# Institutional Student Learning Outcome (ISLO) Assessment Summary Report
# Academic Year: 2020-2021
# ISLO2: Written Communication

**Written Communication**

*Students will produce writing that is well organized, well developed, and clear.*

Report prepared by Kevin Cavanaugh, Suzanne Riela,
and Susan Rogers, in consultation with participating faculty.

Report submitted on October 1, 2021

# Executive Summary

*SCOPE*:

Courses from which assessment data was gathered (# of students): ART 104 (20); COM 120 (24); ELT 218 (4); ENG 101 (323); ENG 203 (7); ENG 211 (13); ENG 212 (21); ENG 214 (12); ENG 216 (21); ENG 223 (16); ENG 226 (15); ENG 227 (23); ENG 234 (20); MUS 201 (6); MUS 212 (8); PAR 102 (18); THE 105 (9).

Participating faculty and academic department:

- AHBS: David Violante
- ENG/HUM: Joe Allen, Jordan Bell, Kevin Cavanaugh, Lucia Cherciu, Cecelia Dos Santos, Danielle Ely, Dana Gavin, Jackie Goffe-McNish, Gina Guarente, Nada Halloway, Navina Hooker, Joan Hukle, Tina Iraca, Melanie Klein, Carrie Landi, Kevin Lang, Scott Lyons, Cheryl Migatz, Willie Morris, Keith O'Neill, Patricia Phillips, Christopher Porpora, Anna Potter, Joslyn Robinson, Brenda Squires, Jennifer Yanoti, Maryann Zuccaro.
- PSET: Leah Akins
- PVAC: Christopher Brellochs, Tommy Costello, Margaret Craig, Dana Weidman

Total # of Sections: 66

Total # of Students: Valid data collected for 560 out of 1002 possible assessments (311 in Fall 2020; 249 in Spring 2021)

*RESULTS*:

- Rubric data reveals that ENG101/003 student outcomes underperformed those in traditional ENG101 sections, and that they did not succeed in subsequent courses at the same rates as traditional ENG101 students; however, the overall impact of the curricular changes to the co-requisite model remains unsettled. Faculty perspectives show an in-the-classroom belief that the changes have been positive, and further data from Institutional Research point to improved overall pass rates for ENG101. Furthermore, IR notes that there was a significant negative impact on student success across the board attributed to the pandemic.
- Students in 200-level courses outperformed students in all 100-level courses, including ENG101. Suggests reinforcement of the Written Communication skills in courses beyond the two-semester composition requirements.

- Direct instructions, scaffolding of writing assignments, clear feedback, and opportunities to revise lead to stronger student outcomes, as does student recognition of the purpose and value of the assignment.
- Students who attended at least one session with a Writing Center tutor and/or swiped in to the Writing Center demonstrated no discernable differences in the numerical ratings of the ISLO2 assessment than students who never attended and/or swiped in to the Writing Center during the semester of assessment.
- Faculty perceived a connection between student reading habits and writing skills.

*CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS*:

The assessment team proffered the following conclusions and recommendations.

| Result/Conclusion | Recommendation for Action |
|---|---|
| Rubric data reveals that ENG101/003 student outcomes underperformed those in traditional ENG101 sections, and that they did not succeed in subsequent courses at the same rates as traditional ENG101 students; however, the overall impact of the curricular changes to the co-requisite model remains unsettled. Faculty perspectives show an in-the-classroom belief that the changes have been positive, and further data from Institutional Research point to improved overall pass rates for ENG101. Furthermore, IR notes that there was a significant negative impact on student success across the board attributed to the pandemic. | The Department of English and Humanities should continue to monitor the outcomes of ENG003 and ENG101 courses and suggest pedagogical changes to enhance student learning. Faculty workshops to share best practices, refine ENG003 and ENG101 pedagogical approaches, and discuss how to best reach desired learning outcomes would be beneficial. |
| Students in 200-level courses outperformed students in all 100-level courses, including ENG101. Suggests reinforcement of the Written Communication skills in courses beyond the two-semester composition requirements. | FAL and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs should share results with Program Chairs Council and hold discussions regarding reinforcing ISLO2 in 200-level courses within programs. |
| Direct instructions, scaffolding of writing assignments, clear feedback, and opportunities to revise lead to stronger student outcomes, as does student recognition of the purpose and value of the assignment. | Hold workshops for faculty to discuss assignment creation, from instructions through the scaffolding and revision to the final product, as well as best practices in instructor feedback. |
| Students who attended at least one session with a Writing Center tutor and/or swiped in to the Writing Center demonstrated no | Reassess the impact of the Writing Center for the 2023-24 assessment cycle of ISLO2. Consider new ways to gather data regarding |

| | |
|---|---|
| discernable differences in the numerical ratings of the ISLO2 assessment than students who never attended and/or swiped in to the Writing Center during the semester of assessment. However, faculty and staff note that the data collected lacked substance that would lead to substantiated conclusions regarding the Center's impact. | the impact of the Center on the students who use it. |
| Faculty perceived a connection between student reading habits and writing skills. | Interdisciplinary discussions, workshops, and other collaborations to consider the integration of reading and writing skills across the curriculum. Consider identifying courses that are reading- and/or writing-intensive to better prepare students for course expectations. |

*ACTION PLAN:*

| Recommendation/Action Item | Potential Resources |
|---|---|
| The Department of English and Humanities should continue to monitor the outcomes of ENG003 and ENG101 courses and suggest pedagogical changes to enhance student learning. Faculty workshops to share best practices, refine ENG003 and ENG101 pedagogical approaches, and discuss how to best reach desired learning outcomes would be beneficial. | Improvement of Instruction or Assessment Grants to support faculty workshops and compensate part-time instructors for the additional time outside their course requirements. |
| FAL and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs should share results with Program Chairs Council and hold discussions regarding reinforcing ISLO2 in 200-level courses within programs. | |
| Hold workshops for faculty to discuss assignment creation, from instructions through the scaffolding and revision to the final product, as well as best practices in instructor feedback. | Improvement of Instruction or Assessment Grants to support workshops, especially to offer compensation to part-time faculty. Professional development for faculty through the Writing Center and its January workshops. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Reassess the impact of the Writing Center for the 2023-24 assessment cycle of ISLO2. Consider new ways to gather data regarding the impact of the Center on the students who use it. | IR, FAL, and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs time and resources to create new modes of data collection and to analyze the results. |
| Interdisciplinary discussions, workshops, and other collaborations to consider the integration of reading and writing skills across the curriculum. Consider identifying courses that are reading- and/or writing-intensive to better prepare students for course expectations. | Improvement of Instruction Grants, Assessment Grants, or other resources from the Office of Academic Affairs to hold campus-wide discussions, workshops, and other professional development opportunities to allow for cross-departmental collaboration. |
| FAL to update PCC regarding status of these actions steps at the PCC meetings on November 19, 2021, and March 10, 2022. | |

**Table of Contents**

# 1    State the specific question(s) asked

The last assessment of ISLO2-Written Communication, completed during the 2017-2018 academic year, led to a number of conclusions and recommendations. While the faculty who completed that assessment felt that student writing skills overall showed college-level competency, particularly in the area of organization, they agreed that these skills were still lagging in development and clarity, especially in students assessed early in their academic career. They noted that skills appeared to strengthen with time, as those students assessed in ENG102 in that cycle slightly outperformed those assessed in ENG101 in the one previous (Fall 2015), and students who had earned 30+ credits outperformed those with fewer credits, indicating improved skill development with more college courses. However, faculty outside the Department of English and Humanities still found the skills of the students in their classes lacking; therefore, there appeared to be a disconnect between the work students do in ENG courses and that done outside of them.

Meanwhile, the college made a number of changes to how it offers developmental composition. In the Fall 2017 semester, a small group of ENG faculty piloted a co-requisite model, creating a new course, ENG003, that was meant to replace the current second-level developmental course, ENG092. In the years since that pilot, the college adjusted its placement criteria, and it scaled-up the ENG003 offerings so that it has now officially replaced ENG092 as the main developmental writing course[1]. Students who test into the co-requisite take it alongside a section of ENG101.

That change and the results of the previous assessment cycle led to a number of recommendations, which in turn have influenced the decisions the faculty made in regards to this academic year's assessment, as well as the specific research questions driving this report. In the previous cycle, the faculty recommended that writing skills be taught incrementally, allowing students to build those skills from assignment to assignment, and to provide opportunities for review and revision. They also suggested faculty work to foster student enthusiasm in the topic (a recommendation deriving from the fact that students in themed-based ENG102 courses slightly outperformed those not in those courses), and/or more clearly explain the purpose of the writing, since a clearer understanding of the value of the work led to better outcomes. In turn, for this cycle, the faculty in the Department of English and Humanities chose to assess students in two distinct groups of courses that would align with these recommendations. First, the most assessed course this cycle was ENG101, which is required of all DCC students. That course stresses the importance of revision and builds student writing skills from assignment to assignment. The faculty decided to use the final exam in that course as an assignment that

---

[1] After approval by the Curriculum Committee, ENG003 became a permanent course offering in Fall 2018. By Fall 2019, the college had fully upscaled the course, eliminated ENG092, and began using multiple measures for placement into composition courses (rather than a single placement exam).

would best provide insight on how students fared after a semester of that type of instruction. In the Spring 2021 semester, the faculty then assessed each 200-level ENG course offered (with the exception of creative writing classes) to provide data on student writing later in the college career, as well as in courses that focus on specific topics that students often choose based on their own personal interest.

The faculty outside of English and Humanities chose their courses based on the college's curriculum map. In order to improve inter-rater reliability, and address the discrepancy in scoring between ENG and non-ENG instructors, the faculty decided to use the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubric for Written Communication created by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). Use of the rubric was normed in workshops during the Fall 2020 semester. All of these actions and decisions led to the following specific research questions.

**Research Questions:**

1. What impact have curricular and pedagogical changes within courses, programs, and the College generally had on students' writing skills?

    a. In particular, what impact have changes to development writing sequences (ENG 091-ENG 092, ENG 003) had on student writing outcomes?
    b. What do comparisons between student outcomes in ENG 101 with and without the ENG 003 co-requisite reveal?
    c. How do students who completed ENG 101/003 perform in ENG 102 as compared to those who completed a traditional ENG 101 course?

2. What do comparisons between the assessments of writing in different courses/disciplines reveal?

    a. In particular, how is ISLO2 reinforced in courses outside ENG 101 and ENG 102?

3. What assignments lead to better enthusiasm/engagement with the writing process in different disciplines?

4. What impact does the Writing Center have on ISLO2 outcomes?

# 2    Describe the methods used to answer the question(s)

An outline of the methodology is provided below:

- In January 2020, all faculty and staff were invited to a workshop to discuss plans for the 2020-2021 assessment of ISLO2. At that workshop, attendees reviewed the definition of the outcome and the current rubric, the results and recommendations of the 2017-2018 assessment, and ways to improve inter-rater reliability by discussing shared standards for the outcome, as well as potentially shifting to the VALUE rubric. They began to formulate potential research questions and the particular courses/college services in which the assessment would be completed.

- During the Spring 2020 semester, the global pandemic of COVID-19 led to a massive disruption of both the culture at-large and DCC specifically. By May 2020, with the college faculty focused on getting students through their courses, the Faculty Assessment Leader and the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs decided it would be best to cancel the usual end of semester planning workshops and instead finalize those plans via email. A message was sent to all faculty that summarized the January workshops, provided clear drafts of the research questions, and asked for feedback, including whether faculty were on board with using the VALUE rubric. By the end of faculty contractual obligation, those plans were set.

- In consultation with department and program chairs at the start of the Fall 2020 semester, the following courses were selected to participate in the 2020-2021 assessment of ISLO2: ART104; COM120; ELT218; ENG101; ENG203; ENG211; ENG212; ENG214; ENG216; ENG223; ENG226; ENG227; ENG234; MUS201; MUS212; PAR102; THE105.

- Using the agreed upon VALUE rubric (see Appendix A), the faculty teaching these courses used a variety of instruments to collect data on the ISLO1 skills (see Appendix B for examples), including:
  - Standard course assignments, such as homework;
  - Major course assignments, such as significant projects;
  - Multiple assignments.

- Faculty in the Department of Allied Health and Biological Sciences and the Department of English and Humanities were awarded assessment grants to assist in the process, totaling 50.5 hours.

- During the academic year, faculty input the data gathered in TracDat/Nuventive (allowing assessment results to be associated with a student and student information in Banner). At the end of the academic year, the data was downloaded and tabulated by the Associate Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IR), who performed further statistical analysis.

- Using the information provided by IR, the Faculty Assessment Leader prepared a draft report of the assessment and provided it to participating faculty for their review. Faculty provided continued feedback for revision of the draft via an August 2021 workshop and through email and conversation with the Faculty Assessment Leader through September 2021.

- The final report was submitted on October 1, 2021.

The COVID-19 novel coronavirus outbreak of 2020 continued to have a significant impact on assessment activities during the 2020-2021 academic year. While we were able to continue those activities – to plan and execute the assessment of ISLO2, to meet virtually to discuss that assessment, and to analyze and report out the data as we have for many years now – we would be remiss not to note the ways in which shifting to a mostly remote educational environment affected instruction, student learning, personal connections (between faculty and staff members, between students, and perhaps most importantly, between faculty/staff and students), and potentially the outcomes of this assessment. We have considered that impact as we analyzed the results outlined below and suggested recommendations moving forward. Furthermore, many faculty addressed these points as they reviewed the outcomes in their own classes, and a small group of faculty in the Department of English and Humanities performed a related side project comparing student engagement in courses with and without synchronous instructional elements. As we move beyond the pandemic and hopefully back to a more typical learning environment in the coming years, we look to use what we have learned during this extraordinary time to inform our work and improve the student learning experience.

## 3    Summarize the Results

### 3.1 Total Tabulated Data and Comments

There were 1002 possible assessments across 66 sections. Valid data was collected for 560 assessments (311 in Fall 2020, 249 in Spring 2021), a rate of 55.9%. Statistics exclude sections where no data was collected.

The rubric shared by all faculty assessing this ISLO (see Appendix A) included five (5) assessment items as provided in the table below. Each item is referred to in the results using the identifier indicated in the table.

*Table 1 Assessment Items/Categories for ISLO2*

| Item | Identifier | Abbreviated Description |
|------|-----------|------------------------|
| 1 | Purpose | *Context of and Purpose for Writing*: Awareness of the situation for which the piece was written, including considerations regarding the audience, the purpose, and any other circumstances surrounding the text. |
| 2 | Content | *Content Development*: The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose. |
| 3 | Discipline | *Genre and Disciplinary Conventions*: Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields. |
| 4 | Sources | *Sources and Evidence*: Texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) that writers draw on as they work for a variety of purposes, and then how that source material is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text. |
| 5 | Mechanics | *Control of Syntax and Mechanics*: Writer's ability to use language clearly and accurately in proper grammatical ways. |

Overall average ratings using the shared rubric were 2.70 for Purpose, 2.63 for Content, 2.53 for Discipline, 2.58 for Sources, and 2.53 for Mechanics, where 4.0 represents the highest rating. Table 2 provides the percentage of students scoring each individual rating for each category.

*Table 2 Percentage of students earning individual rating for ISLO2 items*

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|--|---------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| 4 = advanced competency | 21.1 | 18.9 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 14.8 |
| 3 = moderate competency | 40.4 | 37.7 | 39.1 | 44.6 | 38.0 |
| 2 = modest competency | 27.3 | 31.8 | 31.1 | 26.3 | 32.9 |
| 1 = developing competency | 10.2 | 10.9 | 13.9 | 12.5 | 13.9 |
| 0 = skill not demonstrated | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 0.4 |

Table 3 provides the percentage of students who have either met or exceeded expectations in each category, as well as the percentage of those who did not meet college expectations.

*Table 3 Percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations as opposed to not meeting expectations*

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|--|---------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| 2/3/4 = did meet expectations | 88.8 | 88.4 | 85.0 | 85.7 | 85.7 |
| 0/1 = didn't meet expectations | 11.3 | 11.6 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 14.3 |

Inter-item reliability was assessed using Pearson correlations and Cronbach's alpha. All ISLO items were positively correlated with one another (rs > .7, ps <.001). Reliability was excellent (α

= .95). This result implies that the items could be combined to form a single score representing written communication competency.

Furthermore, the means (provided in Table 4, along with standard deviations) for each item were compared using a repeated-measures ANOVA. The results indicate an overall significant difference between items, $F_{(4,2236)} = 16.33$, $p < .001$. Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons indicated several significant differences ($ps < .001$). Purpose was higher than the other four categories. Content was higher than Discipline and Mechanics. There were no other significant differences.

*Table 4 Overall Ratings (Mean Scores and Standard Deviations)*

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Ratings (n=560) | 2.70 (0.95) | 2.63 (0.93) | 2.53 (0.94) | 2.58 (0.95) | 2.53 (0.92) |

Finally, independent t-tests were used to compare the results from the Fall and Spring semesters. Ratings in the Fall were lower than ratings in the Spring for all ISLO items, $ts_{(558)} > 3.54$, $ps < .001$. Table 5 provides those results.

*Table 5 Outcomes by Semester*

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 2020 (n=311) | 2.55 (0.95) | 2.51 (0.93) | 2.39 (0.94) | 2.45 (0.98) | 2.38 (0.90) |
| Spring 2021 (n=249) | 2.90 (0.91) | 2.79 (0.92) | 2.70 (0.92) | 2.75 (0.88) | 2.71 (0.92) |

### 3.2 Types of Assignment Data and Comments

Faculty were asked to describe the assignment(s) used for assessment. Methods varied, as some faculty used single course assignments while others used significant term papers. Some faculty assessed multiple assignments over the course of the semester. ENG101 faculty all used the final exam, which consisted of a short essay based on assigned readings. Samples of the assignments can be found in Appendix B.

### 3.3 Student Academic Experiences

Traditional inquiries regarding campus assessments often focus on students' previous academic experiences, and a few specific research questions for this cycle indicate a desire to know more about that student experience. In order to answer those questions, student characteristics that might impact their experience (such as full-time versus part-time, or previous course work) were examined in relation to performance on the assessment criteria.

#### 3.3.1   Student Characteristics

The students' higher education history (i.e., whether they were new/continuing/transfer/high-school concurrent) was analyzed. The numbers of students in each group were as follows: New First-Time (n=234), Continuing (n=305), New Transfer (n=12), and High-School Concurrent (n=9). Given the small sample sizes for Transfer and Concurrent students, those results were ignored. Using independent t-tests, New First-Time and Continuing students were compared. Continuing students outperformed New First-Time students for all ISLO items [$ts_{(537)} > 4.90$,

ps < .001.]: Purpose (2.89 v 2.44), Content (2.79 v 2.40), Discipline (2.70 v 2.27), Sources (2.76 v 2.34), and Mechanics (2.72 v 2.26).

Students were also grouped into full-time (FT; n=458) and part-time (PT; n=102). Independent t-tests revealed no significant differences, though part-time students slightly outperformed full-time (PT v. FT): Purpose (2.75 v 2.69), Content (2.71 v 2.62), Discipline (2.58 v 2.52), Sources (2.62 v 2.57), and Mechanics (2.63 v. 2.51).

Statistical analyses were also performed on the data to test for differences between students who had passed the course in which the ISLO skills were assessed (n=486, grades of A, B, C) and those who did not pass (n=74, grades of D, F, I, W, or ZF). Independent t-tests revealed that students who passed the course had higher ratings for all ISLO items than students who did not pass [ts (558) > 6.08, ps < .001]. The results for each item were: Purpose (2.81 v 1.99), Content (2.73 v 1.96), Discipline (2.63 v 1.82), Sources (2.68 v 1.93), and Mechanics (2.62 v 1.93).

Further analyses were performed to test correlations between course grades and the outcomes of the assessment. Grades were transformed to the 4.0 GPA scale (NOTE: withdrawals and other grades not included in GPA calculations were excluded). All ISLO items were positively correlated with course grades [rs (555) > .47, ps < .001], meaning that higher ISLO ratings were associated with higher grades in the course.

Data was also collected on the type of degree the student was pursuing (associate, certificate, or non-degree); however, the sample sizes for certificate (n=4) and non-degree (n=7) were insufficient to conduct inferential analyses.

### 3.3.2 Course Characteristics Data and Comments

In order to answer research questions regarding how writing skills are reinforced beyond ENG101 and ENG102, as well as how student skill develops in upper-level courses, statistical analyses were performed to test differences based on course characteristics.

First, independent t-tests were used to compare students in ENG101 versus all other courses assessed. Students in ENG101 scored lower on all ISLO items as compared with students assessed in other courses, ts (558) > 6.35, ps < .001.

*Table 6 ENG101 v All Other Courses Assessed*

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ENG101 (n=323) | 2.43 (0.93) | 2.42 (0.91) | 2.27 (0.89) | 2.37 (0.96) | 2.28 (0.84) |
| Other Courses (n=237) | 3.07 (0.84) | 2.92 (0.90) | 2.87 (0.90) | 2.87 (0.85) | 2.87 (0.92) |

Next, results from students enrolled in traditional ENG101 courses were compared to results from students enrolled in an ENG101/ENG003 corequisite course. Again, independent t-tests were used to compare students who did or did not take ENG003 in conjunction with ENG101. Students in the traditional ENG101 scored higher on all ISLO items as compared with students who were simultaneously taking ENG003, ts (321) > 2.60, ps < .05.

*Table 7 ENG101 v ENG101/ENG003*

| | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ENG101  traditional (n=205) | 2.53  (0.89) | 2.53  (0.87) | 2.40  (0.83) | 2.50  (0.96) | 2.42  (0.80) |
| ENG101  with ENG003  (n=118) | 2.25  (0.97) | 2.24  (0.94) | 2.05  (0.95) | 2.15  (0.94) | 2.03  (0.83) |

Independent t-test were also used to compare students who did or did not take ENG003 in conjunction with ENG101 during the Fall 2020 semester. The dependent variable of interest was performance in ENG102 during the Spring 2021 semester – whether the student passed or failed. There was a significant difference between the groups. The percentage of students passing ENG102 was higher among the traditional ENG101 group (82%) as compared with the ENG101/ENG003 group (66%), $t(175) = 2.52$, $p = .013$.

Beyond simply looking at ENG101 students, faculty also expressed interest in what the outcomes might reveal based on course-level. Analyses were performed comparing 100-level courses (n=394) and 200-level courses (n=166). Ratings in 200-level courses were higher than ratings in 100-level courses for all ISLO items, $ts(558) > 5.81$, $ps < .001$. See Table 6.

*Table 8 200-level Courses v 100-level Courses*

| | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100-level  (n=394) | 2.55  (0.96) | 2.49  (0.92) | 2.34  (0.93) | 2.43  (0.97) | 2.34  (0.89) |
| 200-level  (n=166) | 3.07  (0.81) | 2.98  (0.87) | 2.96  (0.83) | 2.93  (0.79) | 2.98  (0.82) |

Finally, given the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on course delivery, many faculty were interested to know if there were statistical differences between the outcomes in courses in which the pedagogical approach was completely asynchronous (meaning fully online with no consistent meetings between the instructor and the student) and those in which the course retained some kind of synchronous element, even if simply via regular online sessions (such as through Zoom or Blackboard Collaborate). Independent t-tests were used to compare those outcomes (excluding a small number of results from traditional, in-person instruction, as the sample size was too small for analysis). However, contrary to the qualitative data gathered from faculty indicating that some differences were observed, there were no significant differences found in any areas between the asynchronous and the synchronous groups. Those results are provided below in Table 9.

*Table 9 Asynchronous v Synchronous Course Delivery*

| | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Asynchronous (n=454) | 2.68  (0.94) | 2.64  (0.93) | 2.54  (0.91) | 2.59  (0.95) | 2.56  (0.87) |
| Synchronous (n=88) | 2.60  (0.99) | 2.55  (0.96) | 2.44  (1.07) | 2.44  (0.92) | 2.35  (1.10) |

### 3.4 Current Assessment Cycle Compared to Last Cycle

ISLO2 Written Communication was last assessed in 2017-2018 (AY17/18). During that assessment cycle, a different rubric and rating scale was used as compared with the ones for the current cycle (AY20/21). For AY17/18, a 1-4 scale was used, where ratings of 3 or 4 indicated students meeting expectations for the ISLO, while ratings of 1 or 2 indicated them not meeting those expectations. For AY20/21, a 0-4 scale was used, where ratings of 2, 3, or 4 indicated meeting expectations, while ratings of 0 or 1 indicated them not meeting those expectations.

Given that change, the outcomes from AY17/18 could not be accurately compared to those from AY20/21.

## 3.5 Student Services and Assessment Outcomes

One research question specifically inquired into the potential impact of student services on the assessment outcomes. Independent t-tests were used to compare students who did or did not use the Writing Center during the semester of assessment. Students who used the Writing Center scored lower on Mechanics than those who did not use the Writing Center, t (558) = 2.80, p = .005. There were no other significant differences.

*Table 10 Outcomes based on Writing Center Usage within the Semester Assessed*

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, used Writing Center (n=52) | 2.48 (0.92) | 2.50 (0.94) | 2.29 (0.94) | 2.54 (0.90) | 2.19 (0.91) |
| No (n=508) | 2.72 (0.95) | 2.65 (0.93) | 2.55 (0.94) | 2.59 (0.95) | 2.56 (0.92) |

## 3.6 Assessment Results Disaggregated by Program

ISLO2 Written Communication outcomes were disaggregated by program (see Appendix C). Table 8 provides an accounting of which courses students were assessed in for each program and how many students were in each of those courses. This data allows programs chairs to know if students in their programs were assessed, and if the major-specific data is generalizable to the program as a whole.

*Table 11 Accounting of Students Assessed by Course and Program*
*\*total # of students data extracted from SUNY BI and reflects the unduplicated headcount for the academic year for each program.*

| Program | Total # Students | Total # Students Assessed | Total # Assessments Conducted | Course ID (# Assessments) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACC | 40 | 3 | 3 | ENG 101 (3) |
| ACR | 2 |  |  |  |
| ARC | 68 | 9 | 10 | ART 104 (2), ENG 101 (7), ENG 226 (1) |
| AVI | 42 | 3 | 3 | ENG 101 (3) |
| AVM | 19 | 2 | 2 | ENG 101 (2) |
| BAT | 456 | 25 | 25 | ART 104 (2), ENG 101 (23) |
| BOK | 14 |  |  |  |
| BUS | 197 | 17 | 17 | ENG 101 (17) |
| CDC | 6 |  |  |  |
| CHC | 11 | 1 | 1 | ENG 101 (1) |
| CIS | 82 | 5 | 5 | ENG 101 (5) |
| CMH | 24 | 1 | 1 | ENG 101 (1) |
| CNC | 7 |  |  |  |
| CNS | 32 | 3 | 3 | ENG 101 (3) |
| COM | 149 | 25 | 25 | COM 120 (15), ENG 101 (8), ENG 226 (1), MUS 201 (1) |
| CPS | 152 | 19 | 20 | ART 104 (1), COM 120 (1), ENG 101 (18) |
| CRJ | 65 | 6 | 6 | ENG 101 (6) |
| CRT | 264 | 23 | 23 | ENG 101 (23) |
| DRC | 2 |  |  |  |
| ECC | 4 |  |  |  |
| ECH | 50 | 2 | 3 | ENG 101 (3) |
| EDB | 10 |  |  |  |
| EDH | 71 | 5 | 5 | ENG 101 (4), ENG 212 (1) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| EDL | 31 | 9 | 10 | ENG 101 (3), ENG 203 (1), ENG 211 (1), ENG 212 (2), ENG 223 (1), ENG 227 (1), ENG 234 (1) |
| EDM | 14 | | | |
| EDP | 1 | | | |
| EDS | 3 | | | |
| EDX | 2 | | | |
| EED | 179 | 19 | 20 | ENG 101 (10), ENG 212 (1), ENG 216 (2), ENG 223 (4), ENG 227 (3) |
| ELT | 47 | 9 | 9 | COM 120 (1), ELT 218 (3), ENG 101 (5) |
| ENR | 119 | 11 | 11 | ENG 101 (11) |
| ESW | 96 | 6 | 6 | ENG 101 (6) |
| FIR | 3 | | | |
| FPT | 5 | 1 | 1 | ENG 101 (1) |
| GSP | 1,238 | 106 | 111 | ART 104 (9), COM 120 (1), ENG 101 (72), ENG 203 (1), ENG 211 (1), ENG 212 (9), ENG 214 (8), ENG 216 (5), ENG 223 (2), ENG 226 (1), ENG 227 (1), MUS 201 (1) |
| HMS | 369 | 20 | 21 | ART 104 (1), COM 120 (1), ENG 101 (18), ENG 212 (1) |
| INM | 11 | | | |
| LAH | 461 | 99 | 110 | ART 104 (1), COM 120 (2), ENG 101 (22), ENG 203 (4), ENG 211 (10), ENG 212 (6), ENG 214 (3), ENG 216 (13), ENG 223 (6), ENG 226 (10), ENG 227 (15), ENG 234 (18) |
| LAM | 13 | | | |
| LAX | 310 | 18 | 18 | COM 120 (1), ENG 101 (11), ENG 203 (1), ENG 216 (1), ENG 223 (2), ENG 226 (1), ENG 234 (1) |
| MLT | 66 | 4 | 4 | ENG 101 (4) |
| MPC | 1 | | | |
| NUR | 130 | | | |
| PAL | 44 | 1 | 1 | ENG 101 (1) |
| PAR | 52 | 17 | 18 | ENG 101 (2), PAR 102 (16) |
| PBH | 21 | 1 | 1 | ENG 101 (1) |
| PDC | 61 | 6 | 6 | ENG 101 (6) |
| PFA | 48 | 20 | 25 | ART 104 (4), ENG 101 (4), MUS 201 (4), MUS 212 (5), THE 105 (8) |
| PLL | 10 | | | |
| PRR | 5 | 1 | 1 | PAR 102 (1) |
| VAT | 152 | 9 | 9 | ENG 101 (9) |
| WAC | 2 | | | |
| UND | 579 | 24 | 26 | COM 120 (2), ELT 218 (1), ENG 101 (10), ENG 211 (1), ENG 212 (1), ENG 214 (1), ENG 223 (1), ENG 226 (1), ENG 227 (3), MUS 212 (3), PAR 102 (1), THE 105 (1) |

## 3.7 Assessment Results Relevant to Diversity and Equity Concerns

The Diversity Council at Dutchess Community College has taken an interest in gathering more data based on demographic information that might shed light on how well different students are reaching the desired institutional learning outcomes, and therefore reveal potential areas of focus for the College. To that end, outcomes based on gender, race/ethnicity, age group, and Pell Grant status were gathered and the results were analyzed.

*Gender*. Used independent t-tests to compare men and women. Women outperformed men on all ISLO items, $ts (558) > 2.20$, $ps < .05$.

*Table 12 Gender Comparison*

| | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male (n=231) | 2.58 (0.98) | 2.51 (0.95) | 2.35 (0.95) | 2.42 (0.94) | 2.43 (0.93) |
| Female (n=329) | 2.79 (0.92) | 2.72 (0.92) | 2.65 (0.92) | 2.70 (0.94) | 2.60 (0.91) |

*Race/Ethnicity*. Used Oneway ANOVA to compare the White, Hispanic, and Black race/ethnic groups. (The other groups were excluded because of their small/disparate Ns.) Overall significant differences were found for all ISLO items, $Fs (2,484) > 8.78$, $ps < .001$. Bonferroni-corrected

pairwise comparisons indicated significant differences (ps < .05) between White and Black students for all ISLO items. White students also outperformed Hispanic students on Content, Sources, and Mechanics. Hispanic students outperformed Black students on Purpose.

Table 13 Race/Ethnicity Comparison

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White (n=291) | 2.82 (0.98) | 2.75 (0.89) | 2.67 (0.92) | 2.73 (0.92) | 2.69 (0.91) |
| Hispanic (n=136) | 2.65 (0.79) | 2.51 (0.89) | 2.46 (0.87) | 2.48 (0.83) | 2.40 (0.85) |
| Black (n=60) | 2.28 (1.01) | 2.23 (1) | 2.15 (0.97) | 2.18 (0.98) | 2.12 (1.01) |

*Age Group*. Used independent t-tests to compare students by age groups – the traditional 17 to 24 (excluding HS concurrent students) and the non-traditional 25 or older students. There were no significant differences.

Table 14 Age Group Comparison

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 to 24 (excludes HS) (n=468) | 2.68 (0.95) | 2.62 (0.93) | 2.52 (0.93) | 2.57 (0.94) | 2.51 (0.91) |
| 25 or older (n=83) | 2.82 (0.95) | 2.65 (0.99) | 2.49 (1.02) | 2.58 (0.99) | 2.59 (1.00) |

*Pell Recipient*. Used independent t-tests to compare Pell recipients and non-Pell students. For all ISLO items, the non-Pell group outperformed the Pell group, ts (558) > 3.27, ps < .005.

Table 15 Pell Recipient Comparison

|  | Purpose | Content | Discipline | Sources | Mechanics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pell (n=220) | 2.49 (0.99) | 2.47 (0.97) | 2.36 (0.96) | 2.41 (0.98) | 2.33 (0.97) |
| No Pell (n=340) | 2.84 (0.90) | 2.74 (0.90) | 2.63 (0.92) | 2.69 (0.91) | 2.66 (0.87) |

### 3.8 Faculty Perspectives (Narrative Results by Course)

Faculty were asked to provide comments on the rubric results of the assessment as they entered that quantitative data into the TracDat system. A full reporting of that commentary is in Appendix D. Below is a summary of the key points from that qualitative data.

- **Scaffolding**: Many faculty noted the importance of scaffolding the writing skills developed in the course, as well as specific writing assignments, in order to improve student success. Peer and instructor feedback on drafts, time to consider that feedback, and dedicated revision strategies all led to stronger outcomes. Even for individual skill areas, that kind of scaffolding was recommended – for instance, one instructor suggested the use of a "citation checklist worksheet" in future courses to help students build their ability to cite source material. For the ENG101 students, the typical structure of that course curricula—during which faculty often use multiple drafts for each assignment, provide time and space for students to practice rhetorical strategies for essay writing (often in non-graded activities), and build upon previously learned skills with each subsequent assignment—reinforced the benefit of this scaffolding approach. Furthermore, a number of instructors in the 200-level ENG courses noted their belief that positive outcomes from their students could be attributed to those students' previous success in

ENG101 and ENG102, implying that writing skills continue to build and develop with more practice, a conclusion also drawn by non-ENG faculty teaching upper-level courses. Finally, the more that faculty were direct with the instructions for an assignment and the purpose of that assignment, the stronger they felt the student outcomes were, which was made clear by either faculty responses to this assessment or could be implied through the assignment they provided as part of the supplemental documents.

- **Student Engagement**: In order for that scaffolding to work, though, students need to engage thoughtfully and meaningfully in the class, and more than any other commonality among the faculty perspectives for the 2020-2021 academic year, the overall lack of engagement from students stood out as the greatest concern. A number of faculty noted a disconnect between the students and the class, and attrition appeared higher than normal to many of them. Some faculty directly blamed the shift to remote learning necessitated by COVID-19. There are three sub-categories within this theme that emerge:

  - *Online/Remote Learning Concerns*: While some faculty thought students were learning to adapt to the online environment as the course developed, most found it problematic. For ENG101 courses, some faculty thought students had a harder time focusing on some of the more specific skills ENG101 looks to develop, such as the control of syntax and mechanics, while others felt that students were not spending the same amount of time focused on revision as they might in a classroom setting. In other courses, faculty expressed concerns that students may not be engaging as deeply with class material as they would in-person, skimming the online material and getting directly to graded work. Again, though some faculty felt the students handled this shift well, the general consensus was that the remote environment had a negative impact on student engagement.

  - *Synchronous v. Asynchronous Approaches*: Most ENG courses, both ENG101 and the ENG200-level ones, were offered without any synchronous elements, though a few faculty did try to add those components, especially for students co-listed in ENG003. A number of the non-ENG courses assessed included those synchronous sessions. Those who held some sort of synchronous meeting – via scheduled class times, office hours, informal meetings, phone calls, etc. – say they found greater engagement from the students. One faculty member made the decision to teach synchronously in the spring because of the stark difference he found in the engagement of those students who attended his weekly Zoom sessions and those who did not during his fall courses, and a group of ENG faculty decided to run a special assessment project in the spring to more directly consider the impact of synchronous course elements on student outcomes.

  - *Overall Student Engagement*: Perhaps unsurprisingly, faculty found that the students who regularly engaged with the course—those who followed the scaffolded weekly instruction, those who attended available synchronous sessions,

those who engaged with the feedback from peers and instructors – succeeded more than those who did not. However, noteworthy here is the fact that faculty believed the remote environment exacerbated typical student disengagement. Many students simply "disappeared," according to faculty, and did not respond to efforts to contact them. Without regular class-time contact with students, faculty also found it more difficult to ascertain whether those students who remained in the course and did the work were paying attention to the material presented and the feedback provided on their writing. Conversely, a few faculty noted the success students had in writing about material that they did have that sense of engagement with – whether through a common subject or theme taught throughout the semester, or by choosing courses/topics relevant to the students themselves, or by simply recognizing the value and purpose of writing to their discipline—as well as in allowing them the space to explore their own opinions and experiences in relation to those topics.

- **The ENG003 Cohort:** One research question asks directly about the results of those students enrolled in the ENG003 co-requisite course. A number of faculty noted that the ENG003 students struggled with the above issues, perhaps more than students enrolled in ENG101 without the corequisite, but other faculty felt the students in that cohort who engaged with the course material, were provided opportunities to meet with the instructor synchronously throughout the semester, and stuck with the course succeeded. One faculty member felt the strongest final essays, which were used as the assessment tool in ENG101, were written by ENG003 students.

- **Reading and Writing:** Connected to the concerns regarding scaffolding and engagement, some faculty expressed a belief that student reading skills and habits led directly to their outcomes in both the course and the development of their writing skills. A few faculty used the word "skim" to describe how they felt students were reading both the instructional material and the required texts for the course, and another quite directly noted that "Students with strong reading and critical thinking skills likewise demonstrated strong written skills."

- **New Innovations**: Despite all of these concerns, particularly those regarding the impact COVID-19 and the shift to remote learning has had on this academic year, a number of faculty felt the challenges led to positive outcomes in terms of pedagogy. Faculty learned to create engaging videos to assist students outside the classroom, located new virtual tools to add to course instruction, and utilized others' efforts to engage students in safe and cost-effective ways, such as through the Metropolitan Museum of Art's newly enhanced virtual tours, which include recordings, three-dimensional presentations, and written material corresponding to its collections, all of which students can then use to enhance their own written material.

# 4 Summarize Conclusions Drawn and Action Plan for Improvement

The 2020-2021 academic year proved unique thanks to the COVID-19 pandemic; however, the faculty and staff at DCC continued its diligent work of assessing the institutional student learning outcomes, and with 560 distinct assessments collected, a number of conclusions could be drawn.

Conclusions are presented below relative to the specific research questions asked:

***What impact have curricular and pedagogical changes within courses, programs, and the College generally had on students' writing skills?***

The majority of pedagogical changes employed during this academic year were necessitated by the pandemic and the shift to online learning. As the faculty narratives reveal, while there were many concerns regarding student engagement in remote learning, the shift did lead to some positive outcomes for both instruction and student learning, as faculty found and/or created new virtual tools to assist students in the development of their writing skills. Faculty can build upon this experience as we move back into the classroom in subsequent academic years, using it to enhance in-person instruction, support student learning outside the classroom, and potentially introduce new modes of delivery beyond the traditional face-to-face course.

However, the data help to answer more specifically the sub-questions:

*What impact have changes to development writing sequences (ENG 091-ENG 092, ENG 003) had on student writing outcomes?*

Faculty perspectives regarding this curricular change are mixed, as some believe it has positively impacted student success in the development of writing skills, while others remain skeptical. The qualitative data from this assessment bears that point out, as some faculty felt the ENG003 students struggled more than their non-003 peers with engagement, while others believed those that did engage with the course (and were offered synchronous time with the instructor not afforded to the non-003 students) flourished and, in some cases, outperformed the rest.

*What do comparisons between student outcomes in ENG 101 with and without the ENG 003 co-requisite reveal?*

While the faculty experiences with the ENG003 co-requisite might remained mix, the rubric data reveals that students registered in the ENG101/003 cohorts underperformed in comparison to those registered in traditional ENG101. Since inter-item reliability was deemed excellent, the rubric scores could be combined to form a single score for the ISLO. Doing so shows the ENG003 student outcomes averaging 2.14, while the ENG101 student outcomes average 2.48.

These numbers should be expected in part, given that the students enrolled in ENG003 came into the course with some deficiency in their skill sets in comparison to those who enrolled directly into ENG101. Furthermore, deliberate choices by ENG faculty to focus less on Mechanics and more on other areas of writing pedagogy likely led to the lower scores in that area of the outcomes. Future assessments might look to perform a pre-test or pre-assessment at the start of the semester to better indicate the development of skills from the beginning of the course to the end for both sets of students. Faculty teaching ENG003 might focus more directly on some of the skill areas, as well, to enhance the outcomes. That said, the ENG003 students did score above the level deemed acceptable for a first-semester writing course, meaning they have met the expected outcome.

The Department of English and Humanities regularly reviews data regarding the changes to multiple-measure placement and to a co-requisite model of developmental education in writing. While initial results from ENG101/003 courses were beyond promising, as the department has scaled the course up from the pilot project, pass rates for the ENG101/003 courses have declined (see Appendix E for a historical look at that data). However, Institutional Research is careful to point out that, while those pass rates may be declining, more students are being offered the opportunity to take a college-level course and the percentage of students passing ENG101 overall has actually increased since Fall 2018. Furthermore, the pandemic certainly impacted those results further, as IR notes that pass rates in all ENG101 classes have declined, but also that the decline was greater for traditional ENG101 students (from 65.3% in Fall 2019 to 52.1% in Fall 2020) than for the ENG101/003 students (58.1% to 51.0% during that same time). ENG faculty also point out that the upscale from the previous developmental composition model to the co-requisite one now in use happened quickly and that some decrease in success rates were anticipated. The hope was that after a year or two, those declines would level off and the department would have a better sense of the impact of these curricular changes; again, though, the pandemic created new challenges that have yet to allow the department to gain a clear assessment of the shift to ENG003. More time is required to truly and fully judge that change.

Prof. Jennifer Yanoti and Dr. Tina Iraca, both from ENG/HUM, presented findings from their review of the ENG003 project in a webinar sponsored by the SUNY Developmental English Learning Community. In that presentation, after noting the decline in pass rates, they suggested a number of next steps that might help to strengthen student outcomes in not only ENG003, but the composition sequence more generally, including increased attention to integrated reading and writing pedagogy, further faculty professional development (including resources to allow for regular meetings of full- and part-time composition instructors to address best practices), direct work with the Writing Center, a review of the multiple-measures approach to placement, and continued research. As the course continues to develop, particularly if further attention is paid to these suggestions, instructors can look to enhance student outcomes by focusing further on engagement and skill development.

*How do students who completed ENG101/003 perform in ENG102 as compared to those who completed a traditional ENG101 course?*

The data once again reveal the ENG003 students struggling in comparison to their traditional ENG101 peers. As noted previously, students who successfully completed ENG101 in the Fall 2020 semester without the ENG003 co-requisite went on to successfully complete ENG102 in the Spring 2021 semester at a rate of 82%, while those who completed ENG101 in the fall with that ENG003 cohort successfully completed ENG102 the following semester at a rate of 66%. Since ENG102 was not assessed in this cycle, it is impossible to tell exactly why the ENG003 students struggled as they did – perhaps the same issues with engagement again surfaced, and without the influence of the co-requisite and the direct contact with the faculty member during that additional instructional time, the students lost focus, became overwhelmed, etc. The data shows more attention should be paid to the co-requisite cohort as they move beyond ENG101, though, and so future assessments might look into how students who successfully complete ENG101/ENG003 perform in subsequent coursework overall.

***What do comparisons between the assessments of writing in different courses/disciplines reveal?*** *In particular, how is ISLO2 reinforced in courses outside ENG 101 and ENG 102?*

ISLO2 is clearly introduced in all programs in ENG101, and in most it is immediately reinforced in ENG102 (though it might be more accurate to call it a continued introduction). Therefore, results from the assessment of ENG101 provide only one part of a broader picture of how written communication skills are developed at Dutchess Community College.

The vast majority of assessments collected in this cycle came from ENG courses, both in ENG 101 and at the 200-level. The sample sizes from the other courses are too small individually and rather disparate to draw conclusions regarding comparisons between disciplines, but the data does reveal improvement in the skills from the 100-level to the 200-level. Overall ISLO scores for ENG101 averaged at 2.36, and when all 100-level courses are added, the average shifts slightly to 2.43, suggesting that courses in other disciplines help to reinforce the baseline skill development in ISLO2. However, the average for 200-level courses, the majority of which came in 200-level ENG courses, was 2.99, suggesting that as students continue on in their programs, particularly in LAH (which requires two 200-level ENG courses), their writing skills should improve. This outcome might be impacted in part by the type of student assessed, as those that found success in ENG101 and ENG102 might gravitate towards courses in which writing is a key component, such as the 200-level ENG courses, and towards programs like LAH, as well as by the attention paid to writing skill development in those ENG courses, but the score does place the students in an appropriate level for a two-year college and therefore reveals those students meeting the outcome well.

*What assignments lead to better enthusiasm/engagement with the writing process in different disciplines?*

There was actually quite a bit of agreement among faculty throughout the disciplines as to the pedagogical approaches that lead to better student outcomes. First, the faculty posited students do better when they understand the purpose and value of the writing they are working on, including how it connects to the discipline they are studying, and that instructors should be clear in communicating that purpose and value. They also noted that students write better when they personally engage with the subject, which if not done through a recognition of the assignment's purpose and value, might come from the student selecting the content of the course, the reading, or the essay's topic. That connection to the content might be easier in courses like the 200-level ENG ones, which are differentiated by genre, literary timeframe, or special areas, like Popular Culture or Women's Studies, so the students are aware of and self-selecting the content as they register, but instructors in the other courses found ways to engage students through common themes that ran through the readings of the semester, discussions that revealed the relevance of the subject matter to the students' lives, or hands-on experiences that tied the world outside of the classroom to the course assignments (such as through the virtual museum tour in an Art History course).

Beyond the importance of engaging with the course material, though, students who were provided a scaffolded approach to writing found more success. Faculty stressed the need to be direct with instructions, providing students a clearer sense of what they were doing and why they were doing it. They suggested breaking assignments into smaller parts, and then building from part to part to the larger whole of a project like a term paper, research assignment, or cumulative activity. They also stressed the need to provide students clear feedback on their writing through thorough revision processes, using rough drafts, peer and professional models, and even opportunities to rewrite essays after they are graded. Obviously, these approaches are intertwined into nearly all ENG101 courses, but faculty outside of that course also saw the benefit of assigning student writing through these approaches.

*What impact does the Writing Center have on ISLO2?*

Originally, the faculty was interested in the impact a few student services might have on the development of ISLO2, such as the Student Academic Success Center and the Writing Center. However, the Student Academic Success Center was eliminated prior to the 2020-2021 academic year, and while other avenues for tutoring services have been provided in its place, the Writing Center remains the key student service focused on the development of ISLO2. The data collected during this cycle revealed what, at face value, might be considered surprising outcomes, in that there was no statistical difference between those students who were assessed in

courses for this cycle and either did or did not use the services of the Writing Center in that same semester, other than a drop in scores in the area of Mechanics for those that *did* use the Center. However, more information would need to be collected regarding those students to be able to draw clearer conclusions. We can say that far fewer students who were assessed used the Center than did not (52 to 508), and we might surmise that those who sought out the Center this year recognized their own deficiencies in writing skill, and therefore that sample group would necessarily reveal weaker outcomes.

Importantly, the Center was also almost completely a remote environment this academic year, impacting both how many students might have sought out its assistance and how effective that assistance could be. The faculty and staff who work at the Center were clear that they felt 2020-2021 did not reflect a typical academic year or the typical impact the Center has on the students who use the service. Prof. Shinelle Espaillat, Director of the Writing Center, notes that student attendance at the Center was far less than usual, which she attributes largely to the campus closing and the services moving remotely. Even when the Center could begin to offer limited in-person services in the Spring 2021 semester, however, only one student utilized that option. She also noted that the Center saw an uptick in the number of students who made appointments but never showed up. Since a number of faculty require Writing Center visits in their courses, students were scheduling those appointments, but then some would simply use the email confirmation they received from the Center as proof of a visit without actually meeting with a tutor, meaning they did not get the support they likely needed. Finally, through remote tutoring, the Center was unable to provide faculty its usual feedback form, which includes information on not only who attended the Center, but for what reason and precisely what the student and tutor worked on in the session, allowing the faculty member to follow-up with the student regarding those points.

Given that the request for online tutoring is likely to continue over at least the next academic year, the Writing Center is now revising its methodology and examining tutoring pedagogy for providing online support. As we move to future assessments, it behooves us to consider more appropriate ways to assess the Center's true impact – possibly collecting not only whether a student visits or not, but how much time they spend at the Center, how many times they visit over the course of the semester, improvements in grades from before and after regular visits, etc. Re-examining how we assess student services like the Writing Center could help the faculty and staff who run those services enhance their impacts and better allocate their resources.

In subsequent workshops and meetings regarding the outcomes of the ISLO2 assessment, faculty expressed an interest in looking at how other services might impact the development of the skill during a student's time at DCC. For instance, future assessments might consider the role of Accommodative Services, online tutoring, and other services.

*General Conclusions*:

In all, faculty expressed concerns about the varied impact the COVID-19 pandemic had on students, both in and out of the classroom, and that impact certainly had an effect on the outcomes in this assessment, whether that effect could be quantified or not. This entire academic year feels as though it should have an asterisk placed next to it, as it may go down as an outlier for many long-term assessments at the college.

With that said, the general consensus from faculty included points of optimism, ways in which the forced isolation of remote learning led to new pedagogical approaches that hold promise for writing instruction throughout the campus, from virtual tools that can assist students outside the classroom to a renewed appreciation for the importance of the one-to-one relationships that instructors build with developing writers. There was a clear sense that alternative formats for instruction, be they remote or hybrid, can work, but that students still need to both feel and literally be engaged with the coursework in order to strengthen their writing skills.

Qualitative data also suggests a connection between student reading habits and their writing skills, a point that connects ISLO2 to other learning outcomes, such as ISLO5-Information Literacy and Technological Competency and ISLO6-Critical Analysis and Reasoning. Faculty noted that many students struggled to read effectively, often skimming passages and instructional material, and that this point led to writing that was less clear, less specific, and less engaging. A renewed focus on the connection between reading and writing may serve the college well.

| Result/Conclusion | Recommendation for Action |
|---|---|
| Rubric data reveals that ENG101/003 student outcomes underperformed those in traditional ENG101 sections, and that they did not succeed in subsequent courses at the same rates as traditional ENG101 students; however, the overall impact of the curricular changes to the co-requisite model remains unsettled. Faculty perspectives show an in-the-classroom belief that the changes have been positive, and further data from Institutional Research point to improved overall pass rates for ENG101. Furthermore, IR notes that there was a significant negative impact on student success across the board attributed to the pandemic. | The Department of English and Humanities should continue to monitor the outcomes of ENG003 and ENG101 courses and suggest pedagogical changes to enhance student learning. Faculty workshops to share best practices, refine ENG003 and ENG101 pedagogical approaches, and discuss how to best reach desired learning outcomes would be beneficial. |
| Students in 200-level courses outperformed students in all 100-level courses, including ENG101. Suggests reinforcement of the Written Communication skills in courses | FAL and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs should share results with Program Chairs Council and hold discussions regarding |

| | |
|---|---|
| beyond the two-semester composition requirements. | reinforcing ISLO2 in 200-level courses within programs. |
| Direct instructions, scaffolding of writing assignments, clear feedback, and opportunities to revise lead to stronger student outcomes, as does student recognition of the purpose and value of the assignment. | Hold workshops for faculty to discuss assignment creation, from instructions through the scaffolding and revision to the final product, as well as best practices in instructor feedback. |
| Students who attended at least one session with a Writing Center tutor and/or swiped in to the Writing Center demonstrated no discernable differences in the numerical ratings of the ISLO2 assessment than students who never attended and/or swiped in to the Writing Center during the semester of assessment. However, faculty and staff note that the data collected lacked substance that would lead to substantiated conclusions regarding the Center's impact. | Reassess the impact of the Writing Center for the 2023-24 assessment cycle of ISLO2. Consider new ways to gather data regarding the impact of the Center on the students who use it. |
| Faculty perceived a connection between student reading habits and writing skills. | Interdisciplinary discussions, workshops, and other collaborations to consider the integration of reading and writing skills across the curriculum. Consider identifying courses that are reading- and/or writing-intensive to better prepare students for course expectations. |

# 5  Recommendations for Resources Needed to Implement Action Plan

| Recommendation/Action Item | Potential Resources |
|---|---|
| The Department of English and Humanities should continue to monitor the outcomes of ENG003 and ENG101 courses and suggest pedagogical changes to enhance student learning. Faculty workshops to share best practices, refine ENG003 and ENG101 pedagogical approaches, and discuss how to best reach desired learning outcomes would be beneficial. | Improvement of Instruction or Assessment Grants to support faculty workshops and compensate part-time instructors for the additional time outside their course requirements. |
| FAL and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs should share results with Program Chairs Council and hold discussions regarding | |

| | |
|---|---|
| reinforcing ISLO2 in 200-level courses within programs. | |
| Hold workshops for faculty to discuss assignment creation, from instructions through the scaffolding and revision to the final product, as well as best practices in instructor feedback. | Improvement of Instruction or Assessment Grants to support workshops, especially to offer compensation to part-time faculty. Professional development for faculty through the Writing Center and its January workshops. |
| Reassess the impact of the Writing Center for the 2023-24 assessment cycle of ISLO2. Consider new ways to gather data regarding the impact of the Center on the students who use it. | IR, FAL, and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs time and resources to create new modes of data collection and to analyze the results. |
| Interdisciplinary discussions, workshops, and other collaborations to consider the integration of reading and writing skills across the curriculum. Consider identifying courses that are reading- and/or writing-intensive to better prepare students for course expectations. | Improvement of Instruction Grants, Assessment Grants, or other resources from the Office of Academic Affairs to hold campus-wide discussions, workshops, and other professional development opportunities to allow for cross-departmental collaboration. |
| FAL to update PCC regarding status of these actions steps at the PCC meetings on November 19, 2021, and March 10, 2022. | |

# WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact value@aacu.org*

AAC&U Association of American Colleges and Universities

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

### Definition

Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

### Framing Language

This writing rubric is designed for use in a wide variety of educational institutions. The most clear finding to emerge from decades of research on writing assessment is that the best writing assessments are locally determined and sensitive to local context and mission. Users of this rubric should, in the end, consider making adaptations and additions that clearly link the language of the rubric to individual campus contexts.

This rubric focuses assessment on how specific written work samples or collectios of work respond to specific contexts. The central question guiding the rubric is "How well does writing respond to the needs of audience(s) for the work?" In focusing on this question the rubric does not attend to other aspects of writing that are equally important: issues of writing process, writing strategies, writers' fluency with different modes of textual production or publication, or writer's growing engagement with writing and disciplinarity through the process of writing.

Evaluators using this rubric must have information about the assignments or purposes for writing guiding writers' work. Also recommended is including reflective work samples of collections of work that address such questions as: What decisions did the writer make about audience, purpose, and genre as s/he compiled the work in the portfolio? How are those choices evident in the writing -- in the content, organization and structure, reasoning, evidence, mechanical and surface conventions, and citational systems used in the writing? This will enable evaluators to have a clear sense of how writers understand the assignments and take it into consideration as they evaluate

The first section of this rubric addresses the context and purpose for writing. A work sample or collections of work can convey the context and purpose for the writing tasks it showcases by including the writing assignments associated with work samples. But writers may also convey the context and purpose for their writing within the texts. It is important for faculty and institutions to include directions for students about how they should represent their writing contexts and purposes.

Faculty interested in the research on writing assessment that has guided our work here can consult the National Council of Teachers of English/Council of Writing Program Administrators' White Paper on Writing Assessment (2008; www.wpacouncil.org/whitepaper) and the Conference on College Composition and Communication's Writing Assessment: A Position Statement (2008; www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/123784.htm)

### Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

• Content Development: The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.

• Context of and purpose for writing: The context of writing is the situation surrounding a text: who is reading it? who is writing it? Under what circumstances will the text be shared or circulated? What social or political factors might affect how the text is composed or interpreted? The purpose for writing is the writer's intended effect on an audience. Writers might want to persuade or inform; they might want to report or summarize information; they might want to work through complexity or confusion; they might want to argue with other writers, or connect with other writers; they might want to convey urgency or amuse; they might write for themselves or for an assignment or to remember.

• Disciplinary conventions: Formal and informal rules that constitute what is seen generally as appropriate within different academic fields, e.g. introductory strategies, use of passive voice or first person point of view, expectations for thesis or hypothesis, expectations for kinds of evidence and support that are appropriate to the task at hand, use of primary and secondary sources to provide evidence and support arguments and to document critical perspectives on the topic. Writers will incorporate sources according to disciplinary and genre conventions, according to the writer's purpose for the text. Through increasingly sophisticated use of sources, writers develop an ability to differentiate between their own ideas and the ideas of others, credit and build upon work already accomplished in the field or issue they are addressing, and provide meaningful examples to readers.

• Evidence: Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text.

• Genre conventions: Formal and informal rules for particular kinds of texts and/or media that guide formatting, organization, and stylistic choices, e.g. lab reports, academic papers, poetry, webpages, or personal essays.

• Sources: Texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) that writers draw on as they work for a variety of purposes -- to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape their ideas, for example.

# WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact value@aacu.org*

Association of American Colleges and Universities

### Definition

Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

| | Capstone 4 | Milestones 3 | Milestones 2 | Benchmark 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Context of and Purpose for Writing** *Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).* | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work. | Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context). | Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions). | Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience). |
| **Content Development** | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work. | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work. |
| **Genre and Disciplinary Conventions** *Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).* | Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices | Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices | Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation | Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation. |
| **Sources and Evidence** | Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing | Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing. |
| **Control of Syntax and Mechanics** | Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free. | Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors. | Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors. | Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage. |

## Appendix B: Sample Instruments Used to Collect Data

**ART104: Fundamentals of Art**

Essay One: 750 words

For this essay you will be concentrating on using your formal terms to support a discussion of the modernist form of criticism called structuralism. The focus of this essay is monotheism and polytheism as a theme in art. Your only sources for this essay will be the textbook, class notes, class lectures, and the Metropolitan Museum links provided. Each student is assigned an image with a link to the museum.

Please pay particular attention to the following:

1- If the link has a catalogue entry or an essay – READ it

2- If there is an audio link – listen to it

3- What mediums were used for the image?

4- Are there any specific visual symbols in this image that would be repeated in other images that represent this particular faith/culture?

5- Remember to define structuralism, monotheism, or polytheism in the essay as you discuss the images.

**ELT218: Electronics II**

*To Be Submitted*:

Each individual is to write and submit by the provided deadline the identified sections that would theoretically be included in a formal technical report on this lab activity's work. The sections required are (1) Design section, (2) Results and Discussion section, and (3) Annotated Bibliography/References. Students are to use the **Technical Report Writing Guidelines**, Writing in STEM handout, and Checklist of Expectations to guide their writing. Additionally, information about how to organize the writing for these sections is provided below. As you work on this assignment, consider the following:

- You **CANNOT** copy or paraphrase from this lab book or the lecture notes without suffering a significant negative impact on your grade.
- You must learn to use proper sources and provide proper citations. Detailed information on this is provided in the Technical Report Writing Guidelines.
- You **MUST** provide an annotated bibliography for all sources used. In the annotation, you need to state what information was used from the source and where it was used in the report.
- Assume that the other sections of the report from title page to conclusion are being written by another party and your job is to create the first draft of these sections for discussion by the team.

**Organize the formal report as follows:**

*Design*

State the design criteria and then show/explain how resistor values are selected in order to meet the design criteria. MUST provide a circuit diagram using the appropriate variable names/labels so that reader can follow your design explanation and readily identify which resistor is to be which value. Make sure to present the final equation for the output voltage as a function of the input voltages where you replace resistor values into the general equation so that you provide a second equation that has numerical coefficients.

For example, if the coefficient for V1 is set by Rf/R1 and Rf = 10kΩ and Ri = 2.5kΩ then the coefficient for V1 is 4.0.

*Results and Discussion*

Present and discuss **all** the results obtained in the lab activity. Since all the results fit appropriately in one table, you will present that table (always introduce with words a table or diagram before including the table or diagram) and then discuss. Keep in mind the objectives of the lab activity. Consider answers to the following questions and observations that would provide appropriate content for this section:

1. How did theoretical values compare to experimental and simulated (Msim) values? Be specific and supply numbers. Use percent differences. When multiple types of values are compared (dc voltage, ac voltage, frequency, phase shift), it must be clear what each presented % difference refers to. For example, if expected and measured outputs are -2Vdc + 1Vpp/100Hz/180☐ and -1.92Vdc + 1.04Vpp/100Hz/180☐, then need to calculate a percent difference to compare the differences in dc voltage AND ac voltage. You also need to be clear with reader which presented percent difference goes with what. When making comparisons, don't forget to state how theoretical and experimental frequency and phase shift compare.
2. Clearly describe the differences between outputs observed and relate them to types of inputs used. Discuss observations of the output when all inputs are dc voltages, when all inputs are ac voltages, and when mixed voltages are used. Also discuss how a 0V input is treated. Use the pictures taken in lab and labelled using Microsoft Paint to clarify the discussion.
3. Did the circuit behave as expected? Support your discussion with data. For an excellent discussion, you must refer back to the functional equation of the circuit and discuss how it amplifies and adds. The key feature of this circuit is that it amplifies individual channel voltages and then adds those amplified voltages. Since this is an inverting circuit, DC voltage polarity and AC voltage phase shift changes. Your discussion of circuit behavior must focus on experimental data that illuminates all this behavior. Here you want to use data to discuss the circuit from a functional or behavioral perspective, not a comparison to theoretical data. Provide a sample calculation of output voltage for a set of input voltages to prove behavior.

*References (Annotated Bibliography)*

It is likely that you will have needed to use references for this report. Please make sure to look in the Technical Report Writing Guidelines for information on how to cite works in the body of the report using parenthetical citations and how to prepare a References page with annotations. Although my course handouts may have provided a good guide of the content for you, you CANNOT use my work as a primary reference since this is not properly reviewed and edited reference material. Much of what I have written is drawn from the textbook (Fiore) so find where the material came from in Fiore and cite that.

Alternatively, look up information on multichannel amplifiers making sure you use a reliable source. **Citations should be in APA style**. The citation generator at http://www.calvin.edu/library/knightcite/ is recommended for creating properly formatted citations. The proper citation for the 741 datashee t was provided with Lab #1.

**ENG101: Composition I**

For the final exam, choose **one** of the options below and write a carefully constructed, well-developed essay of roughly 500-750 words in response. Your essay should be formatted using correct MLA guidelines for essays, from the heading through the Works Cited entry (I have provided you correct entries in the links, but you need to include them in your paper). Be sure to use appropriate parenthetical citations within the essay, as well. Once written, post y our final draft in the assignment area within the Blackboard folder for the final exam.

You will need to read one of two resources in order to write the essay. For whichever prompt you choose, be sure that you clearly and directly reference the appropriate resource throughout the essay. Both resources can also be found within the Blackboard folder for the final exam.

**Jane Goodall, "Learning from Chimpanzees: A Message Humans Can Understand," from *Science*, 18 December 1998**

- Goodall's essay focuses in large part on how what she learned in studying chimpanzees in their natural habitat challenged pre vailing assumptions about not only the chimps, but animals more generally. Write an essay which describes what Goodall learned and how your own experience with animals relates to those lessons.

- Write an essay that, like Goodall's, explains a time in which you learned new information or knowledge, or gained new insight, that challenged your own long-held assumptions or beliefs, or some other accepted doctrine or rule. Be sure to compare your experience directly with Gooda ll's to provide the appropriate context within which you are writing for your essay. For instance, Goodall notes that how sometimes the new scientific knowledge she or her peers presented "provoked a storm of bitter protest." What was the initial reaction to your particular experience?

- Goodall tells us that her study of the chimpanzees, which led to an awareness of their "intellectual and emotional similarities" to humans, has "blurred the lines, once thought so sharp, between human beings and other animals." Does it matter that those lines have been blurred ? Why so? Argue the importance of Goodall's work in terms of science, more generally, or even just our understanding of animals, more specifically.

- Finally, Goodall ends with the story of Rick Swope and the chimpanzee he saved from drowning at the Detroit zoo, one that she believes has "truly symbolic meaning." What do you believe is the symbolism of that story? Write an essay that defines and explains that symbol ism for your reader. Be specific.

**Carl Sagan, from an interview by Charlie Rose on the latter's show, *Charlie Rose*, from 27 May 1996**

- You can review the entire interview (found in the link provided with the transcription) and then respond to something specific within it, but if you choose to look at only the selection I've provided here (which comes from the YouTube link), then write an essay which argues for or against Sagan's main reasons for being fearful of a society run by science and technology in which the people do not *understand* that science or technology. Use his points to contextualize your discussion, but be sure to defend your own ideas using both his words and examples of your own. In essence, your essay will answer the questions: Is it imperative that the general population understand science and technology, and if so, why?

**ENG212: Greek and Roman Literature in Translation**

For the last essay assignment, choose ONE of the following prompts below and write a focused, specific, and well-supported argument in response. Be sure to use the primary source(s) as your main piece of evidence, quoting it directly and documenting those references according to MLA guidelines. You do not need to use any source beyond the primary one(s); however, if you do, you must document its use. Provide a Works Cited entry for all sources, though it does not need to be on its own page. (APA format is also acceptable, but be consistent in each essay).

**Length**: Roughly 750 words (or about three pages)

**Options**:

1. Compare and contrast *The Aeneid* to the epics of Homer. Consider focusing on Aeneas (as a hero) versus Achilles and Odysseus, the thematic intention of each work, or even simply the heroes' journeys into the underworld. You are deciding what specifically to compare/contrast, so just be clear about that point in your introduction.

2. Discuss the thematic significance of the debate between Dido and Aeneas in the section "The Passion of the Queen." How are the characters contrasted and for what purpose? Remember that Aeneas is presented to us as the Stoic hero, so consider the tenets of that philosophy as you analyze the scene.

3. What themes of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations* are evident in the following passage? Be clear in how the reference illuminates those themes (see the video lecture for a list of them):

   "Now your remaining years are few. Live them, then, as though on a mountain-top. Whether a man's lot be cast in this place or in that matters nothing, provided that in all places he views the world as a city and himself its citizen. Give men the chance to see and know a true man, living by Nature's law. If they cannot brook the sight, let them do away with him. Better so, than to live as they live."

4. Discuss the biblical imagery found in St. Augustine's *Confessions*. Using a minimum of two examples from his writings, discuss how St. Augustine uses that imagery to solidify the overriding purpose of his work.

**MUS201: History of Music Before 1750**

Choose a composer before 1750 and select a representative composition featuring your instrument/voice (no arrangements); if your instrument was not invented by 1750 pick a predecessor of your instrument. You may not choose a composition covered in class or your textbook. Discuss your choice with the instructor prior to all deadlines. Your paper should be based on research AND your own analysis. DO NOT include biographical information on the composer. Include a bibliography of all sources. See course schedule for all due dates.

Write a 5-page paper covering the following:

1. Historical information on the specific piece you chose (1 page minimum).
2. Description of the piece in terms of instrumentation, melody, rhythm, harmony focusing on musical innovation (1 page minimum).
3. The emotion you think the composer wished to express and your interpretation (1 page minimum).

Name:
1. Introduction/thesis [5]
2. Content
       a. Historical information [20] – 1 page
       b. Description of the piece [20] – 1 page
       c. Emotion [20] – 1 page
3. Conclusion [5]
4. Bibliography [10]
5. Grammar and structure [15]
6. Recording submitted by due date [5]

# Appendix C: Student Performance on Assessment Disaggregated by Program

| MAJ | N | 2.1 Purpose | | 2.2 Content | | 2.3 Discipline | | 2.4 Sources | | 2.5 Mechanics | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % earn 2/3/4 | % earn 0/1 | % earn 2/3/4 | % earn 0/1 | % earn 2/3/4 | % earn 0/1 | % earn 2/3/4 | % earn 0/1 | % earn 2/3/4 | % earn 0/1 |
| ACC | 3 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | |
| ARC | 10 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 90.0% | 10.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 90.0% | 10.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% |
| AVI | 3 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% |
| AVM | 2 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% |
| BAT | 25 | 88.0% | 12.0% | 88.0% | 12.0% | 96.0% | 4.0% | 96.0% | 4.0% | 92.0% | 8.0% |
| BUS | 17 | 70.6% | 29.4% | 58.8% | 41.2% | 47.1% | 52.9% | 52.9% | 47.1% | 47.1% | 52.9% |
| CHC | 1 | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | 100.0% | | | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| CIS | 5 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 60.0% | 40.0% |
| CMH | 1 | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| CNS | 3 | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | |
| COM | 25 | 84.0% | 16.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 76.0% | 24.0% | 88.0% | 12.0% |
| CPS | 20 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 75.0% | 25.0% | 75.0% | 25.0% | 90.0% | 10.0% |
| CRJ | 6 | 100.0% | | 83.3% | 16.7% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% | |
| CRT | 23 | 82.6% | 17.4% | 95.7% | 4.3% | 82.6% | 17.4% | 82.6% | 17.4% | 91.3% | 8.7% |
| ECH | 3 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 66.7% |
| EDH | 5 | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | |
| EDL | 10 | 90.0% | 10.0% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 90.0% | 10.0% | 90.0% | 10.0% | 90.0% | 10.0% |
| EED | 20 | 95.0% | 5.0% | 90.0% | 10.0% | 95.0% | 5.0% | 95.0% | 5.0% | 95.0% | 5.0% |
| ELT | 9 | 88.9% | 11.1% | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| ENR | 11 | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 90.9% | 9.1% | 90.9% | 9.1% | 81.8% | 18.2% |
| ESW | 6 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 83.3% | 16.7% |
| FPT | 1 | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | |
| GSP | 111 | 92.8% | 7.2% | 91.0% | 9.0% | 88.3% | 11.7% | 88.3% | 11.7% | 85.6% | 14.4% |
| HMS | 21 | 76.2% | 23.8% | 81.0% | 19.0% | 81.0% | 19.0% | 81.0% | 19.0% | 76.2% | 23.8% |
| LAH | 110 | 95.5% | 4.5% | 96.4% | 3.6% | 94.5% | 5.5% | 94.5% | 5.5% | 97.3% | 2.7% |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|----|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| LAX | 18 | 94.4% | 5.6% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 94.4% | 5.6% | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| MLT | 4 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 75.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 75.0% | 25.0% | 75.0% | 25.0% |
| PAL | 1 | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | | 100.0% | 100.0% | | | 100.0% |
| PAR | 18 | 100.0% | | 88.9% | 11.1% | 77.8% | 22.2% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 77.8% | 22.2% |
| PBH | 1 | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| PDC | 6 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| PFA | 25 | 100.0% | | 96.0% | 4.0% | 88.0% | 12.0% | 88.0% | 12.0% | 68.0% | 32.0% |
| PRR | 1 | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | |
| UND | 26 | 88.5% | 11.5% | 92.3% | 7.7% | 84.6% | 15.4% | 80.8% | 19.2% | 96.2% | 3.8% |
| VAT | 9 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 55.6% | 44.4% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 33.3% |

## Appendix D: Faculty Narrative Data

**ART104:FUNDAMENTALS OF ART**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: completed

There were mixed results for this assignment. Students who regularly attended the synchronous lecture and participated in the discussions, and read the assigned textbook readings did well for the most part. Some students struggled due to the pandemic conditions: trying to take class from their phones, in their car instead of a hime base, lack of in person access to the writing center, classroom dynamics etc.

A benefit - museums, such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art NYC, have rigorously updated their virtual options for visual research to include more recordings, three dimensional presentations, and written material to correspond with their collections. Overall students maintained the same standards with their engagement in research for their essay materials as they did pre pandemic when they were required to visit a museum in person. (04/01/2021)

Assessment Method: Students were assessed based on a series of lectures that culminated in their writing an essay on the modernist form of crticism called structuralism

**COM120:MEDIA WRITING**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

This was an assessment of a 7.5 week Hybrid COM 120 course to look at completion data for this course delivery modality. Overall the pass rates and assignment completion rates were very good. Considering that students had 50% of the time of a normal semester to complete assignments and only 50% of the meeting times, students seem to adjust to the Hybrid format and benefitted from the expedited format. (11/20/2020)

Assessment Method: Analysis of completion of 6 major writing assignments; use of resources, grammar, and format and style for media writing.

**ELT218:ELECTRONICS II**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

The students with ratings of 1 or 2 are either very young and come out of the P-Tech program or an adult student with a full-time job who could easily write better but likely prioritized effort. For the young students, their technical skills are good and they met the standard for t his assignment, but their writing is still developing. The student scoring all 4s, already has a bachelor's degree and it shows in the writing. Overall, students primarily performed at the level expected as 3rd semester college students. I'd like to see them do better but developing excellent writing skills is a long process takin g a lot of practice. (11/04/2020)

Assessment Method: Assignment was completed in the middle of the semester. Students had to write Design and Results & Discuss ion sections that would be part of a formal technical report experimental work they performed. Earlier in the semester, they had worked with a Google doc modeling the expectations for a formal technical report (first time I did the assignments this way and I'm satisfied with results).

## ENG101: COMPOSITION I

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: completed

Overall, this seemed like a very difficult semester for students who were still not use to some elements of Blackboard. Live meeting times, scheduled live office hours and even some off schedule meeting hours did not work so well with some st udents. There was also a population of students that kind of dropped off after the first essay . However, there was a small group that kept contract via emails and meetings. Overall, they did better and finished assignments. (06/01/2021)

Assessment Method: Essays

**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: no action needed

This class was presented using synchronous method. All the students who completed the final exam, were successful. The fina l exam grade correlated to their semester grade. The students who did not complete the exam, also did not complete most of the assignments for the course. T he students who completed the course, also attended about 95% of the classes and were fully engaged during the sessions. They part icipated in discussions and group work. (05/13/2021)

Assessment Method: Final Exam

**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: completed

The students who took the final exam are developing their writing competencies. (05/12/2021)

Assessment Method: I assigned a 750-word final essay that allowed students to choose from one of the two social justice texts they read during the course, and I assessed their writing samples according to both MLA and ELA standards.

**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action/Modification: More emphasis on clarity and cohesion in essay writing. Additional practice with essay outlines. (05/12/2021)

Action Type: minor course update

Overall, students showed a developing ability to use given sources to develop a reasonable argument. In some essays, the students did not clearly state their stance and/or use language that supported their claims. In a few essays, the support only loosely matched the claim. Students who attended more classes performed better than those who had low attendance and low class participation. (05/12/2021)

Resource Needed 1: Additional models of essay writing, particularly argumentative writing.

Assessment Method: Assessment was based on the final 5-6 paragraph argumentative essay which incorporated the readings/viewings discussed in Zoom meetings and through Blackboard discussion forums during the semester. Students received the topic and prompt for the final exam essay one week before the due date.

**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: completed

These students were part of a late-start for ENG 101 during the Covid-19 lockdown. The results should show that there is a direct result in almost a 50/50 split between prodigal students of above average grades and those who could not complete the course for various reasons. To understand these results, we need to further evaluate a student on an individual level in this particular situation. There may have been some student success and/or failure based on the way I delivered the course. It seems that some students understood perfectly what I required and some did not as I copied over course material and changed it in real time, and had to change due dates. On the other hand, some students simply didn't do anything. (05/12/2021)

**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: completed

At the conclusion of this course, I found through this data that student grades fell on either end of the spectrum. While some students excelled at a high level throughout the the semester, a few struggled academically while others produced virtually no gradable assignments. I may nee d to evaluate my own course delivery and teaching style because some students may have misunderstood the on line course expectations. I feel that the late afternoon class module time slot played a factor in why students stopped showing up for instruction.   (05/12/2021)

Assessment Method: Grades and Student Learning Outcomes

**

Semester Assessed: 2021   Spring

Action Type: ongoing

Students in 003 scored lower than their 101 counterparts on the final exam.   However, students who completed more of the smal ler assignments and scaffolding assignments throughout the semester scored better overall.   Students who did not do these smaller/scaffolding assignments not only scored lower on the final exam,  but a large percentage of them did not even submit the final exam.   Students were definitely more likely to complete a larger assignment when smaller stakes assignments like discussions, text summaries, and/or essay drafts were submitted.   (05/11/2021)

Assessment Method: Final Exam

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

I break the research project down into shorter assignments so they submit it in sections. Topic proposal, thesis statement, bibliography, body paragraph, outline , rough draft, final draft and works cited. These earlier assignments provide feedback and cushion so that the final paper is n ot the be all end all of their research grade. (01/05/2021)

Assessment Method: Research Essay

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action/Modification: I am going to try doing some grammar content and essay instructions and specifications during on line office hours and in a video format as I have found that students respond well to videos if they are not too long (ten minutes seems to be successful). (01/04/2021)

I have found that students' overall have a harder time becoming more proficient in grammar and syntax in an online class than an in-person class. I also find they don't grasp the overall content development for specific types of essays as well online. I think this is because they tend to skim through essay instructions and grammar content when they are not being prompted to go over it face-to-face. (01/04/2021)

Action Type: minor course update

Assessment Method: A written essay was given as the final exam at the end of the semester with three days for completion.

**

Semester Assessed: 2019-2020

Action Type: no action needed

The students were given a take home final essay due to Covid 19. I taught using the suggested asynchronous model; however, their was a marked disconnection between students and the class. Many students became inactive within the first months of the class. This was especially true for students who fell into the 003 category. As we move forward post covid19, It gives me great concern if we attempt to do the 003 online. (01/01/2021)

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: completed

The students in this section were above average in most aspects assessment. Mostly, they were able to ascertain the course material in complete asynchronous/remote learning. It was apparent they came into the class with strong understanding of the expectations, and they continued to advance on a moderate level in not only responsibility but also course curriculum. I believe this was because it was a traditional 101 --not a co-requisite and simply a coincidence of an astute cohort of students. (12/31/2020)

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action/Modification: More time will be devoted to thesis statement identification and writing, as well as integration of evidence (phrasing and citation) during the upcoming semester. Additional argumentative readings with guided annotation, discussion, and modeling will be incorporated. (12/29/2020)

Action Type: minor course update

Although most students clearly followed the argumentative writing format, they struggled in two areas: writing strong thesis statements and embedding evidence to support their claims. (12/29/2020)

Assessment Method: Take home final (argumentative essay). Students were given one week to complete the essay that was based on readings and videos discussed during the semester.

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: minor course update

Unsurprisingly, students who consistently logged on to Blackboard, and who completed Essays 1 and 2, met modest competencies by Essay 3. More students made the step up from basic competency to modest competency; students who entered with moderate competencies remained there and improved incrementally. My initial reaction is that the early scaffolding I have built into the first four weeks are critical to student success, and more effort needs to be made to attain early student buy-in. (12/28/2020)

Assessment Method: Essay 3 was due at the end of Week 11. Essay 3 built on strategies learned in Essays 1 and 2, requiring students to research a topic in order to present a multi-faceted issue as well as their commentary on the topic. Students had a rough draft stage with peer review, and then a week to complete revisions. The paper was expected to be at least four pages long.

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action/Modification: To develop student learning I would incorporate classroom instruction on developing academic language and sentence development in writing and supporting a compelling argument. (12/28/2020)

Action Type: minor course update

Overall class assessment met with my expectation as students continue to adapt to online instruction and developing their writing and critical reading skills with virtual tools and methodology. In identifying an area to focus on for overall improvement would be additional class time dedicated to developing language to communicate and support an argument. (12/28/2020)

Assessment Method: Take Home Final Exam

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: completed

The asynchronous format of the class was problematic for majority of the students. The ones who were diligent did well but the ones who did not follow the directions did not do well. (12/27/2020)

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

Students who worked steadily and who carefully reviewed instructor feedback on their writing improved significantly over the course of the semester. Others, who were less connected with the instructor and much less responsive to outreach, did not improve much, and some of these eventually stopped handing in work. I believe the added stresses of covid (on other areas of life) and of the necessarily remote instruction contributed somewhat to the number of the latter students, but in general the results I see are not much out of line with those of a normal semester. (12/19/2020)

Assessment Method: final exam

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action/Modification: I intend on making a change to the final exam in the digital space so that students are forced to complete a citation checklist worksheet before submitting their final exam to ensure that students are citing with more attention to detail. (12/18/2020)

Action Type: minor course update

Most students are improving their theoretical (ideas) and structural (grammar) writing as the semester progresses. However, while students are working towards producing developed, organized, and clear essays, improper citing is still an issue on too many final exams. (12/18/2020)

Assessment Method: Students were assigned a three-page (750 words) final exam where they had to respond to prompts about either the young adult novel Riot Baby or PET. Students had to frame and support an argument, and they had to create in-text citations and a works cited page. They were allowed to complete the final exam at home over the course of one week.

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: minor course update

I struggled with retaining my module students this semester. A few never engaged with the course at all, but a couple stayed engaged up until the research assignment. In an effort to keep everyone on top of the material, I assigned a lot of smaller assignments. I think I went overboard with this, and students who fell behind began to feel like they had an insurmountable amount of work to complete. For next semester, I'm going to consolidate a couple of the assignments in order to streamline the Blackboard grading experience for both students and myself. (12/18/2020)

Assessment Method: final exam essay

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action/Modification: I wanted my Spring classes to by synchronous based on the fall off in participation in this class. (12/17/2020)

Action Type: completed

Covid 19 and remote learning had a negative impact on this class. Many of the 101 and 003 students just disappeared. The ones that stayed and attended the twice weekly Zoom classes fared much better. (12/17/2020)

Assessment Method: Final exam: They could choose between two persuasive articles, one arguing against tattoos and one by a Black, female doctor in NYC, lamenting that few patients think she is the "real" doctor. Had to write 500 words arguing for or against with evidence from the article to support or refute.

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: completed

This semester I taught five sections of Composition. Paradoxically, the two co-required pairs I taught this semester (ENG 101 / ENG 003) were better than my independent, stand-alone ENG 101. Teaching online made it more difficult for students to focus on issues related to the category of Control of Syntax and Mechanics, so I dedicated more time to the first four categories. Overall, I found that in online classes students spent less time on revision. Finally, at least 14 students from my fall classes have signed up for my ENG 102 in spring, which is wonderful! I was pleasantly surprised that one student from my ENG 003 turned out to be the best student of the whole semester. (12/17/2020)

Assessment Method: final exam

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

The students who showed the most improvement in the areas of assessment were unsurprisingly those who followed the weekly course instruction and reviewed individual feedback and markups on their semester essays.

Although I was impressed by the overall effort of the all the students who completed the assessment essay. I think this is b ecause I told them it was an 'assessment' of their writing for the English department, but would not be graded or 'marked', and the essay structure was s imilar to weekly critical writing assignments they had done throughout the semester. But also, I believe- I hope- the content/source was relevant to the students, and they were interested in establishing that relevancy in their writing. My observation is that 'most' students seem to write better when they are engag ed and interested in the material, are allowed and encouraged to express what they think about the material as uncensored as possible, and are not worried so much about a 'grade'. However, I think they also need- and appreciate-all of this tempered with instructor expectations, and good, basic, solid tools to create disciplined writing. (12/16/2020)

Assessment Method: I gave them a 2- 3 page final exam essay to be composed in Word, MLA style formatting with a Work Cited page, and submitted into the last Weekly Discussion Forum. They were also to read and comment on at least two other peers' essays. They could not access the forum until they posted. The essay was also to be formatted into their Final Writing Portfolio. The essay consisted of a choice from three prompts analyzing the , argument ( thesis and main points), rhetorical strategy, situation, or devices in Mitch Landrieu's 2018 Confederate Monument Removal Speech in New Orleans. The source was video with a written transcript. The students had a choice of citing the video or the transcript- I offered no template or instruction. The essay was not 'graded', but I pasted in the ISLO Written Assessment Rubric for each essay and returned them individually with my assessment.

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

The strongest area in this class was the Context/Purpose. Given the direct instructions from the prompt, it was likely easy for them to provide that context, but they also were clearly aware of their purpose across the board. Two students even scored 4's , which didn't happen anywhere else. The weakest area was the Genre Conventions, impacted by two students who wrote long pieces without paragraphing.

I'm left to wonder the impact of Covid overall on this assessment, though. Only about 60% of the class completed the assessment tool. Many of the students disappeared long before the end of the course; therefore, the ones left were the self-motivated ones, and perhaps stronger students overall. We may end up with higher rubric averages because many students are missing. At the same time, even those who stayed received a very different pedagogical approach this semester. I was able to provide a lot of individual feedback, but it's harder for me to know if they actually read, understo od, and did anything with that feedback. I noticed a few students make the same simple formatting mistakes again and again, no matter how many times I pointed it out, leaving me to think they never read my feedback and looked only at the grade. While this is always an issue, I wonder if it's worse of one in a totally remote learning environment.

Otherwise, I'm not surprised by the outcomes of the students who were assessed. The averages are where I'd expect students t o be at the end of ENG101. (12/15/2020)

Assessment Method: Final Exam - provided students two readings and a number of prompts based on those readings. They had to write a 500-750 word responding to one prompt. They were given a week to submit their final draft.

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: ongoing

Of the students who finished the semester, those who had consistently kept up with the work (and thereby received timely feed back for subsequent work) showed the most improvement. This was similar to traditional in-person instruction, but student attrition overall was clearly higher than normal. While demonstrating basic writing competency, students do not illustrate a high level of attention to detail. Relatively little progress was evid ent in grammar and MLA citations/mechanics. This may be as a result of the online-only environment where it is difficult to stress those elements which seem minor but are needed in other courses. Many students disappeared just as the work was getting the most challenging, and two of my students c laimed to have Covid-19 (one was documented). Further, students who showed the most significant improvement were the ones I had face -to-face contact with via Zoom or through optional English 003 Collaborate sessions on Blackboard or those who corresponded regularly via email; one student I also met serendipitously in the real world (and guessed who he was because of the content of his first paper). He was the only student who had disappeared and, after the in -person conversation, subsequently submitted all of his missing work. Three of the four highest assessed final essays were written by English 003 students, and all four of th em had either met with me virtually, in-person, or emailed regularly. The online-only environment is clearly a challenge for our students, but those in the English 003 course who maintained contact were especially successful. The success may be attributed to the English 003 students' expectation of having to devote extra time to the subject and subsequently experiencing success despite the online environment as compared with the other students who did not anticipate the additional time needed for the subject or the particular challenges of an online environment. In short, most students were "remedial" this se mester because of the novelty of the online environment, and those who expected to invest extra time succeeded while those who did not adjust did not achieve simi lar results. (12/15/2020)

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action/Modification: Students could definitely benefit with more practice effectively and smoothly incorporating source material, so I will be revamping my research lessons to focus more on this skill. (12/14/2020)

Action Type: minor course update

Students were particularly strong in the development of their final exam essays. I believe this was due to it drawing upon a common theme they studied throughout the entire semester. Since they were able to address a final text and then also use support from other texts they had already studied, they were able to make deeper connections overall. While students were quite strong in documenting these sources in MLA, they demonstrated the need to work more effectively on incorporating them into the essay with full attribution. Students overall still need to work on basic grammatical and mechanical issues. The remote nature of this semester was definitely a challenge for many students. I think many of them would have done better if they could have used the Writing Center face to face. While some did use it virtually (and benefited) some were reluctant to set up an online session. (12/14/2020)

Assessment Method: Final Exam

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

Strengths - Formal essay structure, clarity of argument, command of compare/contrast strategy/approach, use of textual evidence to back up claims

Weaknesses - Fully proper & consistent MLA formatting / Works Cited

Outside influences - COVID (complications) seems to have impacted final exam participation for some students

Instructional practices to continue - More so than Zoom calls, this group enjoyed one-on-one emailing & subsequent phone calls. Students felt that one-on-one phone calls could dispel any confusion, and left them feeling confident for the final (12/11/2020)

Assessment Method: Final Exam

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

The approach for the final exam: Students read in advance five short essays (three from the semester's text and two from online sources). From the essays' overall topic, students had to compose their own argument thesis, give two reasons in support of the thesis, explain each reason, and give further support for each reason by quoting from at least two of the five sources, using correct MLA citation. Students should have felt reasonably comfortable with this exam, since over the course of the semester, they had written two short essays and one longer research essay that all involved arguments. Comments had been given to them for possible revision for each essay. Exam results: For the most part, students were successful in composing a simple argument thesis, and defending the thesis with two reasons of support, along with quoting from sources. (12/10/2020)

Assessment Method: Final Exam

**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

These are the results expected at the end of ENG 101 since the final exam is the culmination of a semester of writing and revision. (12/09/2020)

Assessment Method: Final Exam - written essay

## ENG203:LIT OF US:COLONIAL/CIVIL WAR

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: no action needed

This being a 200-level class, the results were as expected. Most writers exhibited skills in the 3 range, and there were no outliers in the 1 or 0 range, which suggests that the practice students have had writing papers in Eng 101 and 102 (as well as other classes) has worked. I did h ave more students not turn the assignment in than usual, which I think is a result of the pandemic and the shift to online instruction. It will be interesting to compare numbers of completed assignments next year, if the same course is in person. (05/13/2021)

Assessment Method: One 5-7 page formal essay using one or more original source from the syllabus. Research is not required, but a Work Cited page and MLA citation method is. Thesis statements should be analytical arguments rather than summaries or reports.

## ENG211:NEWSWRITNG EDITING & PUBLICATN

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: no action needed

All the students in this ENG 211 class demonstrated the ability to write at at least the level of 3. (05/14/2021)

Assessment Method: They watched a documentary on The New York Times called PAGE ONE. They were asked to analyze those traits and skills that are necessary to be a successful journalist at a world class newspaper. They had to cite and discuss examples from the film.

## ENG212:GREEK/ROMAN LIT TRANSLATN

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: no action needed

In this course, I don't provide much writing instruction beyond my commentary on their essays, but given that the essay used to assess the skills was the last of four this semester, and that they were provided an opportunity to revise older essays, those that participated throughout the course were offered some one-on-one feedback and instruction. However, it's not clear how much each student truly paid attention to my comments. Those that did showed improvements over the course of the semester, but others clearly did not, at times handing in drafts that included the same grammatical errors I pointed out in rough drafts.

I do believe they used the primary source well in their essays, which I attribute at least in part to my consistent reminders to them, both in discussions and on essays, to be sure to quote that source directly as evidence for their claims or context for their discussions. I also think the nature of the assignment itself, which asked specific prompts directing them to the primary source and in essence required a grounding in that source, led to those outcomes. The more direct we are with our purpose and intention, the more they meet the desired outcomes.

They were overall rather solid as writers, which speaks in part to this being a 200-level ENG course; the students successfully completed ENG101 and ENG102 by this point and are likely in programs in which writing is a necessary component of their course work. (05/11/2021)

Assessment Method: Used the VALUE rubric to score the students' fourth formal essay, which was due at the end of the semester. They were provided four prompts, asked to select one, and to write an essay of roughly 750 words which provided "a focused, specific, and well-supported argument in response. Be sure to use the primary source(s) as your main piece of evidence, quoting it directly and documenting those references according to MLA guidelines."

## ENG214: WRITING CREATIVE NON-FICTION

Demonstrated modest ability for close analytical reading comprehension of selections of creative nonfiction; however, the first weeks were problematic. I believe this was due to students' skimming of the material, rather than taking the time for in-depth reading. Also, I think it could be due to students either skimming over or not watching at all the videos made for help with comprehension of the readings. This habit of "skimming" became obviously problematic when students were asked to distinguish between objective and subjective writing in the creative nonfiction selections. I feel discussion analysis of readings was more successful with in-class sessions, in which the students are more engaged in the face to face lectures. By the second half of the semester and many detailed announcements for mandatory viewing of video lectures, comprehension seemed much improved.

Demonstrated modest to moderate ability in creating writing examples and portfolios. Students were much more engaged with the actual writing process, more so than the readings. I have found this to be a fair norm across semesters.

Demonstrated advanced to moderate ability in discussing and critiquing literary efforts of peers in small groups. Students were very engaged in helping each other for upcoming essays; they did exceptionally well in writing peer reviews. Even though I did give them a clear set of instructions to follow, I feel they went the extra mile in writing support to each of their peer group members. This may be due to the remote circumstances; this was the one main way in which they were in contact with each other and they seemed to really enjoy it. (05/07/2021)

Assessment Method: Students were asked to write a seven page literary journalism essay concerning a place or event. In the writing process, the student is the narrator, while the place or event becomes the main subject of the writing. Factual and source information are critical, while also making sure to combine the necessary components of creative nonfiction writing. This essay can be challenging for students, as they are apt to place themselves as the subject, rather than the place or event they are writing about. Instructions were made available at the start of week seven of the semester, with the completed essay to be submitted at the end of week twelve. This was their third essay of the semester, having already completed two other essays, Essay of Memory and Portrait/Profile Essay. Rough drafts were requested by week ten; suggestions were given to students at this time. Most were able to use the suggestions and make successful revisions with the final product.

**ENG216: THE SHORT STORY**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: no action needed

Students performed as expected in a 200-level literature class and exhibited good critical thinking and writing skills. (04/28/2021)

Assessment Method: Critical literary analysis written late in the semester - students had several weeks to read the short story and complete the response as both were posted in advance of the due date.

**ENG223: WOMEN IN AMERICAN LITERATURE**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: completed

This essay is an analysis of the short story "Any Further West" by Kali Fajardo-Anstine, which is part of a recent book, so there is no literary criticism available online. It was interesting to see that sixteen out of twenty students submitted the assignment. I was glad to observe that the majority of students were able to write a thesis and organize their essays into well-developed paragraphs. Students did a lot of writing during the semester and were good at quoting and paraphrasing correctly. There were a couple of students who were able to write well but did not submit this assignment. I believe remote learning can be difficult for students who are used to hands-on learning and need in-person guidance and motivation. (04/12/2021)

Assessment Method: Essay

**ENG226: POPULAR CULTURE**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: completed

Usual diversity of writing skills -- some highly advanced and some with room to grow. (04/05/2021)

Assessment Method: Second essay of the semester.

## ENG234:INTRO TO WOMEN'S STUDIES

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: no action needed

Students with strong reading and critical thinking skills likewise demonstrated strong written skills. There was a clear correlation between the quality of the writing and the students' overall level of understanding and responsiveness to the material. (05/07/2021)

Assessment Method: Long form essay

## MUS201:HISTORY OF MUSIC BEFORE 1750

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: no action needed

Students were strongest in "Context of and Purpose for Writing" and weakest in "Control of Syntax and Mechanics." It seems like students need increased emphasis on syntax and mechanics in ENG 101 and ENG 102 course work. (05/14/2021)

Assessment Method: History of Music I: Term Paper (late semester, outside of class)

## MUS212:HISTRY OF AMER MUSICAL THEATRE

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: completed

All students who completed written analyses of full musical theatre performances demonstrated baseline competency in written communication skills (score of "3" or higher). (05/10/2021)

Assessment Method: In order to successfully demonstrate ISLO #2 in MUS 212, students are required to complete three written scholarly reviews summarizing a digitally archived production, and graded on the basis of quality of research, attention to detail, clarity, and appropriaten ess of writing style (including proper academic grammar, citations, and strong essay structure). Upon completion of each, students are furnished with a comprehensiv e rubric, detailing areas for improvement.

**PAR102:PATHOPHYS & LIFE SPAN DEV**

Semester Assessed: 2021 Spring

Action Type: ongoing

These results are not surprising to me. A few students are exceptional communicators, a few are not, and most reside in-between.

I believe most are attempting to improve their skills. However, interestingly, a few do not appear convinced in the value of the construct and attempt to comply with it's requirements out of obligation or some other external motivating factor. To an extent, their affect or internal motivation to the value of the skills is something we need to foster and develop by demonstrating its use and own value for them. We cannot merely tell them this is important. The difficulties we face in doing so are because of hurdles the profession currently faces (poor external value and poor resource allocation) and because of the external social, political, and economic forces on this group. Students are operating with a limited capacity and must balance requirements placed upon them against the values they attribute to their success. (05/12/2021)

Assessment Method: I evaluate students using short-answer and essay questions on quizzes, an essay question on the midterm, an essay question on the final, and a literature review style term paper. I use a rubric that the students and I review at the start of the course, which is in their syllabus. I assess all assignments (including work in class and on quizzes) for grammar, format, and comprehensiveness. I evaluate the components of the paper (topic, outline, annotated bibliography, abstract) as homework assignments throughout the course, and following the overall evaluation rubric plus additional component-specific facets (for example I require 10 sources in the bibliography of which five must be from peer reviewed journals no more than 10 years old). I evaluate the completed paper on its own rubric, inclusive of the overall evaluation scheme, and include the ISLO components as factors.

**THE105:THEATRE HISTORY I**

Semester Assessed: 2020 Fall

Action Type: completed

Theatre History students write three theatre reviews, as well as numerous discussion posts throughout the term.

Their writing skills are assessed via the written component of the final assignment: preparing a concise written document that showcases their research into a specific aspect of theatre history.

Of particular note in Fall 2020 is that the attrition rate in the class was much higher than normal, with several students not completing the final project. Of the students who completed the final written assignment, the majority demonstrated writing skills consistent with their college experience. (Two students in the class had much more collegiate experience than the others, and their writing was thus unusually strong for this intro class.) (12/14/2020)

Assessment Method: The written component of the final project is a distillation of the students' research. It is intentionally constrained by length, and students are tasked with creating a format for the paper that speaks directly to their topic. Thus, many students go through drafts and initially write much longer material than necessary, and then try to bend it toward the assignment constraints. Their target audience for the assignment is their peers in class - which helps them tighten the focus for their writing.

Students are then graded based on the 1) included historical information, 2) creative title, 3) annotated bibliography, 4) technical merit, 5) structure and readability, and 6) discussion board interaction. (Students react and reflect on each other's work.).

## Appendix E: Historical Data on ENG003 (from Institutional Research)

Fall 2018 – Spring 2021 English 101 Data

Historical Pass Rates:
English 92: 60%
English 101: 65%
English 101 (from English 92): 61%
English 102 (from English 101): 77%
English 102 (from English 92 and English 101): 76%

Fall 2018 (12 Sections of 101/003)
Eng. 92: 58.7%
003: 82.7%
101/003: 82.7%
Pure 101: 81.6%

Spring 2019 (4 Sections of 101/003)
Eng. 92: 58.3%
003: 74.3%
101/003: 77.1%
Pure 101: 76.3%

Fall 2019 (39 Sections of 101/003)
003: 58%
101/003: 59.7%
Pure 101: 65.6%

Spring 2020 (16 Sections of 101/003)
003: 59.7%
101/003: 52.8%
Pure 101: 47%

Fall 2020 (26 Sections of 101/003)
003: 52.7%
101/003: 51.0%
Pure 101: 52.9%

Spring 2021 (13 Sections of 101/003)
003: 54.1%
101/003: 51.3%
Pure 101: 42.8%

It is worth noting that even with the significant decline in pass rates from Fall 2019 to Fall 2020, a higher percentage of students are passing college level English than they were in Fall 2018. For white students that is 58.4% compared to 52.7%, for African American students 39.1% vs. 37.4%, and for Latinx students 46.6% vs. 39.7%