

Model Course/Program Outcomes Guide

Last Updated: January 2015

Course/Program Title: English 101 English Composition

Course/Program Team: Joan Johnson, Melinda May, Kathryn Benchoff, Alicia Drumgoole, Amanda Miller

Expected Learning Outcomes as of January 2015:

Students will be able to:

Processes

- Employ prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing to contribute to the clear communication of ideas, taking into consideration the feedback of instructors and peers.

Conventions

- Formulate and support a focused thesis statement with adequate evidence while adhering to the conventions of standard written English in a well-structured essay.

Rhetorical Knowledge

- Demonstrate critical thinking and an understanding of appropriate audience and rhetorical mode in order to employ collegiate voice, tone, level of formality, and development of support.

Research

- Engage in inquiry-driven research, properly attributing and citing the language and ideas of others to avoid plagiarism in a well-reasoned essay.

Expected Learning Outcomes prior to May 2013:

Students will be able to 1.) Generate and gather information for a specific audience and topic; write using a variety of appropriate rhetorical modes to expand and develop ideas; expand and improve critical thinking skills in both writing and reading; understand writing as a process 2.) Formulate clear thesis statements; organize ideas logically and effectively to support the thesis statement; present appropriate, adequate, unified, and coherent support; incorporate and document source material using the MLA format. 3.) Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality; employ effective revising and editing skills; write using a variety of sentence structures and patterns. 4.) Write well-reasoned, logical essays and research papers that synthesize and evaluate various sources and the writer's ideas to present a cogent argument.

See also these Course Content Objectives:

Students will:

1. Write a minimum of 5 essays (4 in a 7.5 week or 8 week session).
2. Read various essays by student and professional writers.
3. Focus on grammar, punctuation, mechanics, and proofreading to produce nearly error-free essays.
4. Submit drafts that indicate an understanding of the writing process, especially revision.
5. Complete assignments and in-class work focusing on paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting and documenting sources.

Assessment:

All instructors assign a minimum of two documented essays, one of which must persuade a scholarly audience and employ academic research.

Instructors use a version of the assignment and rubric below to assess all papers, and we collect data on the Research Paper to measure individual performance and ensure that course content objectives are being met.

**Hagerstown Community College
English and Humanities Division
Eng 101 Documented Argumentative Essay**

Assignment

1. The argumentative essay must be on an arguable topic, i.e., it must have at least two debatable sides. Students are not permitted to write on the following topics: abortion, capital punishment, gun control, euthanasia/assisted suicide, or topics that bring in personal religious beliefs as “evidence.” I must approve your topic before you go forward.

2. Documented research essays should have a minimum of three sources, not including dictionaries, general encyclopedias (Wikipedia, Encarta, Encyclopedia Britannica, etc.), internet Cliff’s notes (bookrags, enotes, pink monkey, etc), cheat sites (123helpme, answers.com). Your first stop should be the HCC databases from the Library web site. If you use sources from outside the databases, those sources should be scholarly and academic.

Audience

1. You should write for a professional audience that is on the fence about the chosen topic or issue. Students should consider that this audience might be at best undecided and at most hostile or in opposition to your position.

Writing – How to get an “A” on this paper:

“A” papers represent superior work, so you’ll have to work hard to get a good grade on this assignment. Papers that only meet requirements will receive a grade of C. An “A” paper exceeds the basic standards listed on this form and shows original and unique thoughts presented in a nearly flawless written document. Here are some tips for how to earn an “A” on this paper:

1. Use the standard five paragraph essay format that we’ve been working with all semester. Research essays should certainly go beyond 5 paragraphs, but adhere to that basic format: for example, you’ll need an introduction that ENDS with the thesis statement, body paragraphs that support, develop and provide details, brief conclusion that provides a satisfying end, transitions between paragraphs.
2. A successful essay will contain strong paragraph development: that includes a solid, specific thesis statement, topic sentences that support the argument present within the thesis, and attention to paragraph unity, coherence, and development.
3. Sentence structure is important: I expect you to use compound, compound-complex sentences, varying sentence beginnings (using phrases, dependent clauses, for instance), and avoiding wordiness.
4. Avoid using the first and second person. An “A” paper is written entirely in third person point of view.

Format and documentation:

1. Use MLA format and documentation. Although many MLA manuals include how to format a title page, we do not advise using one because title pages are not preferred and are rarely used. It is a waste of paper and very few four year college and universities use title pages.
2. A good title is important to orient the reader and preview the essay, so make sure that your title is appropriate to the essay.
3. The paper should be 4-6 pages long (excluding the Works Cited page). Four pages means 4 full pages with some writing on a fifth page. If you provide less than this, you will receive a lower grade. Two excellent pages only represents 50% of the work, so keep this in mind when you write.
4. You must document your sources within the paper and provide an accurate, properly written Works Cited page. A sloppy, poorly written list of sources very often indicates a sloppy, poorly written and thought-out essay.
5. Additionally, you must use sources properly to support your argument rather than pulling random quotes from sources in an attempt to meet research requirements. Your research needs to come first, so you need to get your quotes and research ideas first, and build your arguments around those; **do not write the paper then attempt to find quotes to fit your argument, it won’t work.**

6. Teach and stress how to integrate quotations and sources into the flow of writing. Avoid “dropped” quotations and block quotations.

Other Points to Consider:

- You must provide all source material so that I can check documentation, quotations, errors of fact, and the quality of sources. **Please put all of this information into a folder.**
- Use last names when referring to sources or people.
- Any strong argument addresses questions and arguments from the opposing viewpoint. A strong (“A”) research argument should answer these arguments and present refutation.
- You may use outlines, but treat these outlines as flexible guides.

English 101 -- Student Outcomes Assessment for Documented Essays

Student: _____

Grade _____

A = Excellent B = Very good C = Good D = Fair F = Poor

Processes	Points Possible = 10	Points Earned =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing to contribute to the clear communication of ideas • Demonstrates consideration of feedback from instructors or peers 	Out of 10 A (9) B (8) C (7) D (6) F (___)	
Conventions	Points Possible = 70	Total Points Earned =
<u>Overall Organization and Coherence (5)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays effective organization with clear transitions within and between paragraphs 	Out of 5 A (5) B (4) C (3) D (2) F (___)	Points earned =
<u>Essay Structure and Development (35)</u> <i>Introduction</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages the reader with an inviting attention statement • Provides background information that orients reader and transitions to the thesis • Ends with an insightful, focused, one-sentence thesis that states the central assertion of the essay <i>Body Paragraphs</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain a topic sentence that directly supports thesis and states central idea of paragraph • Provide concrete details and textual evidence, where appropriate, to explain, expand, and support the topic • Are well-organized, fully developed, and on topic 	Out of 35 A (33) B (30) C (26) D (23) F (___)	Points earned =

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide satisfying closure for each paragraph <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides closure for entire essay • Is well-developed, transitioned, and satisfying • Does not introduce significant new information 		
<p>Grammar and Style / Use of Standard English (30)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a variety of sophisticated (but clear and concise) sentence structures • Exhibits specific, advanced vocabulary and diction • Avoids fluff, wordiness, and vague, generic phrases • Contains few errors in grammar, punctuation, usage • Avoids fragments, comma splices, and run-on sentences 	<p>Out of 30 A (28) B (25) C (22) D (20) F (___)</p>	<p>Points earned =</p>
<p>Rhetorical Knowledge Points Possible = 20</p>		<p>Points Earned =</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates well-informed critical thinking and sound logical analysis • Demonstrates structure consistent with appropriate rhetorical mode(s) • Addresses the proper audience • Displays a consistent and appropriate point of view • Adopts college-level voice and tone 	<p>Out of 20 A (19) B (17) C (15) D (13) F (___)</p>	
<p>Research Points Possible = 50</p>		<p>Points Earned =</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses appropriate MLA format • Utilizes various sources and the student's own ideas to present a cogent argument • Uses timely, academic, and reliable sources • Uses summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation to avoid plagiarism • Integrates short, appropriate, focused quotations into paragraphs driven by student-authored text • Uses parenthetical citations properly • Provides an accurate, properly formatted Works Cited page 	<p>Out of 50 A (46) B (40) C (36) D (30) F (___)</p>	
<p>Note: For the argument research essay, instructors must weight this section at 50 points. For earlier essays involving a research component, points may be awarded at the discretion of the instructor.</p>		
<p>Deductions</p>		
<p>Total</p>		

Validation:

ENG 101 Course Outcome Revision Rationale:

In SP 13, the Department decided that, in order to better measure student achievement and course success, we decided to revise the outcomes in such a way that data collection would be more streamlined and specific areas of weakness and strength could be better pinpointed. To that end, we decided that creating outcomes that spoke to a specific category of skill (and then revising the rubric to reflect these categories and the subset of skills measured in each) would help us to see where the course was reflecting the most success and where students or instructors were struggling to meet the course goals.

The first step of the process was to research other colleges and universities in order to get some idea of how other writing and English programs structured their goals and assessment. Upon gathering that data, we met several times to discuss the pros and cons of each of the strongest examples. With those in mind, we decided the best way to organize our outcomes was in the following categories: rhetorical knowledge, critical reading and thinking, processes, conventions, and research. While these five categories were always the foundation of assessment in this course, the rubric was organized (more or less) by essay structure rather than by category, and thus data collection and thoughtful reflection was more difficult.

Once we had decided on the categories, we went back to our original course outcomes and the specific skills measured in the rubric, and reshuffled everything into the appropriate category. We also added some items that we came across in our research that we thought were appropriate and valuable, and which had been overlooked in previous iterations of the rubric. For example, we added into our “processes” category the element of reflection consideration of feedback from peers and instructors. We also eliminated items that seemed to be redundant or unclear. The elements in place, we worked carefully on synthesizing everything into five concise outcome statements.

Finally, we applied those new categories and revised outcomes to our rubric, separating the rubric by category and then by skill. After devising a draft of the new rubric, we held a department meeting and reviewed each section and skill sub-set, and determined that success in the category “critical thinking and reading” was going to be difficult to measure in a concrete way, so we absorbed the skills into “rhetorical knowledge” and “research.” We reordered the sections of the rubric to reflect the process of writing from a student’s perspective, and were in agreement that we should be introducing research requirements into essays earlier than the formal research essay. We applied tentative point values to each section of the rubric, agreeing to each try the new rubric on five of our research essays from this semester, after which we would meet for a norming session and revision of the rubric before sending it out to the rest of the faculty.

While revising the rubric, we addressed some key issues regarding data collection. After a lengthy discussion, we decided to continue using the formal research essay for data collection, at least until we see how the new outcomes and rubrics work in terms of data collection. We determined that we may be able to use the General Education Outcome database to develop reports that would provide feedback broken into the new outcome categories, though we would need to add other courses into that database.

Results:

Although data and statistical goals are certainly important in assessing an English class, we must also ensure that the transformation of subjective data (evaluation of essays) into statistical data (number of students satisfying a certain outcome) is standardized.

While we might say we expect 80% of our students to achieve 70% competency levels in all outcomes, these numbers are arbitrary until we are able to standardize the way we collect qualitative data and transform it into statistical data.

The data collected in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 reflect information about the previous rubric.

We began data collection Spring 2012, so our first semester was a pilot of an entirely new database and new general education outcomes. First we measured the research paper for outcome 1. In the ENG 101 classes for the SP12 Semester, we found that the department averages indicated that of the 223 students who turned in a Research Paper, upwards of 68% passed all categories of the rubric.

Course Totals for General Education Outcome 1: SP12 (Pilot) ENG 101 Research Papers

Course	Organization		Coherence		Development		Standard English Skills		Source Citation	
	% Pass	%Fail	% Pass	% Fail	%Pass	% Fail	% Pass	% Fail	% Pass	% Fail
ENG 101	83	17	83	17	72	28	79	21	68	32

In Fall 2012, of the 243 students who turned in a Research Paper, upwards of 80% of students passed all categories of the rubric.

Course Totals for General Education Outcome 1: FA12 ENG 101 Research Papers

FA 12	Organization		Coherence		Development		Standard English Skills		Source Citation	
	% Pass	%Fail	% Pass	% Fail	%Pass	% Fail	% Pass	% Fail	% Pass	% Fail
ENG 101	92	8	93	7	84	16	94	6	84	16

However, the data indicated that as a department, we should pay greater attention to essay development and source citation, as these two categories have the highest fail rate in all sections.

Likewise, this data presented a problem because the staff agreed that “passing” (above 60%) did not reflect an adequate measure of student success. We agreed that success should be defined as the achievement of the minimum grade of C (70%).

Therefore, we decided to break out the success measures into grade-specific categories so that we can see the students who are genuinely successful. Otherwise, A students are combined with D students, the latter of which we should not determine as successful per our outcomes.

As a result, we changed the databases to reflect letter grades rather than pass/fail. We also changed the rubric (see “validation” above) and have planned norming sessions to ensure the viability of the new rubric.

Course Totals for General Education Outcome 1: SP13 ENG 101 Research Papers

SP 13 Course	Organization			Coherence			Development			Standard English Skills			Source Citation		
	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F
ENG 101	84	107	22	67	12 1	26	53	12 6	34	46	13 8	30	58	10 7	50
% out of 214 students	39	50	11	31	57	12	25	59	16	21	65	14	27	50	23

This data reflects the bell curve we would expect to see in a 101 class. We will continue to norm to make sure we are grading essays in a similar way, but the data, as seen here, presents no grade inflation issues. Our data for the 2013-2014 academic year should be more valuable, since our outcomes and rubrics are now aligned and the outcomes information can be pulled directly from the rubric.

In SP13, the Department met and began to revise course outcomes, and implemented a new rubric to measure course outcomes, which were now called: Processes, Conventions, Rhetorical Knowledge and Research. Within this data, we continued to capture the requirements for General Education Outcome 1, as Conventions represent the Organization, Coherence, Development, Standard English Skills and Source Citation as required in General Education Outcome 1. The Research continued to be measured in its own category on the rubric. We continued this measurement system into the SP 14 semester. Additionally, we decided to further break out the grade measurements to see what grades students earned on their Research papers to help ensure that the faculty members across the Department were grading with a measure of accuracy. Also, it was important to us to separate, in particular, the B and C students, as these are both the majority of our grades and often the most difficult grades to determine.

Instructors piloted the rubric in SU 13, and this led to two formats of measurement for the Summer semester.

SU 13: General Education Data (Non-Pilot)

SP 13 Course	Total	Organization			Coherence			Development			Standard English Skills			Source Citation		
		A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F
ENG 101	18	8	10	0	11	7	0	13	5	0	10	8	0	11	6	1
% out of 18		44%	56%	0%	61%	39%	0%	72%	28%	0%	56%	44%	0%	61%	33%	6%

SU13 Pilot: General Education Data

Semester	Total	Processes					Conventions					Rhetorical Knowledge					Research				
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F
SU 13 Total	47	21	11	7	1	0	15	11	11	0	1	22	17	7	0	1	17	21	7	2	2
Percentage		45	24	15	2	0	32	24	23	0	2	47	36	15	0	2	36	45	15	4	4

After the initial pilot was deemed a success, the rubric featuring the revised course outcomes was applied in FA 13 across English 101 platforms so that the Department could use and comment on the new rubric. The only thing that the rubric did reveal was a tendency towards high grading in the processes category. When we met to discuss the rubric in FA13 and FA14, we learned that many teachers were issuing a grade of A for students who had prepared for the paper with drafts and peer review. After meeting on this, preliminary data in FA 14 reveals that this trend was going down as people became more comfortable with the rubric.

Course Outcomes: FA13-SP14 Semester

Semester	Total	Processes					Conventions					Rhetorical Knowledge					Research				
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F
FA13	336	158	79	51	19	21	81	126	88	30	12	104	114	91	15	13	96	100	72	41	28
SP 14	274	120	64	54	23	13	61	115	67	24	5	81	97	73	18	4	85	76	71	21	21
Total	610	278	143	105	42	34	142	241	155	54	17	185	211	164	33	17	181	176	143	62	49
Percentage		46	23	17	7	6	23	40	25	9	3	30	35	27	5	3	30	29	23	10	8

The Course Outcomes tell us that in the FA13-SP 14 Semester:

Processes: 86% have scored a C or higher in the category

Conventions: 88% have scored a C or higher in the category

Rhetorical Knowledge: 92% have scored a C or higher in the category

Research: 82% have scored a C or higher in the category

We also began to measure the delivery format of the classes to look for discrepancies in grading between conventional and online delivery formats. Currently, we do not see significant differences between traditional and online delivery formats with the exception that research paper grades tend to be slightly lower in the 101 classes delivered in an online format.

We then revised the General Education Outcome so that all English and speech General Education Outcomes could be measured as both English and Speech classes transitioned to a revised and more consistent rubric. To do this, we monitored the Conventions and Research sections of all classes on the Research Paper or Informative Speech.

General Education Outcome 1: FA13-SP14

Semester	Total	Conventions					Research				
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F
FA13	336	81	126	88	30	12	96	100	72	41	28
SP 14	274	61	115	67	24	5	85	76	71	21	21
Total	610	142	241	155	54	17	181	176	143	62	49
Percentage	--	23	40	25	9	3	30	29	23	10	8

Conventions: 88% of students in the 101 classes scored a C or higher on the Conventions Section of the Research Paper

Research: 82% of students in the 101 classes scored a C or higher on the Research Section of the Rubric in ENG 101.

*Note in the Spring of 2014, the College introduced new software to help students address information literacy. We believe that this software accounts for a jump in research scores between FA13 and SP 14.

From this data, it can be concluded that the classes are meeting goals in all categories to date. We monitor individual data by semester for aberrations in the Department, but, in general, all courses are grading consistently regardless of instructor.

The data indicates that the most common grade issued on a Research Paper tends to be a B. To confirm this, the Department collected every third paper in English 101 during the FA 14 semester to review a sample of the grades and confirm student and instructor performance and standards in all categories. We will then discuss findings with all faculty members during training sessions as well as review standards for individual grades and norm papers.

General Education Outcome 2:

For General Education outcome 2, we require students to “evaluate a piece of writing from either literature, current events, non-fiction essays, or a college textbook for logical flaws, rhetorical purpose, organization, and evidence for claims.”

We selected a piece called “The Case for Torture” (see below) and asked students to read this text and answer four accompanying questions about that text. The questions ask students to evaluate rhetorical purpose, organization, evidence, and logical flaws using a multiple choice format.

OUTCOME 2

Evaluate a piece of writing from either literature, current events, non-fiction essays, or a college textbook for logical flaws, rhetorical purpose, organization, and evidence for claims.

ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME 2

Read the following passage that is excerpted from a slightly longer essay. This excerpt does not misrepresent in any way the author's main point that torture is acceptable in some cases. When you are finished reading, answer the questions following.

(Para. 1) "It is generally assumed that torture is impermissible, a throwback to a more brutal age. Enlightened societies reject it outright, and regimes suspected of using it risk the wrath of the United States.

(Para. 2) I believe this attitude is unwise. There are situations in which torture is not merely permissible but morally mandatory. Moreover, these situations are moving from the realm of imagination to fact.

(Para. 3) Death: Suppose a terrorist has hidden an atomic bomb on Manhattan Island which will detonate at noon on July 4 unless ... here follow the usual demands for money and release of his friends from jail. Suppose, further, that he is caught at 10 a.m on the fateful day, but preferring death to failure, won't disclose where the bomb is. What do we do? If we follow due process, wait for his lawyer, arraign him, millions of people will die. If the only way to save those lives is to subject the terrorist to the most excruciating possible pain, what grounds can there be for not doing so? I suggest there are none. In any case, I ask you to face the question with an open mind.

(Para. 4) Torturing the terrorist is unconstitutional? Probably. But millions of lives surely outweigh constitutionality. Torture is barbaric? Mass murder is far more barbaric. Indeed, letting millions of innocents die in deference to one who flaunts his guilt is moral cowardice, an unwillingness to dirty one's hands. If you caught the terrorist, could you sleep nights knowing that millions died because you couldn't bring yourself to apply the electrodes?

(Para. 5) Once you concede that torture is justified in extreme cases, you have admitted that the decision to use torture is a matter of balancing innocent lives against the means needed to save them. You must now face more realistic cases involving more modest numbers. Someone plants a bomb on a jumbo jet. He alone can disarm it, and his demands cannot be met (or they can, we refuse to set a precedent by yielding to his threats). Surely we can, we must, do anything to the extortionist to save the passengers. How can we tell 300, or 100, or 10 people who never asked to be put in danger, "I'm sorry you'll have to die in agony, we just couldn't bring ourselves to . . ."

(Para. 6) Here are the results of an informal poll about a third, hypothetical, case. Suppose a terrorist group kidnapped a newborn baby from a hospital. I asked four mothers if they would approve of torturing kidnapers if that were necessary to get their own newborns back. All said yes, the most 'liberal' adding that she would like to administer it herself."

Michael Levin. "The Case for Torture" 1982.

1. This author’s rhetorical purpose is mainly to:
 - a. inform readers
 - b. persuade readers
 - c. entertain readers

2. In Paragraph 3, the author uses which type of organization?
 - a. chronological
 - b. spatial
 - c. most important to least important

3. What type of evidence does the author use?
 - a. factual statistics regarding terrorism
 - b. hypothetical scenarios
 - c. expert testimony

4. Which sentence contains a logical flaw?
 - a. Torturing the terrorist is unconstitutional? Probably. (para 4)
 - b. Moreover, these situations are moving from the realm of imagination to fact. (para 2)
 - c. If you caught the terrorist, could you sleep nights knowing that millions died because you couldn’t apply the electrodes? (para 4)
 - d. You must now face more realistic cases involving more modest numbers. (para 5)

In SP12, the data indicated that of the 187 English 101 students who completed the exercise, 73.5% passed the test. However, we did notice that only 57% of the students successfully answered Question 4. We noted this and then collected more data on the same reading for the FA12 data.

Course Total for General Education Outcome 2 – SP 12 Critical Reading Sample

SP 12 ENG 101 Outcomes for Gen Ed. 2		
	%Pass	%Fail
Question1:	74	26
Question 2:	68	33
Question 3:	95	5
Question 4:	57	43
Total	73.5	26.75

In Fall 2012, we kept the same reading passage and questions, aware of the fact that Question 4 was proving difficult for the students. We found, similarly, that of the 281 students who completed General Education Outcome 2, 73% passed the quiz, but only 53% answered Question 4 correctly. We discussed this question in our English Department meeting and decided

to revise the question so that it still dealt with logical fallacies, but asked about logical fallacies in a different way.

Course Total for General Education Outcome 2 – FA 12 Critical Reading Sample

FA 12 ENG 101 Outcomes for Gen Ed. 2		
	%Pass	%Fail
Question1:	82	18
Question 2:	64	35
Question 3:	93	7
Question 4:	53	47
Total	73	26.75

For the SP 13 semester, the Department decided to alter the wording of question 4 because we felt it was more important that we assess the student’s understanding of logical fallacies rather than the student’s memorization of specific logical fallacy names. The first 3 questions remained relatively the same, but now question 4 gave students even more difficulty, lowering the pass rate for question 4 to 45% and the pass rate for the overall test to 70%. Faculty will look at question 4 again to determine whether the question is flawed or whether students are not achieving an important Gen Ed. outcome.

Course Total for General Education Outcome 2 – SP 13 Critical Reading Sample

SP 13 ENG 101 Outcomes for Gen Ed. 2		
	%Pass	%Fail
Question1:	78	22
Question 2:	65	35
Question 3:	92	8
Question 4:	45	55
Percentage(out of 190 students)	70	30

In SP13, we rewrote question 4 on logical fallacy to make the concept broader, and encouraged faculty to teach logical fallacy as part of their normal course requirements. This work seemed to have little overall impact on the question or idea.

Course Total for General Education Outcome 2 in ENG 101 classes: SU13-SP 14

Semester	Total	Question 1		Question 2		Question 3		Question 4	
		Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail
--	--								
SU13*	56	46	10	41	15	50	6	26	30
FA 13	378	296	82	262	116	357	21	142	235
SP 14	229	184	45	138	91	214	15	94	135
Total	663	526	137	441	222	621	42	262	400
Percentage		79%	21%	67%	33%	94%	6%	40%	60%

From SU13-SP14:

Rhetorical Purpose: 79% of 101 students could accurately determine this from the text.

Organization: 67% of 101 students could accurately identify textual organization.

Evidence: 94% of 101 students could accurately identify textual evidence

Logical Flaws: 40% of 101 students could accurately identify logical flaws

One of the issues that we've struggled with in this passage is the ability of all students to accurately identify logical flaws within a text. We feel that although this concept may be weak among students, it is also time to evaluate the validity of the assessment tool to help better determine the success of this outcome.

*Note: There were more sections in SU13 of 101 than were measured, but a few of the files were not completed accurately, so these numbers reflect a sample from the usable data. The percentages on the sample are consistent with the larger numbers of students in the Fall and Spring Semesters. We followed up with faculty that semester on use of the forms for Moodle, and the Moodle database was updated as of FA13 to help overcome some of these issues.

The trends show that the data for these sections are relatively static no matter how we're teaching different sections or changing questions. Because of this, we will be implementing a new measurement tool to collect more specific data to measure General Education Outcome 2.

Follow-up:

In FA13, full-time faculty collected an A, B, C, D, and F paper, as determined by our use of the rubric and met during August workshop week to discuss academic standards and rigor.

Later that week, we discussed our findings with adjunct faculty at a meeting and together discussed academic rigor in courses and grading.

Plans for 2014-2015 Semesters:

In FA14, we continued this conversation and agreed to collect a sample of all 101 and 102 papers from all courses so that faculty could review and comment on grading and to physically ensure that courses and comments are consistent throughout the department.

We will compare the way we use the new rubric, the resulting grades, and the feedback provided on student papers. We will also encourage adjunct feedback about the new outcomes and rubric. Several of us will pilot the rubric in summer classes, and the Department will implement the outcomes and rubric in Fall 2013. Additionally, the Department, after using General Education Outcome 2 and discovering that percentages on reading comprehension are static on this test, have decided to use a new tool to measure General Education Outcome 2, and to implement a test that measures students' performance upon entering and leaving their General Education classes to compare the data.

Budget Justification:

Professional development funds for full time faculty and stipends for adjunct faculty will be needed. These will go toward conferences, webinars, and training/norming sessions for full time and adjunct faculty.

Files referenced and attached:

- 101 Rubric
- Excel Database
- General Education Outcomes Data Collection Tools
- Reading for General Education Outcome 2: *The Case for Torture* and accompanying questions