

# Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

## Program - English

**Mission Statement:** The English Department of Seward County Community

College contributes to students' general education by providing the knowledge and skills necessary to perform personal, academic, and professional reading and writing tasks.

| Outcomes  | Assessment Tools | Results  | Actions   |           |             |         |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |  |
|---|------------------|--|---|-----------|-------------|---------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|--|
| <b>Knowledge of Grammar and Usage - Directly related to Objective</b><br>Students will demonstrate knowledge of grammar and usage skills needed to communicate effectively in writing.<br><b>Outcome Status:</b> Active<br><b>Outcome Type:</b> Curricular<br><b>Start Date:</b> 08/17/2010 |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Complete<br><b>Result Type:</b> Problem/limitation<br>I averaged the scoring of each class, and after informing them of the essay changes, I asked each class what conclusions could be drawn from this information.<br><br><table> <tr> <td></td><td>Structure</td><td>Correctness</td><td>Content</td></tr> <tr> <td>9:00</td><td>1.72</td><td>1.38</td><td>1.56</td></tr> <tr> <td>10:00</td><td>2.29</td><td>2.71</td><td>1.93</td></tr> <tr> <td>12:00</td><td>2.00</td><td>1.50</td><td>1.75</td></tr> </table> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, the essay scored as incompetent in all three classes.</li> <li>Though the grammar score from the 10 class should have been higher since few errors existed, the lack of errors still affected the scoring in the other two areas of the rubric. Few grammar errors appear to affect the overall impression of an essay's structure and content development.</li> <li>Students are doubtful about grammar issues. They will assume there are more errors than they recognize and will automatically score an essay lower on the correctness portion of the rubric. (12/14/2007)</li> </ol> |   | Structure | Correctness | Content | 9:00 | 1.72 | 1.38 | 1.56 | 10:00 | 2.29 | 2.71 | 1.93 | 12:00 | 2.00 | 1.50 | 1.75 |  |
|   | Structure        | Correctness  | Content   |           |             |         |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |  |
| 9:00  | 1.72             | 1.38   | 1.56  |           |             |         |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |  |
| 10:00   | 2.29             | 2.71   | 1.93  |           |             |         |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |  |
| 12:00   | 2.00             | 1.50   | 1.75  |           |             |         |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |  |
| <b>Direct - Comparison of pre/post competency test scores in Comp I</b><br><br>Comparison of pre/post diagnostic mastery test scores in Pre-Comp II.  |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>EG 0603: 63% (17/27) improved; 4% (1/27) no change; 33% (9/27) declined. Benchmark not met.<br>EG 1103: 59% (83/140) improved; 13% (18/140) no   | <b>Action:</b> (A) Confirm/review curriculum map for developmental and composition courses to identify presence/sequence of |           |             |         |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |  |

| Outcomes | Assessment Tools  | Results  | Actions   |
|----------|---|--|---|
|          |   | change; 28% (39/140) declined. Benchmark not met.  | grammar/usage outcomes.   |
|          | <b>Benchmark:</b> 80% of PC II and Comp I course completers will show improvement on post-test score as compared to pre-test score.<br><b>Schedule:</b> Beginning and end of each semester. | Previous year's report:<br>EG 0603: 63% (27/43) improved; 14% no change; 23% declined.<br>EG 1103: 61% (212/349) improved; 8% no change; 32% declined. (05/19/2022)  | (B) Confirm aspects of grammar/usage to be assessed.<br>(C) Develop more precise correctness rubric for English program.<br>(D) Develop question bank in relation to confirmed aspects in B. (This testing is to be a multiple choice quiz administered within first week of class and then as part of the final exam. For Comp I, the first quiz is typically assigned full credit for completion as defined by instructor. The final exam version is required to be worth 2.5% of total course grade. No scoring mandate is in place for PC2.)<br>(E) Report PLUS student data separately from Comp I.<br>(F) Identify recommended teaching methods, perhaps through focus group with instructors.<br>(G) Ensure 100% of instructors reporting.<br>(05/19/2022) |
|          |   | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>For Comp I, 61% (212/349) of students improved on the test, 27 stayed the same, and 110 declined in their pre/post competency test scores.<br><br>For Pre-Comp II, 63% (27/43) of students improved on the test, 6 stayed the same, and 10 declined in their pre/post competency test scores. (05/14/2021) | <b>Action:</b> For Comp I and Pre-Comp II, Grammar tests seem arbitrary in the measurement of skills compared to a more holistic evaluation in real-world learning.<br><br>We need to develop a more complex rubric to explore pre and post improvement in a semester.<br><br>Over the summer each instructor will craft a possible correctness rubric that we can bring to the   |

| Outcomes | Assessment Tools | Results  | Actions  |
|----------|------------------|--|--|
|          |                  |  | table in August to construct a single program rubric for correctness and norm our use of the rubric. (05/14/2021)  |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>For Comp I, 216 of 320 students improved, 33 students stayed the same, and 71 declined in their pre/post competency test scores, 68% improved.<br>For Pre-Comp II, 28 of 68 students improved, 12 stayed the same, and 28 declined in their pre/post-test score, 41% improved.<br>(05/29/2020)             | <b>Action:</b> The pandemic might have somewhat affected scores, but this remains an opportunity for improvement. (05/29/2020)   |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>In Comp I, 85% of students (217/318) improved on the post test. Three full-time instructors reported and seven out of adjuncts reported. Comp I met benchmark.<br>In PC II, 31% of students (17/54) showed improvement, with 2 full-time instructors reporting. PC II did not meet benchmark. (05/23/2019) | <b>Action:</b> The reporting for Comp I and PC II was combined with Developmental English merged with the English Department, but we should look at making separate outcomes for Comp I and PC II. PC II is far below the benchmark. Next fall, look at past history and discuss what should be done.<br>Though Comp I met the benchmark, the English Department will switch to an electronic version of the test next fall. We piloted the test this spring and scores are much lower than on the paper version. May need to adjust the benchmark or work on practice testing/test prep with students. (05/23/2019) |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>91% (265/290) of Comp I students finishing the course earned a grade of C or higher. Three full-time instructors and nine adjuncts reported. Increased reporting by adjuncts resulted in much larger pool of data. (05/21/2018)   | <b>Action:</b> We will look at PC pre-post mastery in 2018-19 as part of our department goal to better align courses and possibly redesign PC II as we move more students into Comp I Plus. We should consider a separate  |

| Outcomes | Assessment Tools   | Results   | Actions  |
|----------|--|---|--|
|          |  | <p>outcome/benchmark for the PC II pre/post mastery. (05/21/2018)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br/>           COMP I F 16-S 17:<br/>           Two full-time and 5 adjunct instructors reporting</p> <p>Improved: 211/244: 86%<br/>           No change/decline: 33/244: 14%</p> <p>PC II F 16-S 17<br/>           Developmental Instructors reporting<br/>           Improved: 85/108 (79%)<br/>           No change/decline: 23/108 (21%)</p> <p>(05/16/2017)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Complete<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           Scores reported by 3 full-time English instructors and 8 Adjunct/Outreach instructors:<br/>           Improved: 255 82%<br/>           Dropped/no change: 57 18% (05/17/2016)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           12 INSTRUCTORS REPORTING, INCLUDING 10 OUTREACH/ADJUNCT<br/>           207 students improved/41 no change or lower, 248 total students<br/>           83% (05/20/2015)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           336 total students/15 instructors (including 13 Adjunct/Outreach) for AY 13-14<br/>           278 students improved.<br/>           58 did not improve (no change/more errors than first testing)<br/>           Result: 83% improved. (05/20/2014)</p> |  |
|          | <p><b>Indirect</b> - Comp I course grade<br/> <b>Benchmark:</b> 70% of students who complete Comp I will earn a grade of</p> | <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           EG1103: 76% (130/170) at or above the rubric score.</p>  | <p><b>Action:</b> This outcome has been measured since 2014; this year's result is the lowest, although it</p> |

| <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Assessment Tools</i>                                | <i>Results</i>   | <i>Actions</i>  |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
|                 | C or higher.<br><b>Schedule:</b> End of each semester. | Decreased 8% year-over-year and meets course benchmark. (05/19/2022)   | still meets benchmark. Actions:<br>(A) Review trend of W's in this course over past 5 years.<br>(B) In the Fall 2022 program review, decide whether or not this assessment continues.<br>(05/19/2022) |
|                 |  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>84% of students completing the course passed with a grade of C or better. (300/356). Three full-time instructors and nine adjuncts reported. (05/14/2021)              | <b>Action:</b> Will track Ws to examine what proportion of students withdraw from the course.<br>(05/14/2021)   |
|                 |  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>260 of 333 students earned a grade of C or higher or 78%<br>(05/29/2020)   |   |
|                 |  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>79% of students completing the course passed with a grade of C or better. (200/253). Three full-time instructors and five out of eight adjuncts reported. (05/23/2019) |   |
|                 |  | <b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>AY 16-17<br>Instructors: 2 full-time, 1 adjunct (fall Adjunct/Outreach results not available)<br>Total students:86<br>C or above: 73 (85%)<br>D/F: 13 (15%) (05/16/2017)    |   |
|                 |  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Complete<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>144 students<br>113 ABC<br>31 DF<br>78% (05/17/2016)   |   |
|                 |  | <b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>111 of 123 total completing students (F14-S15) earned C, B, or A  |   |

| Outcomes   | Assessment Tools  | Results   | Actions  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  |   | 90% (05/20/2015)<br><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>124 total students/3 instructors for AY 13-14<br>C grade or higher: 108<br>D/F (not including W and MIA--students attending class until end of semester): 16<br>Result: 87% (05/20/2014)                                      | <b>Action:</b> English instructors will meet at the start of Fall 14 semester to decide the definition of "Complete" for the purposes of this assessment (05/20/2014)  |
| <b>Critical Thinking -</b> Critical Thinking rubric score for Comp II final exam in-class essay (students write a persuasive argument).<br><b>Outcome Status:</b> Active<br><b>Outcome Type:</b> Curricular<br><b>Start Date:</b> 08/17/2010 | <b>Direct -</b> Critical Thinking rubric score for Comp II final exam in-class essay (students write a persuasive argument).<br><b>Benchmark:</b> 80% of students completing the course will score a 3-3-2 or higher on the critical thinking rubric.<br><b>Schedule:</b> End of each semester. | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>EG1113: 85% (202/237) at or above the rubric score. Increased 14% year-over-year and meets course benchmark. (05/19/2022)   | <b>Action:</b> This outcome has been measured since 2014; the only result higher than this year was in 2015 with 87% (65/75). There are swings up and down year-over-year with no discernable pattern.<br><b>Actions:</b><br>(A) confirm artifact for assessment.<br>(B) hold at least one norming session with selected artifact for Comp 2 instructors in AY 2022-23. (05/19/2022) |
|  |   | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>178 of 252 students scored a 3-3-2 or higher on the critical thinking rubric or 71% (05/14/2021)  | <b>Action:</b> Consider redesign of assignment to better teach skills. We would like to assess a different assignment other than the final. (06/23/2021)   |
|  |   | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>186 of 241 students scored a 3-3-2 or higher on the critical thinking rubric or 77% (05/29/2020)  | <b>Action:</b> Perhaps results were affected by the pandemic as spring semester scores seem abnormal. We will continue to monitor the results. (05/29/2020)  |
|  |   | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Complete<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>80% of students (280/286) scored a 3-2-2 or higher on the Critical Thinking Rubric for the 2019 Comp II final exam essay. 2 full-time instructors and seven our of eight adjuncts reported. (05/24/2019)<br><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress |  |

| Outcomes | Assessment Tools   | Results   | Actions   |
|----------|--|---|---|
|          |  | <b>Result Type:</b> Directional Improvement<br>74.8% (176/235 students) scored a 3-3-2 or better Two full-time instructors and eight adjuncts reported. This is a much larger sample than we have reported in the past, due to increased response from adjuncts. (05/21/2018) | <b>Action:</b> We need to make time during 18-19 department meetings to do some norming using the critical thinking rubric. (05/21/2018)  |
|          |  | <b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>134 Total Students<br>2 full-time and 4 adjunct instructors reporting<br>99 students at 3-3-2 or better, 74%<br>35 students below 3-3-2, 26%<br>(05/16/2017)                             |   |
|          |  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Complete<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>120 students/2 full-time instructors and 4 adjunct outreach<br>96 received 3-3-2+ 80% (05/17/2016)  |   |
|          |  | <b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>65 of 75 total students (F14-S15) scored 3-3-2 or higher.<br>87% (05/20/2015)  |   |
|          |  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>Total students: 111 (3 instructors reporting for AY 13-14)<br>Meet expectations (3-3-2 or higher): 80<br>Do not meet expectations: 34<br>Result: 70% (05/20/2014)                   | <b>Action:</b> Suggestion (to be proposed at first English meeting of F 14): Individual rubric scores might be reported and tallied with breakdown available to instructors. Anomalous artifacts might then be pulled for discussion/modeling. (05/20/2014)<br><br><b>Follow-Up:</b><br>English/Developmental full-time instructors<br>Fall 2014 (05/20/2014) |
|          | <b>Indirect -</b> Comp II course grade<br><b>Benchmark:</b> 80% of students who complete Comp II will earn a grade of C or higher.<br><b>Schedule:</b> End of each semester. | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>EG1113: 94% (227/241) at or above the rubric score.<br>Increased 6% year-over-year and meets course benchmark.<br>(05/19/2022)  | <b>Action:</b> This outcome has been measured since 2014; 2014 reported 77% at or above rubric score. Report for each year since exceeds the benchmark. ACTIONS: (A) review trend of W's in this  |

| Outcomes | Assessment Tools | Results  | Actions  |
|----------|------------------|--|--|
|          |                  |  | course over past 5 years.<br>(B) Decide if this assessment needs to continue.<br>(05/19/2022)  |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>88% of Comp II students 235/266) completing the course earned a grade of C or higher. Two full-time instructors and five adjuncts reported. (05/14/2021)   | <b>Action:</b> Exceeding benchmark. Will track Ws to examine what proportion of students withdraw from the course. (05/14/2021)  |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>232 of 252 earned a C or higher, or 92% (05/29/2020)   |  |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>87% of Comp II students 273/313) completing the course earned a grade of C or higher. Two full-time instructors and eight out of eight adjuncts reported. (05/24/2019)   |  |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>93.8% of students completing the course earned a C or better. (212/227 students). Three on-campus full-time instructors reporting and eight adjunct/outreach instructors reporting. This is more than a 10% increase over previous years, but all adjuncts reported data this year. (The completion rate for adjunct/outreach is usually close to 100%.) (05/21/2018) | <b>Action:</b> Our current benchmark is set for students who stay in the class and doesn't take into account Ws. Do we need rethink the benchmark and attempt to reduce the number of Ws, or would that be unrealistic? (05/21/2018) |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>Instructors: 2 full-time, 5 adjunct<br>C or higher: 142 (86%)<br>D or below: 23 (14%) (05/16/2017)  |  |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Complete<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br>101 of 117 students passed the course with ABC (input from 3 adjunct/outreach instructors and 2 full-time English instructors)<br>86%/14%<br>(05/17/2016)  |  |
|          |                  | <b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required   |  |



| Outcomes   | Assessment Tools  | Results  | Actions  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   | <p><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>76 of 93 total students earned C, B, or A.<br/>82% (05/20/2015)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br/>113 total students/3 instructors for AY 13-14<br/>C grade or above: 87<br/>D/F (does not include W or F for students enrolled but not present for final exam): 26<br/>Result: 77% (05/20/2014)</p>   | <p><b>Action:</b> English Comp I and Comp II instructors will meet at the start of the Fall 14 term to determine a definition of "who complete the course." Will it include all W and F grades (as in IPEDS and NCCBP) or only the grades for students who attend until the end of the semester. (05/20/2014)</p>  |
| <p><b>Writing skills</b> - Students will demonstrate the ability to write effectively.<br/><b>Outcome Status:</b> Active<br/><b>Outcome Type:</b> Curricular<br/><b>Start Date:</b> 05/31/2010</p> | <p><b>Direct</b> - Writing rubric score on scholarship essay. All students enrolled in Pre-Comp I, Pre-Comp II, and Comp I will write the essay. On-campus instructors who teach PC I, PC II, and Comp I will score 30 anonymous artifacts selected at random and scores will be averaged.<br/><b>Benchmark:</b> PC I and II essay averages will equal at least a 2.5 in structure, 2.0 in correctness, and 2.5 in content on the rubric.<br/>Comp I essay averages will equal at least a 2.75 in structure, 2.5 in correctness, and 2.75 in content.</p> <p><b>Schedule:</b> Beginning and end of each semester.</p> | <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/><b>Result Type:</b> Inconclusive<br/>No report for AY 2021-2022. (05/19/2022)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/><b>Result Type:</b> Directional Improvement<br/>PC1&amp;2: 10 students assessed. Structure Average 2.35; 5/10 met 2.5 goal; goal not met. Correctness Average 2.40; 9/10 met this goal; goal met. Content Average 2.35; 5/10 met the goal of 2.5; goal not met.</p> <p>Comp I: 20 students assessed. Structure Average 2.80; 8/20 met 2.75 goal; goal not met. Correctness Average 2.68; 14/20 met 2.5 goal; goal met. Content Average 3.00; 17/20 met this goal; goal met. (06/10/2020)<br/><b>Related Documents:</b><br/><a href="#">2019_Random_Sampling_Scholarship_Essay.xlsx</a></p> | <p><b>Action:</b> It appears the last report on this outcome was 06/10/2020.<br/><b>Action:</b><br/>In August 2022 will need to define the plan for this outcome and follow through for AY 2022-23. (05/19/2022)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> This past year, we agreed to require students to stay the entire class period when writing this essay to see if scores improved, and they did. However, we also had a new instructor, and</p> |

| Outcomes | Assessment Tools | Results  | Actions  |
|----------|------------------|--|--|
|          |                  | structure, 2.54 in correctness, and 2.95 in content, meeting the benchmark in all 3 areas. This is the first time in several years that Comp I students met the benchmark.<br>(05/23/2019)   | higher scores may reflect changes in instructors. (05/23/2019)   |
|          |                  | <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p> <p>PC I Average: 3 in structure/ 1.8 in correctness/ 2.6 in content (5 students). Benchmark met in structure &amp; content, but not correctness.</p> <p>PC II Average: 2.5 in structure/ 1.8 in correctness/ 2.4 in content (9 students). Benchmark met in structure, but not in correctness or content.</p> <p>Comp I Average: 2.5 in structure/ 2.4 in correctness/ 2.5 in content (16 students). DNM benchmark in any area, but correctness average is better for Comp I than for PC I and II.<br/>(05/21/2018)</p>   | <p><b>Action:</b> We corrected the problem from previous year of instructors not scoring the same number of artifacts. Each artifact was scored by two instructors, but of those instructors, two were new to SCCC. We may need to spend more time norming BEFORE scoring next year. We may also look at changing benchmark to number of students who make a certain score, rather than averaging all the scores.<br/>(05/21/2018)</p> |
|          |                  | <p><b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p> <p>PC I: 2.2--2.0--2.7. Benchmark met in Correctness and Content/Audience.</p> <p>PC II: 2.5--2.2--2.7. Benchmark met in all three rubric categories.</p> <p>Comp I: 2.5--2.2--2.7. Benchmark not met. (05/16/2017)</p>   |  |
|          |                  | <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Inconclusive</p> <p>Problems with artifact selection and distribution resulted in some artifacts being scored by 4 instructors and some only once, making the following averages anomalous, at best. They were arrived at by averaging the average scores for artifacts at each level according to individual scorers results. The plan is to refocus this assessment in Fall 2016 with a more reliable distribution/scoring/collection procedure in place.</p> <p>Comp I: 2.86 (ME), 2.29 (DNM), 2.42 (DNM)</p> <p>PC I and II: 2.75 (ME), 2.42 (ME), 2.91 (ME).<br/>(05/17/2016)</p> |  |

| Outcomes    | Assessment Tools | Results  | Actions  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
|-------------|------------------|--|--|-----------|-------------|--------------------|--|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|-------------|--|-----|-----|--|
|             |                  | <p><b>Action Status:</b> No Action Required</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Inconclusive</p> <table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Form</th><th>Correctness</th><th>Content / Audience</th></tr><tr><td></td><td>Overall</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>EG0403</td><td>2.0</td><td>1.8</td><td>2.7</td></tr><tr><td>EG0603</td><td>2.7</td><td>2.4</td><td>2.4</td></tr><tr><td>EG1103</td><td>2.6</td><td>2.5</td><td>2.6</td></tr><tr><td>Grand Total</td><td></td><td>2.5</td><td>2.4</td></tr></table> <p>PC I DNM in Structure and Correctness/Exceeds in Content/Audience</p> <p>PC II Exceeds in Structure and Correctness DNM in Content/Audience</p> <p>Comp I Meets in Correctness/DNM in Structure and Content/Audience (05/20/2015)</p> | Course   | Form      | Correctness | Content / Audience |  | Overall |           |           | EG0403    | 2.0       | 1.8 | 2.7 | EG0603 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.4 | EG1103 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | Grand Total |  | 2.5 | 2.4 |  |
| Course      | Form             | Correctness  | Content / Audience   |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
|             | Overall          |  |  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
| EG0403      | 2.0              | 1.8  | 2.7  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
| EG0603      | 2.7              | 2.4  | 2.4  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
| EG1103      | 2.6              | 2.5  | 2.6  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
| Grand Total |                  | 2.5  | 2.4  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
|             |                  | <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Complete</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met</p> <p>2013-14</p> <table><tr><td>A. 30 50%</td><td>A. 28 47%</td><td>A. 27 45%</td></tr><tr><td>A. 20 33%</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>B. 30 50%</td><td>B. 32 53%</td><td>B. 33 55%</td></tr><tr><td>B. 40 67%</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>(05/22/2014)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">WAC EOY report AY 2013-2014.docx</a></p>  | A. 30 50%  | A. 28 47% | A. 27 45%   | A. 20 33%          |  |         | B. 30 50% | B. 32 53% | B. 33 55% | B. 40 67% |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
| A. 30 50%   | A. 28 47%        | A. 27 45%  |  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
| A. 20 33%   |                  |  |  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
| B. 30 50%   | B. 32 53%        | B. 33 55%  |  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
| B. 40 67%   |                  |  |  |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |
|             |                  | <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Inconclusive</p> <p>4 Developmental/English Instructors S 14</p> <p>PC AVE: 2.83 (MET) 2.55 (MET) 2.83 (MET)</p> <p>COMP I</p> <p>AVE: 2.43 (DNM) 2.27 (DNM) 2.37 (DNM)</p> <p>(05/21/2014)</p>  | <p><b>Action:</b> These score averages reflect only one semester of AY 13-14. Score collection for F13 was incomplete. Because of complaints about timing and workload of artifact scoring, English and Developmental instructors will redesign this assessment at the start of Fall 14 to allow for more equitable division of scoring responsibilities among full-time and part-time instructors. The goal remains to involve all instructors in the</p> |           |             |                    |  |         |           |           |           |           |     |     |        |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |             |  |     |     |  |

| Outcomes   | Assessment Tools  | Results  | Actions   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  |   |  | scoring process in the course of the AY and to have at least one joint session for norming every AY. (05/21/2014)   |
| <b>Reading</b> - Read with comprehension, be critical of what they read, and apply knowledge gained to real life.<br><b>Outcome Status:</b> Active | <b>Direct</b> - EG 0403 2-2-2 at end of semester assessment<br>EG 0603 3-2-2 at end of semester assessment<br>EG 1103 3-3-3 on journal assignment<br>EG 1113 4-3-3 on annotated bibliography<br><b>Benchmark:</b> 80% of students completing course will achieve the above rubric score<br><b>Schedule:</b> End of semester | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>EG 0403: 100% (14/14) at or above benchmark. Same year-over-year and meets benchmark.<br>EG 0603: 96% (26/27) at or above benchmark. Increased 14% year-over-year and meets benchmark.<br>EG 1103: 68% (106/156) at or above benchmark. Decreased 9% year-over-year and does not meet benchmark.<br>EG 1113: 78% (181/232) at or above benchmark. Increased 7% year-over-year and does not meet benchmark.<br>Program benchmark for reading is not met given results for Comp I and Comp 2. (05/19/2022) | <b>Action:</b> This is the third year of reporting on this outcome. All courses except Comp 1 show improvement during these years, but not all instructors reported in the first and third years. Actions: (A) Review Program's curriculum map to confirm reading's development within English courses.<br>(B) Identify best "next step" for improvement and confirm artifact in each course to be assessed w/attention on Comp I and Comp 2, perhaps through focus groups with instructors.<br>(C) Ensure 100% of instructors report. (05/19/2022) |
|  |   | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Directional Improvement<br>For EG 0403, 13 of 13 students reported, or 100%, scored a 2-2 at the end of the semester.<br>For EG 0603, 31 of 38 students reported, or 82%, scored a 3-2-2 at the end of the semester assessment.<br>For EG 1103, 249 of 324 students reported, or 77% scored a 3-3- on a journal assignment.<br>For EG 1113, 172 of 248 students reported, or 71% scored a 4-3-3 on the annotated bibliography. (05/14/2021)   | <b>Action:</b> For EG1113, redesign and consider relevance of annotated bibliography as artifact to assess. For EG1103, continue to refine assignment to match assessment. For EG0603, continue with reading assignments. For EG403. continue with reading assignments. (06/23/2021)  |
|  |   | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>For EG 0403, 4 of 7 students reported, or 57%, scored a 2-   | <b>Action:</b> This is the first year that we are reporting this data. Not all instructors reported data for both   |

| Outcomes   | Assessment Tools   | Results  | Actions  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>2-2 at the end of the semester.<br/>           For EG 0603, 23 of 25 students reported, or 92%, scored a 3-2-2 at the end of the semester assessment.<br/>           For EG 1103, 20 of 39 students reported, or 51% scored a 3-3- on a journal assignment.<br/>           For EG 1113, 31 of 71 students reported, or 43% scored a 4-3-3 on the annotated bibliography. (05/29/2020)</p>   | <p>semesters. Assignment redesign should help address shortcomings. (05/29/2020)</p>   |
| <p><b>Diversity</b> - Understand each other, move beyond simple acceptance to embracing and celebrating the rich dimensions of diversity by working as a team to learn engage with community, exhibiting cultural awareness, and creating equity.<br/> <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active</p> | <p><b>Direct</b> - Rubric on final essay test<br/> <b>Benchmark:</b> 70% of students will score a 2-2-2-2 in EG 1303<br/> <b>Schedule:</b> End of semester</p>                                       | <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           EG 2413: 100% (3/3) at or above rubric score. Increase of 5% year-over-year and meets benchmark.<br/>           NOTE 1: ALL literature courses report on diversity; EG 2413 is the only SP 2022 literature course.<br/>           NOTE 2: Instructors choose the artifact to assess; the artifact is *not* limited to the final exam.<br/>           (05/19/2022)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           18 of 19 students scored a 2-2-2-2 or better on the diversity rubric on the final test or 95% (05/14/2021)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           7 of 8 students scored a 2-2-2-2 or better on the diversity rubric on the final test or 88% (05/29/2020)</p> | <p><b>Action:</b> Gather examples of artifacts and discuss in a focus group of literature instructors. (05/19/2022)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> Change the artifact for direct assessment to be an assignment of the instructor's choice rather than the final exam. (06/23/2021)</p>  |
| <p><b>Information Literacy</b> - Exhibit skills in information and technological literacy<br/> <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active</p>   | <p><b>Direct</b> - Rubric to score annotated bibliography for research paper<br/> <b>Benchmark:</b> 70% of students will score at least a score of 3-3-2-3<br/> <b>Schedule:</b> End of semester</p> | <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           EG 1113: 72% (173/240) at or above rubric score. Increase of 2% year-over-year and meets benchmark. (05/19/2022)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br/> <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Met<br/>           172 students of 247 students scored at least a score of 3-3-2-3 on the annotated bibliography for the research paper or 70% (05/14/2021)</p>  | <p><b>Action:</b> Instructors will review rubric reports to share ideas about next "best step" - may include revision of ann. bib. form and/or norming session. (05/19/2022)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> Consider redesign of assignment to better teach skills. (05/14/2021)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> We will continue to work</p> |

| Outcomes  | Assessment Tools  | Results   | Actions  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   |   | <b>Result Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met<br>121 students of 175 students scored at least a score of 3-3-2-3 on the annotated bibliography for the research paper or 68% (05/29/2020)   | to improve the outcome by encouraging instructors to use the rubrics more effectively in assignment design. (05/29/2020)   |
| <b>Writing -</b> Communicate ideas clearly and proficiently in writing, appropriately adjusting content and arrangement for varying audiences, purposes, and situations<br><b>Outcome Status:</b> Active<br><b>Start Date:</b> 04/21/2021 | <b>Direct -</b> Institutional Writing Rubric<br><br>EG 0113<br>EG 0403 2-2-2 on final<br>EG 0603 3-2-3 on final<br>EG 0622<br>EG 1103 3-3-3 on final<br>EG 1113 4-3-3 on final<br><b>Benchmark:</b> 65% of students completing the course will achieve the above rubric score in EG 0403<br><br>70% of students completing the course will achieve the above rubric score in EG 0603<br><br>75% of students completing the course will achieve the above rubric score in EG 1103<br><br>75% of students completing the course will achieve the above rubric score in EG 1113<br><b>Schedule:</b> On final/ end of semester, except for EG 0113 which is ¾ through the semester. | <b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Directional Improvement<br>EG 0403: 100% (14/14) at or above rubric score. Same year-over-year and meets course benchmark.<br>EG 0603: 96% (26/27) at or above rubric score. Increased 25% year-over-year and meets course benchmark.<br>EG 1103: 64% (111/173) at or above rubric score. Increased 19% year-over-year but does not meet course benchmark.<br>EG 1113: 77% (184/238) at or above rubric score. Increased 14% year-over-year and meets course benchmark.<br>Program benchmark for writing is not met given EG1103 misses course benchmark by 11%. EG1113 meets benchmark by 2%. (05/19/2022)<br><br><b>Action Status:</b> Action Plan in Progress<br><b>Result Type:</b> Inconclusive<br>For EG 0403, 4 of 4 students reported, or 100%, scored a 2-2-2 at the end of the semester.<br>For EG 0603, 12 of 17 students reported, or 71%, scored a 3-2-3 at the end of the semester assessment.<br>For EG 1103, 35 of 79 students reported, or 45% scored a 3-3-3- on a journal assignment.<br>For EG 1113, 152 of 241 students reported, or 63% scored a 4-3-3 on the annotated bibliography. (06/23/2021) | <b>Action:</b> This is the second year for this assessment. Actions:<br>(A) In AY 2021-22, EG 1103 Comp 1 shifted to assess last non-timed essay of the semester; will consider this shift for Comp 2.<br>(B) In future reporting, offer data for the individual criteria of the writing rubric to define intervention.<br>(C) Develop more active program assessment loop during the AY.<br>(D) Ensure 100% of instructors report. (05/19/2022)<br><br><b>Action:</b> For Comp I and II, look at the course level reporting data to gain a better understanding of where students are struggling. We do not have enough information about this to recommend action. Look at the last essay that offers opportunity to draft/revise as well as the final exam, which is a timed writing to determine what is the best artifact to use for this assessment.<br>For Pre-Comp I and II, not enough data with only one semester to evaluate with other data in this course. (06/23/2021) |