and integrate secondary source material into their own arguments. [SECONDARY MATERIAL]
6. Students will situate works of literature in terms of the cultural, literary, historical, and/or biographical context in which they were produced. [CONTEXT]

The undergraduate outcomes specify measurable skills and knowledge presented in two "introductory" courses, ENG 298 and ENG 398, and practiced and reinforced throughout our literature courses at the 200-400 level. They are rooted in the fundamentals of approaching literature as a discipline: argumentation about meaning, close analysis, quotation of sources, and use of secondary criticism.

2. Findings

1. Learning Evaluation (All Outcomes)

The B.A./B.S. outcomes are measured with a writing rubric consisting of 6 categories for evaluation. Each "anchor" on the rubric represents a distinct learning outcome. A student's last piece of untimed writing is evaluated by the course instructor using the rubric and measuring accomplishment in that category on a scale of 1-5 (5 is most accomplished). A "3" meets expectations: the student is working at an appropriate level in that particular category.

2. Rubrics (All Outcomes)

See Appendix A

3. Links of Learning Outcome and Assessment Method (All Outcomes)

In the study of English literature, competent writing is more than a basic expectation. Literary criticism in its most significant and influential form is argumentation about literature expressed in writing. And at the core of that written criticism is a sophisticated and contestable argument about meaning, supported closely and persuasively by the analysis of specific linguistic evidence cited from a text. Therefore, a student's writing is the best expression of her ability to perform a critical reading within the expectations of the discipline.

4. Student Performance: B.A./B.S.

5-yr Total of Students Passing (3 or higher) by Course Level

LO Thesis

Outcome	298	300-level	398	400-level	Total
Thesis	89%	81%	92%	91%	88%

LO Reading

Outcome	298	300-level	398	400-level	Total
Reading	71%	82%	94%	89%	84%

LO Quotes

Outcome	298	300-level	398	400-level	Total
Use of Quotes	89%	86%	89%	89%	88%

LO Demonstration

Outcome	298	300-level	398	400-level	Total
Demonstration of Thesis	87%	77%	90%	89%	86%

LO Context

Outcome	298	300-level	398	400-level	Total
Context	92%	79%	95%	89%	89%

LO Secondary

Outcome	298	300-level	398	400-level	Total
Secondary Criticism	79%	----*	89%	90%	86%*

*Some corrupt data, leading to unreliable total

The tables above suggest English majors gradually increase their knowledge and skills as they progress up through the major. Some of the inconsistencies observed from 298 up to the 400-level result from far fewer students assessed in 298 and 398 (only 3 sections each per year).

5. Five-Year Trend* (B.A./B.S)

Percent of Students Passing (3 or better)

Outcome	S 13	S 14	S 15	S 17	Total
Thesis	86%	83%	93%	90%	88%
Reading	85%	83%	83%	83%	84%
Quotes	87%	89%	86%	93%	88%
Demonstration	87%	83%	92%	86%	86%
Context	83%	87%	91%	94%	89%
Secondary	85%	84%	90%	83%	86%

*Spring 2016 Data was lost during the transition of data processing from OIRA to the English Department.

3. Analysis

Given the similarity of the figures for each outcome over the last 5 years, it makes little sense to analyze by outcome. English assessment shows far greater variability across course levels, therefore analysis is offered for all outcomes by 200, 300, and 400 level courses.

ENG 298, Introduction to Literary Studies, and ENG 398, Topics in Literary Theory and Research, are our two basic skills courses within the major; 298 prepares students for work in 300-level courses, and 398 prepares students for 400-level specialty classes.

We expect, then, for students completing 298 to meet expectations in our basic categories, and for students in 300-level courses to score at the same level or better. Likewise, we expect students in 398 to meet expectations, though with higher scores in the Secondary Material category—which is not emphasized in 298--than those achieved by 298 students. Scores in 400-level courses should be equal to or better than 398 scores.

298

Overall 298 students work at the appropriate levels, averaging well above a 3 in all categories. The score on the Thesis category is especially strong, and reflects 298's pronounced emphasis on this core competency. Secondary Material scores are unreliable, or non-existent, since few assignments require such sources. Together, the evidence suggests students in 298 are working at a high level and exiting the course with a sturdy foundation in the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in the major.

300-level

Scores in 300-level courses are strong and consistent across the board, averaging above 3 in all categories. Thus, our 300-level students are working at an appropriate level for English majors. Even so, their scores are consistently *lower* than scores in 298; since 298 is a prerequisite for 300-level courses, students in those courses have had at least one course more, and in some cases several courses more. Consequently, we should expect higher achievement at the 300-level.

One possible explanation is accuracy. We only assess 15 students per term in 398, whereas in recent semesters we have assessed over twice as many 300-level courses (there are simply more of them). In addition, students in 298 work expressly on the particular skills identified on our writing rubric, and the assignments are designed to exercise those abilities. Students at the 300 level employ their skills while working with the literature of a specific period, genre, author, or culture. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that instructors could tailor assignments and class exercises to reinforce the fundamentals measured by the rubric.

398

Since students who have completed 398 have also completed 298, and very likely one or more additional 300-level courses (including 398, which can be taken twice under different topics), one would expect scores to be significantly higher than in 298. That is exactly what the data show. Students in 398 achieve average mean scores of nearly 4 in every category, with particularly high marks in the Thesis category and Reading Literature as Literature, a measure of students' ability to analyze literature according to the conventions of the discipline. Students demonstrate competence in using secondary literature, a point of emphasis in 398, and achieve their consistently high scores while undertaking substantially more complex writing assignments.

400-level

The English department's 400-level courses show students maintaining the high level of accomplishment reached in 398. Scores are slightly lower in Secondary Literature and Context (categories in which students are expected to do more work on their own than in 398), comparable in other anchors, and higher in the Demonstration of Thesis rubric. Again, the higher number of students assessed probably indicates a higher level of accuracy. But overall the consistently strong writing submitted suggests the 400-level courses are further strengthening the practices introduced and reinforced in literature classes at the lower levels.

4. Use of Results

Curricular:

Based on the success of our ENG 298, which serves as an introduction to the major and is a prerequisite for our 300-level courses, in Spring of 2013 we introduced ENG 398. Like 298, the course serves as an introduction to skills and knowledge necessary for 400-level courses: specifically, research methods in literary scholarship and an overview of literary theory. The

course resulted from a need to practice and refine the abilities developed in 298 and the 300-level courses, and from noted shortcomings in the outcome of Secondary Material. The deficiency isn't obvious from the totaled data, but one can see it in the number of students assessed by rubric category: 298 and 300-level courses simply do not regularly assign secondary reading. The course has been successful: at the 400-level for which 398 is a prerequisite, student performance is outstanding, with just under 90% meeting or exceeding our expectations (scoring a 3 or better in each rubric category).

Overall, the data also suggest that while our students even at the lower course levels are meeting or surpassing expectations, and that generally they are improving as they progress, there are two particular areas in which we can help students improve:

- Integrating quoted material into analytic prose
- Overall structure of essays and links between evidence and thesis

The Assessment Committee will pursue a "best practices" approach. We will collect and make available exercises and assignments designed to enhance these particular skills, particularly in 298 and 300-level courses. And the Committee will work with the department's first-year writing director to design a workshop for faculty who wish to discuss and workshop new pedagogical approaches to these areas.

Procedural:

In the last years we have made significant structural change and one gradual reform in our assessment process. During the academic year 2016-17 the department began to collect and process the data on its own. In prior years, we had relied on OIRA. The advantage of OIRA was clear tables with data sorted a multitude of ways. The drawback was lengthy delays in obtaining our processed data, and the risk that in the multiple exchanges data would be lost. This in fact occurred in the spring of 2016, when an entire semester's data was lost. The English department now prepares its own rosters for data collection, does all data entry electronically, and outputs the data into simple tables clearly and quickly. The new procedure will surely assist us in the timely reporting of our assessment results.

The department in the past has also suffered from inconsistent participation from faculty. The Assessment Committee, with the assistance of OIRA, has simplified data collection by allowing instructors to evaluate a fraction of the students in a given class, generated randomly. The simplified procedure produces fewer samples, but the process is statistically sound. And the benefit is that we have had wider participation on behalf of faculty. The Assessment Committee has also worked to send more frequent reminders and to charge one administrative assistant with the collection of data and the tracking of what course rosters remain outstanding.

The remaining weak point in our process is "norming," or achieving consistency among a variety of evaluators. Different faculty tend to have different standards. And it is particularly difficult to maintain a consistent sense of expectations across the various course levels. We have begun to

address this deficiency by piloting a new approach to evaluating: instructors would evaluate each other's student papers, rather than those of their own students. The hope is that we can reach a greater level of objectivity without a drop in faculty participation.

5. General Education (Literature Courses)

1. General Education literature courses taught: ENG 203, 204, 205, 206, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 215, 220, 250, 260, 261, 262, and 347.

2. Correspondence of General Education Outcomes and English Assessment Instrument

Rubric Item		General Education Outcome
Thesis	→	CRT1. Define a problem.
Reading	→	CRT4. Analyze information to uncover underlying meanings, structures and patterns.
Quotes	→	AH3. Engage in literary, philosophic, and artistic analysis
Demonstration of Thesis	→	CRT2. Assemble evidence to support a conclusion
Context	→	AH3. Engage in literary, philosophic, and artistic analysis
Sec Material	→	CRT3. Assess the validity of a sustained argument

3. Assessment Instrument: Literature Rubric for assessing General Education courses
   - See Appendix A

Findings

1. Method (all outcomes): The study of complex literary texts requires careful discernment of formal elements: the overall structure of a whole or parts of a text; patterns of repetition and variation; figurative language and rhetorical tropes; point of view and other narratological features; and echoes of and allusions to other texts and motifs in the long tradition of literary writing. From these, students assemble evidence of how a text introduces and develops themes. Ultimately, this analysis allows students to assert claims about how literary structure creates a perspective on a theme, character, occurrence, or other textual "content." Students offer their conclusions in the form of written arguments, drawing on other arguments for support and refuting competing interpretations. Thus, the critical writing of students in literature courses is suited for assessment of their abilities in the 5 General Education outcomes listed above.

2. Process (all outcomes): General Education courses in literature are assessed every spring term. For each course, the department produces a roster of 10 students drawn randomly from the full course enrollment. Each instructor is responsible for assessing the last piece of untimed writing from the first 5 students listed (should one of the initial 5 students withdraw from the course or fail to turn in a final assignment, instructors can proceed to the next name on the

list). Writing is assessed using the English Department Literature Assessment rubric.

3. Link of method and outcome: The assessment of writing, while labor intensive, gives the clearest indication of a student's critical thinking skills. Analytical writing cannot be a product of guesswork or memorization. The introduction and pursuit of a written argument requires logic, synthesis, the selection and evaluation of evidence, and critical discrimination.

4-5. Recent student performance and 5-year trend

THESIS/ CRT1								
CRT1	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2015	Spring 2013	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	77%	78%	82%	85%	78%	81%	80%	80%
Mean Score	3.29	3.36	3.46	3.28	3.53	3.44	3.48	3.40
Total Assessed	209	78	109	101	131	113	130	871
Not Assessed	17	12	80	59	23	56	60	307
Total Students	226	90	189	160	154	170	190	1179

READING OF LIT/ CRT 4								
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2015	Spring 2013	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	78%	75%	82%	84%	83%	84%	79%	81%
Mean Score	3.16	3.42	3.46	3.44	3.58	3.51	3.35	3.39
Total Assessed	209	77	109	101	131	112	130	869
Not Assessed	17	13	80	59	23	57	60	309
Total Students	226	90	189	160	154	170	190	1179

USE OF QUOTES/ AH 3							
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2015	Spring 2013	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	74%	69%	77%	88%	85%	82%	78%	79%
Mean Score	3.06	3.17	3.36	3.37	3.45	3.55	3.40	3.32
Total Assessed	200	77	99	101	131	112	129	849
Not Assessed	17	13	90	59	23	57	60	319
Total Students	226	90	189	160	154	170	190	1179

DEMONSTRATION OF THESIS / CRT2							
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2015	Spring 2013	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	76%	72%	78%	87%	81%	88%	82%	80%
Mean Score	3.17	3.39	3.43	3.47	3.53	3.62	3.39	3.40
Total Assessed	209	76	109	100	131	112	119	856
Not Assessed	17	14	80	60	23	57	71	322
Total Students	226	90	189	160	154	169	190	1178

CONTEXT/ AH3							
CRT4	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2015	Spring 2013	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	72%	74%	83%	84%	79%	84%	78%	79%
Mean Score	3.12	3.38	3.51	3.29	3.64	3.53	3.19	3.38
Total Assessed	161	77	88	92	131	102	58	709
Not Assessed	65	13	101	68	23	66	131	467
Total Students	226	90	189	160	154	168	189	1176

SECONDARY MATERIAL/ CRT 3							
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2015	Spring 2013	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	88%	90%	78%	79%	66%	73%	--	77%
Mean Score	3.52	3.60	3.50	3.18	3.07	3.15	--	3.27
Total Assessed	25	10	40	61	41	41	0	218
Not Assessed	186	80	149	99	113	128	190	945
Total Students	211	90	189	160	154	169	190	1163

Analysis

Both in our most recent semester (Spring 2016) and over the course of the past 5 years, English general education students have demonstrated an ability for complex critical thinking and analysis. Our totals overall suggest that just under four-fifths of our students score at or above "acceptable" on our rubric. Our courses demand students discriminate among literary forms, meanings, and structures; build meaning from these; and communicate those meanings. A substantial majority of our students are succeeding.

CRT1: Students score well above the mean of 3.0 in their ability to define a problem. In their writing, students offer clear arguments about the meaning of literary texts, and such arguments are necessarily distinct from description of what a text "says" (which is consensual and factual). Arguments about literature assert what a text does—how it problematizes or creates perspective on its content. Over the past about 4 in 5 students in General Education courses have consistently defined such problems in literary texts.

CRT4: Students in General Education literature courses are learning to perceive and analyze formal literary elements and features. In the last 5 years, 81% have scored at or above the mean. Spring of 2016 saw student performance in this outcome dip; we will watch to see if performance declines further and, if so, intervene to reinforce close reading skills.

AH3: Over recent years students have effectively selected and discussed quotations from literary texts in their writing. Such quotations are the basic evidence in literary critical arguments; the discussion of these, revealing their literary qualities and import and tying the evidence to the thesis presented, is a fundamentally analytical skill. Students in General Education literature courses are achieving the level of acceptable or above in this outcome 79% of the time. Our rubric anchor "context" also measures success in this outcome, and reveals a

nearly identical rate of reaching "acceptable." Thus the vast majority of students in our literature courses are meeting the objective.

CRT2: Students in General Education literature courses have achieved their highest and most consistent scores in the area of demonstrating a thesis, which requires gathering and synthesizing evidence in support of a claim. The mean score is 3.4, and 80% of students are reaching or surpassing the level of acceptable (3.0).

CRT3: Of the outcomes measured in General Education literature courses, students are scoring lowest in their ability to assess the validity of arguments. Performance remains acceptable—more than ¾ of students are meeting or surpassing a 3.0 on our rubric, but this area is measurably below achievement in the other outcomes.

Use of Results

Over the last 5 years the department has addressed its General Education responsibilities by adding additional "topics" courses geared toward non-majors (ENG 213, 214 and 216). These have proved to be popular and allowed instructors to focus less on the breadth of content appropriate for English majors and more on the critical thinking skills described in the 5 outcomes English addresses.

Given the strong performance of our students and the university's forthcoming plans to make changes in General Education, including adopting the Multi-State Collaborative model for assessment, the department will wait to introduce changes in its assessment method. However, in coming terms we will reconsider our measure of CRT3. Not all courses require students to use secondary material in their writing, and the use of such material does not always reveal how well students assess the validity of the material they are using.

6. Assessment Plan

1. The assessment of undergraduate literature courses has 2 key weaknesses (see #4, "Procedural," above): full faculty participation and the lack of uniform standards in evaluating student writing. In Spring of 2017, 23 courses ran that grant credit toward the major; 115 students should have been assessed. In fact, 96 students were assessed, which means the equivalent of nearly 4 courses went unevaluated, or about 17% of students.

2. 2017-18 will be the first year that data is gathered and processed entirely within the English Department. A administrative assistant has been designated to collect data and keep track of faculty who neglect to submit. We expect near full participation in the coming semesters.

One "norming" workshop will be scheduled and run by the department Assessment Committee per semester. The goal will be to determine "acceptable" levels for each rubric anchor by comparing assessment artifacts across the various curriculum levels.

3. The goal of our improvements is to obtain more reliable data. With more accurate measure of where are students are excelling and where they are lacking, faculty can design student exercises and instructor development to address the deficiencies.

4. Changes to data gathering will begin in Fall 2017 and continue indefinitely; norming workshops will begin in Spring 2017 and continue every semester.

5.-7. The effort is targeted initially to faculty, particularly those teaching 298 and 398. These two courses create the baseline of achievement for the 300- and 400-level, for which they serve as prerequisites. Our norming sessions will seek to create a standard based on the skills and knowledge evident in writing from 398—a standard for which students in 398 must aspire and which we look to see maintained in 400-level courses.

8.-9. Since English assesses literature courses in the spring term only, we can expect a noticeable impact on the accuracy of assessment in the data obtained in spring of 2019. From there, we will be able to schedule faculty development workshops with the goal of producing exercises and assignments to implement in courses.

Finally, given the shift in General Education to the Multi-State assessment model, English assessment will consider 1) moving to assessment of literature courses in the major every semester, rather than in spring only, and 2) adopting a system in which instructors evaluate artifacts gathered across courses and course levels (rather than assess their own course material).

Appendix A: ENGLISH LITERATURE ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Outcome	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
thesis	no thesis or thesis not literary, or is deemed indefensible or illegitimate	rudimentary, implicit, or conceptually muddled thesis, or is merely description rather than claim	basically sound thesis— arguable, appropriate, but simplistic and perhaps not ambitious enough for assignment	solid thesis, defined, detailed, and not only appropriate but also addresses the complexity of the work(s) addressed	explicit, complex, original
reading of lit.	on the basis of textual evidence misrepresents or misunderstands work(s) addressed	only basic or general understanding of work(s) addressed—often treats plot rather than literary elements	solid understanding of literary elements observable in work(s) addressed, but may not have much authorial elaboration or may name them without integrating them into a clear reading	demonstrates some sophistication in the reading of literature; identifies and discusses appropriately with accurate vocabulary literary elements supporting claim, though may miss some implications of what has been observed	finely drawn observations/comments on work(s) addressed
use of quotes	may be missing any textual support; quoted passages may actually contradict point at hand; may quote inaccurately	may rely too heavily on quotes to make point; may not include strongest textual evidence available, may draw spurious conclusions from appropriate passages or only limited and minor points	generally appropriate, accurate use of textual evidence, but may be used to make rather simple or obvious points; may offer passages that are unnecessarily long or fail to include details necessary to support claim	appropriate, accurate, supports argument clearly, but there may be some relevant details within quotation left untreated or a failure to recognize other elements within a passage beyond the immediate point at hand	well-chosen, well-explicated, accurate, and integrated into author's argument
demonstration of thesis	missing, spurious; may not be literary; may be	rudimentary; may be only implicit or only indirectly tied	present, addresses literature, but perhaps does not	present, relevant, literary, arises	convincing, complex picture of literature and literary issues addressed;

	entirely or largely plot summary	to claim; may include unnecessary plot summary	arise directly from the claim or is not particularly striking or original; may be more description rather than close reading	from the claim presented but may miss opportunities to develop the nuances of the work(s) addressed	stems directly from claim presented
rel. between lit. work and its context	misassertions or misinformation about context; or no attempt to contextualize	awareness of issues of context, but may ID inappropriate contexts or have only rudimentary notions of connections	ID's appropriate and helpful context; able to draw clear, useful, if not necessarily sophisticated, connections in discussion of work(s) addressed	clear, valid relationships between works and context(s), makes use of relationship to craft argument and conclusion but may miss additional contexts that complicate claim	articulates clear, valuable relationship between work(s) and appropriate context(s) in a variety of ways; sees complexity of such relationships
use of secondary or research material	req. by assignment but missing, or no citation, or material dropped into text without any purpose or relevance	material present (if req.) but long passages may be presented without discussion or authorial contextualizing; may be poorly cited; may not be related to argument advanced	used largely appropriately in support of argument, but may not be integrated fully into the argument; may have some problems with citation	used appropriately and cited correctly; demonstrates sound understanding of sources used, and sources are relevant to topic at hand; citation practices correct	material mastered and set into clear, valuable rel. with author's perspective; technicalities of use of citation entirely correct

English Department
First-Year Writing Program (General Education)
Full Assessment Report
Fall, 2017

Preamble and Highlights

English 110 and English 105/105P are two different versions of a required course for the University's general education communication skills category (Skill Area I); there are no other required general education composition courses. They meet the same learning outcomes, but English 110 does so in a 3-credit course, while English 105/105P includes the same 3-credit course with a 2-credit "lab" section for students to work with greater instructor and peer support. The curriculum requires that all sections teach 3-4 major papers that are non-fiction, academic essays. The courses emphasize analysis, argumentation, and original research.

The program has developed considerably since 2014 when the course described above was solidified and instructor support to ensure consistency across sections was implemented by the Director of Composition. The program now has annual professional development meetings (sometimes these occur more frequently, throughout the year), syllabi review every semester, and class observations every three years. The program now uses one common text across sections, which is an anthology of student writing, *Comp@Central.* We also piloted a new assessment practice in Fall 2017, which had different instructors score anonymous student essays from English 105 and 110, rather than our current practice represented by this data, which is that instructors score their own students' writing.

1—Learning Outcomes

Students will be able to:

CRT 4. ANALYZE INFORMATION TO UNCOVER UNDERLYING MEANINGS, STRUCTURES AND PATTERNS

WC 1. DEVELOP A CHOSEN TOPIC

WC2. ORGANIZE SPECIFICS TO SUPPORT A MAIN IDEA

WC3. USE PROPER GRAMMAR

WC4. ADDRESS A PARTICULAR AUDIENCE

WC5. REVISE AND EDIT TO PRODUCE FOCUSED AND COHERENT PROSE

2—Findings

CRT 4. ANALYZE INFORMATION TO UNCOVER UNDERLYING MEANINGS, STRUCTURES AND PATTERNS

The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in their own English 105 or English 110 class. LO CRT 4 corresponds to the Item #2 on the English Composition Rubric (Appendix A), Thoughtful Ideas. The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. A summary of student performance over the last three years is below. Over the last three years, 78% of students scored in the superior range, above 3.

THOUGHTFUL IDEAS				
CRT4/WC1	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	82%	74%	78%
Mean Score	4.40	3.52	3.28	3.43
Total Assessed	5	145	137	287
Not Assessed	10	80	99	189
Total Students	15	225	236	476

WC 1. DEVELOP A CHOSEN TOPIC

The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in their own English 105 or English 110 class. LO WC 1 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric Item #1, Controlling Idea; Item #2, Thoughtful Ideas; and Item #4, Demonstration of Controlling Ideas. The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. A summary of student performance over the last three years is below. Over the last three years, 83% of students scored in the superior range, above 3, for Controlling Idea; 78% of students scored in the superior range, above 3, for Thoughtful Ideas; and 77% of students scored in the superior range, above 3, for Demonstration of Controlling Idea.

CONTROLLING IDEA

WC1/WC2	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	86%	79%	83%
Mean Score	5.00	3.62	3.24	3.46
Total Assessed	5	145	137	287
Not Assessed	10	80	101	191
Total Students	15	225	241	481

THOUGHTFUL IDEAS

CRT4/WC1	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	82%	74%	78%
Mean Score	4.40	3.52	3.28	3.43
Total Assessed	5	145	137	287
Not Assessed	10	80	99	189
Total Students	15	225	236	476

DEMONSTRATION OF CONTROLLING IDEA

WC1/WC2	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	80%	73%	77%
Mean Score	4.40	3.28	3.12	3.23
Total Assessed	5	145	137	287

Not Assessed	10	80	101	191
Total Students	15	225	241	481

WC2. ORGANIZE SPECIFICS TO SUPPORT A MAIN IDEA

The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in their own English 105 or English 110 class. LO WC 2 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric Item #3, Organization, and Item #4, Demonstration of Controlling Idea. The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. A summary of student performance over the last three years is below. Over the last three years, 83% of students scored in the superior range, above 3, for Effective Organization, and 77% of students scored in the superior range, above 3, for Demonstration of Controlling Idea.

EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION				
WC2	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	87%	78%	83%
Mean Score	4.60	3.58	3.34	3.48
Total Assessed	5	145	137	287
Not Assessed	10	80	101	191
Total Students	15	225	241	481

DEMONSTRATION OF CONTROLLING IDEA				
WC1/WC2	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	80%	73%	77%
Mean Score	4.40	3.28	3.12	3.23

Total Assessed	5	145	137	287
Not Assessed	10	80	101	191
Total Students	15	225	241	481

WC3. USE PROPER GRAMMAR

The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in their own English 105 or English 110 class. LO WC 3 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric's Item #6, Conventions. The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. A summary of student performance over the last three years is below. Over the last three years, 75% of students scored in the superior range, above 3.

ATTENTION TO CONVENTIONS AND READABILITY				
WC3	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	76%	73%	75%
Mean Score	4.00	3.16	3.20	3.19
Total Assessed	5	145	136	286
Not Assessed	10	80	102	192
Total Students	15	225	241	481

WC4. ADDRESS A PARTICULAR AUDIENCE

The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in their own English 105 or English 110 class. LO WC 4 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric's Item #5, Style. The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. A summary of

student performance over the last three years is below. Over the last three years, 76% of students scored in the superior range, above 3.

MATURE AND EFFECTIVE STYLE				
WC4	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	77%	73%	76%
Mean Score	4.20	3.19	3.26	3.24
Total Assessed	5	145	137	287
Not Assessed	10	80	101	191
Total Students	15	225	241	481

WC5. REVISE AND EDIT TO PRODUCE FOCUSED AND COHERENT PROSE

The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in their own English 105 or English 110 class. LO WC 5 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric's Item #1, Controlling Idea. The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. A summary of student performance over the last three years is below. Over the last three years, 83% of students scored in the superior range, above 3.

CONTROLLING IDEA				
WC1/WC2	Fall 2014 Writing	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Grand Total
Percent >=3	100%	86%	79%	83%
Mean Score	5.00	3.62	3.24	3.46
Total Assessed	5	145	137	287
Not Assessed	10	80	101	191
Total Students	15	225	241	481

Section 3—Analysis

CRT 4. ANALYZE INFORMATION TO UNCOVER UNDERLYING MEANINGS, STRUCTURES AND PATTERNS

The data from 2014 to 2016 indicate that a majority of students meet this learning outcome. During this period of time, 78% of the student writing assessed was satisfactory or better. Students have performed consistently well on this learning outcome during the past three years. Over time the scores appear to have gone down, but Fall 2014 only had 5 student papers assessed, and so it is meaningless that 100% of such a small sample scored above satisfactory. The fact that scores are trending down, but the majority are still satisfactory indicate to us that we are doing a better job of genuinely representing student achievement in this introductory level course.

WC 1. DEVELOP A CHOSEN TOPIC

The data from each item of the rubric that is used to assess this learning outcome shows student achievement at an acceptable level. The cumulative percentage of student writing rated higher than satisfactory is 83% for Rubric Item #1, 78% for Rubric Item #2, and 77% for Rubric Item #3. These percentages indicate that students effectively generate their own ideas and perspectives on complex issues, and they draw on appropriate types and amount of evidence. Over time the scores appear to have gone down, but Fall 2014 only had 5 student papers assessed, and so it is meaningless that 100% of such a small sample scored above satisfactory. The fact that scores are trending down, but the majority are still above satisfactory, indicate to us that we are doing a better job of genuinely representing student achievement in this introductory level course.

WC2. ORGANIZE SPECIFICS TO SUPPORT A MAIN IDEA

The results of our assessment indicate that students are able to organize specific evidence in support of a central idea. The cumulative percentages from our rubric items (83% above satisfactory for item #3 and 77% above satisfactory for item #4) are high. These results indicate that our faculty teach stages in the writing process (such as outlining, peer review, and evaluation of evidence) that aid students in building well supported arguments. We know that some of our instructors work with our librarians to support students as they search for and evaluate sources. Over time the scores appear to have gone down, but Fall 2014 only had 5 student papers assessed, and so it is meaningless that 100% of such a small sample scored above satisfactory. The fact that scores are trending down, but the majority are still above satisfactory, indicate to us that we are doing a better job of genuinely representing student achievement in this introductory level course.

WC3. USE PROPER GRAMMAR

The results of our assessment demonstrate that students use proper grammar in their formal writing assignments. The cumulative percentage of students who scored satisfactorily or better is 75%; while high, this percentage is slightly lower than other rubric items and learning outcomes. Over time the scores appear to have gone down, but Fall 2014 only had 5 student papers assessed, and so it is meaningless that 100% of such a small sample scored above satisfactory. The fact that scores are trending down, but the majority are still above satisfactory, indicate to us that we are doing a better job of genuinely representing student achievement in this introductory level course.

WC4. ADDRESS A PARTICULAR AUDIENCE

Our data shows that over the past three years students are writing in an appropriate style that indicates awareness of audience. The cumulative percentage of students who scored satisfactorily or better is 76%; while high, this percentage is slightly lower than other rubric items and learning outcomes. Over time the scores appear to have gone down, but Fall 2014 only had 5 student papers assessed, and so it is meaningless that 100% of such a small sample scored above satisfactory. The fact that scores are trending down, but the majority are still above satisfactory, indicate to us that we are doing a better job of genuinely representing student achievement in this introductory level course.

WC5. REVISE AND EDIT TO PRODUCE FOCUSED AND COHERENT PROSE

The data from the rubric item that is used to assess this learning outcome show student achievement at an acceptable level. The cumulative percentage of student writing rated higher than satisfactory is 83% for Rubric Item #1. This percentage indicates that students are writing as a process and improving each draft until they have an effective final draft. Over time the scores appear to have gone down, but Fall 2014 only had 5 student papers assessed, and so it is meaningless that 100% of such a small sample scored above satisfactory. The fact that scores are trending down, but the majority are still above satisfactory, indicate to us that we are doing a better job of genuinely representing student achievement in this introductory level course.

4—Use of Results

CRT 4. ANALYZE INFORMATION TO UNCOVER UNDERLYING MEANINGS, STRUCTURES AND PATTERNS

The results for this LO and all of our LOs have trended downward in the past three years, which we view as a positive result in the sense that it is a more accurate reflection of our student's achievement level. This data has led us to two specific changes. In an effort to improve our pedagogy and better articulate the curricular expectations of English 105 and 110, our Director of Composition holds annual professional development sessions for all faculty teaching English

105 and 110. This practice began in August 2015. All instructors teaching these courses also have their syllabi reviewed by the Director of Composition each semester, beginning in the spring 2016 semester.

WC 1. DEVELOP A CHOSEN TOPIC

The results for this LO and all of our LOs have trended downward in the past three years, which we view as a positive result in the sense that it is a more accurate reflection of our student's achievement level. To continue honing effective teaching strategies for developing topics, the Director of Composition provides professional development about how instructors can teach writing as a process. She also encourages instructors, where appropriate, to assign papers that require students to choose their own topics and to always write their own thesis statements. Sample assignments that support this learning outcome have been made available on an Instructor Resource Blackboard site and in the Composition Instructor Handbook.

WC2. ORGANIZE SPECIFICS TO SUPPORT A MAIN IDEA

The results for this LO and all of our LOs have trended downward in the past three years, which we view as a positive result in the sense that it is a more accurate reflection of our student's achievement level. These results have encouraged some of our instructors work with our librarians to support students as they search for and evaluate sources. In order to continue improving our instruction, we have partnered with our librarians who are designing a composition specific LibGuide that aids students in finding sources; our composition instructors then have more time to teach students to organize their findings from these sources.

WC3. USE PROPER GRAMMAR

The results for this LO and all of our LOs have trended downward in the past three years, which we view as a positive result in the sense that it is a more accurate reflection of our student's achievement level. The results of this assessment have led to continued professional development on this topic. This pedagogical concern is also addressed in the Composition Instructor Handbook.

WC4. ADDRESS A PARTICULAR AUDIENCE

The results for this LO and all of our LOs have trended downward in the past three years, which we view as a positive result in the sense that it is a more accurate reflection of our student's achievement level. To continue improving our teaching methods based on this assessment data, we have shared class materials among our instructors (on our Blackboard site and during in-person professional development meetings) to generate ideas for teaching student writers to consider audience.

WC5. REVISE AND EDIT TO PRODUCE FOCUSED AND COHERENT PROSE

The results for this LO and all of our LOs have trended downward in the past three years, which we view as a positive result in the sense that it is a more accurate reflection of our student's achievement level. This assessment data does not provide insight into the students' writing and revision process, although the faculty member assessing the writing has taught the student and knows his/her process. However, this data has led us to continue providing pedagogical support for our instructors through our training and our Composition Instructor Handbook. The Director of Composition has also been checking all syllabi to make sure they require writing as a process.

5—General Education

English 105 and English 110 are General Education Skill Area I courses that meet the following General Education Learning Outcomes: CRT4, WC1, WC2, WC3, WC4, WC5. Our departmental assessment of these courses is already aligned with General Education Learning Outcomes, so please refer to Sections 2-4 above for more detail on our data for these LOs.

6—Assessment Plan

Our assessment plan for English 105 and 110 is inclusive of General Education LOs.

2017-2018 The Director of Composition can focus professional development for instructors on the lowest scoring category for this academic year: Using proper grammar (WC3)/ Paying attention to conventions and readability for the next year. The goal of this adjustment is to improve instructors' skill at teaching grammar in the context of students' own writing, which is a best practice in our field.

For the next four years, the Composition Committee would also like to continue a pilot of having different instructors score anonymous student essays from English 105 and 110, rather than our current practice represented by this data, which is that instructors score their own students' writing. We piloted this assessment strategy at the beginning of the Fall 2017 semester with writing from AY 2016-2017 and are currently analyzing the results. The last untimed writing will still be used and an anonymous group of five students will still be scored from each section.

2018-2019 The Director of Composition can focus professional development for instructors on the second lowest scoring category for this academic year: Revising and editing to produce focused and coherent prose (WC5)/ Writing in a mature and effective style. The goal of this adjustment is to improve instructors' skill at teaching the later-order concerns in the writing process that deal with the sentence-level.

2019-2020 The Director of Composition can focus professional development for instructors on

the third lowest scoring category for this academic year: Developing a chosen topic (WC1) and Organizing specifics to support a main idea (WC2)/Demonstration of the controlling idea. The goal of this adjustment is to improve instructors' skill at teaching the later-order concerns in the writing process that deal with the sentence-level.

The Composition Committee and the Assessment Committee should also during this year, with three years of data from the new assessment practice, evaluate its effectiveness and decide how to proceed.

2020-2021 The Director of Composition can focus professional development and consider curricular revisions based on the weakest student performance in a particular LO.

	5	4	3	2	1
Thesis	The writer has clearly indicated a thesis that guides and structures the essay. The thesis is appropriately complex for the scale of the essay. The thesis is compelling in that it is not derived from a boilerplate; it emerges from a close intellectual engagement with the material.	The thesis is present and clear, but it may not incorporate all of the issues addressed in the essay. The thesis is interesting and complex, but not perhaps entirely original.	The thesis is present and clear, but it could definitely be better developed. Although there is a governing idea to the essay, it may have a tendency to be simplistic or clichéd.	The thesis is not functioning as a controlling idea. Parts of the essay may diverge from the thesis and go in an entirely different direction. It is easy to get lost in the essay, even if it does make some sense. There may be ideas here, but the essay wanders.	Either no thesis is present or the thesis entirely inappropriate for the subject matter or genre.
Argument Development	The writer offers several thoughtful ideas that reveal a distinct analytical engagement with the topic. Writer has likely asked important questions about the topic or text in order to develop and clarify it.	The writer offers several compelling ideas that shed light on the topic or text. There is a solid sense of intellectual engagement here, but the writer has not pushed him/herself to develop ideas to their fullest.	Although there are clear ideas in the paper, they tend to be predictable and their connection to the topic isn't always clearly developed. It's clear that the writer has a sense of a relationship between his/her expressed ideas and topic, but that relationship may remain implicit in part rather than being clearly explained.	Ideas may not shed light on the topic or may not be appropriate for the topic. Possible moments of clarity alongside contradiction. There is not a clear sense that the student understands the material or has thought about it at length.	No evidence of intellectual engagement with the material. Ideas, if present, may be contradictory to one another or may work against the essay's use of evidence.
Use of Evidence and Sources	Writer offers ample, striking, and convincing evidence in support of the thesis. Writer recognizes and incorporates other perspectives into the argument. Paper arrives at a meaningful and original conclusion arising effectively from engagement with other sources. Writer's perspectives are clearly distinguishable from those of the sources.	Writer offers appropriate and convincing evidence in support of the thesis. Writer acknowledges other perspectives appropriately within the paper and offers a conclusion arising from the argument in support of the thesis. Writer's perspectives are clearly distinguishable from those of the sources.	There is appropriate evidence offered in support of the thesis, but it may be scanty or in need of elaboration. There may not be a clear acknowledgement of other views, and there may be a summary, rather than analysis, or the analysis may be general or obvious.	There is evidence offered, but it is inappropriate or inadequately set forth. There is no acknowledgement of multiple perspectives. The conclusion may be absent or may not arise clearly from the argument presented.	No thesis, or no appropriate evidence offered, or no evidence at all. There is no analysis or original conclusion, or merely random statements or assertions that have no relationship to the thesis or the argument. Or writer may have presented an idea from a source as his/her own.
	5	4	3	2	1

Effective Organization	All paragraphs are coherent and unified. Logic of the argument proceeds smoothly with appropriate transitions and a clear relationship among the various points presented.	All or most paragraphs are both coherent and unified. Appropriate transitions enhance the logic of the argument.	Some paragraphs are unified and coherent, but others may need to be expanded or combined. Transitions may be inappropriate or missing.	Paragraphing is present, but erratic and problematic. There is little in the way of transitions or other landmarks to help the reader through the argument.	Little in the way of organizing structure. Sentences may be presented as paragraphs, or whole pages may be offered with no paragraph breaks. No indications that the writer is aware of the relationships among the points, or may not even articulate points.
Mature and Effective Style	Writer provides a rich variety of sentence structures, both in length and format; word choice is appropriate, precise, and avoids triteness or clichés.	Writer provides a variety of sentence structures; word choice is accurate and helps advance the writer's claim.	Sentences and word choice are predictable with occasional infelicities in sentence structure. Some terms may be over-used or may be asked to do too much of the work of the argument.	Sentences and word choice are predictable, with frequent infelicities in sentence structure that begin to interfere with the writer's ability to communicate the purpose.	Little sentence structure variety; wording is predictable or inappropriate for collegiate work. Many errors are present in sentence structure.
Attention to Conventions and Readability	Writer follows conventions for college writing, including signal phrases, correct citations, and standard forms for punctuation, spelling, verb tense, and agreement. Essay avoids such mistakes as missing words, homonym confusions, tangled sentences, unclear references, and confusing punctuation.	Writer makes few, if any, minor errors in style, sentence construction, usage, grammar, or mechanics. Writer has very few mistakes with missing words, homonym confusions, tangled sentences, unclear references, and confusing punctuation.	Writer has some errors in style, sentence construction, and mechanics, but the writer generally demonstrates a correct sense of syntax.	Writer has many and/or major errors in style, sentence structure and mechanics; writers' sense of correct use of syntax is in question. At times errors interfere with the reader's ability to comprehend the writer's ideas.	Writer has numerous minor errors and major errors; sentence construction is below mastery and displays a pattern of errors in usage and mechanics. Errors impede the reader's ability to comprehend the writer's argument.