

General Education SLOA Summary

General Education Category: English and Speech

Semester: Spring 2013

Data Summary

Outcome 1: Write or deliver an organized, coherent, fully developed essay or speech that uses standard English and cites outside sources appropriately.

This outcome is assessed in ENG 101, 102, 112, 201, 202, 205, and 206 by evaluating the final research papers and in SPD 103 and 108 by evaluating the informative research speech.

Data collected for 675 students (550 on-campus, 109 online*) in SP 13:

	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
All ENG/SPD gen ed classes	42%	50%	8%	38%	52%	9%	33%	55%	12%	37%	54%	9%	32%	52%	16%
On-Campus only	41%	52%	7%	37%	54%	8%	31%	57%	12%	35%	56%	8%	31%	54%	15%
Online only	47%	41%	11%	41%	41%	17%	38%	45%	17%	39%	48%	13%	36%	45%	20%

*The remaining students were in a hybrid class, but since we only had data from one hybrid class, we don't have a large enough sample from which to draw conclusions.

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.

This outcome is assessed by asking students to answer 4 multiple choice questions about an excerpt from a persuasive essay.

Question 1 tests a student's understanding of rhetorical purpose.

Question 2 tests a student's understanding of organizational strategies.

Question 3 tests a student's ability to differentiate between different types of evidence for claims.

Question 4 tests a student's ability to identify logical flaws.

Data was collected for 579 students (486 on-campus, 81 online*) in Spring 2013:

	Question 1				Question 2				Question 3				Question 4			
	Correct	Incorrect	%Pass	%Fail	Correct	Incorrect	%PASS	%FAIL	Correct	Incorrect	%PASS	%FAIL	Correct	Incorrect	%PASS	%FAIL
All ENG/SPD gen ed classes	452	127	78%	22%	691	399	63%	37%	520	59	90%	10%	253	326	44%	56%
On- Campus only	375	111	77%	23%	298	188	61%	39%	431	55	89%	11%	220	266	45%	55%
Online only	66	15	81%	19%	60	21	74%	26%	78	3	96%	4%	27	54	33%	67%

*The remaining students were in a hybrid class, but since we only had data from one hybrid class, we don't have a large enough sample from which to draw conclusions.

Data Analysis

By Whom: Alicia Drumgoole, Melinda May, Kate Benchoff, Joan Johnson, Mike Harsh, and Amanda Miller

When: Numerous Meetings throughout and following the SP 13 semester

Outcome 1

The data for outcome 1 shows a bell curve.

The pass/fail matrix used FA 12 did not provide us with adequate information regarding student success in these categories because "pass" was defined as anything above "59%." Therefore, in 2013 we decided to break out the success measures into grade-specific categories so we can see the students who are genuinely successful rather than lumping A students in with D students, the latter of which we should not be determined as successful per our outcomes. We altered the data collection tool to reflect letter grades: A,B-C, D- F rather than pass/fail.

Because of the revision to the data collection tool, our SP 13 is much more valuable to us. We are able to see a strong bell curve, which is what we would expect. However, 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 subjective data and transform it into statistical data.

The outcome 1 data for online classes suggests slightly less of a bell curve, with fewer B-C grades and more A's and F's.

This data is consistent with our views of online classes, which seem to draw not only highly motivated students, but also students who don't truly have the time necessary to complete college level classes. Our classes are usually a mixture of these two types of students with not as

many mid-range students. The data supports this hypothesis, but a study of online demographics might be helpful to determine whether this is truly the case. The instructional design self-study subcommittee will be researching this during the 2013-2014 year.

Outcome 2

For general education outcome 2, upwards of 78% of students answered questions 1 and 3 correctly. However, the success rate for question 4 was particularly low.

Questions 1 and 3 suggest that students understand rhetorical purpose and types of evidence.

Only 63% of students passed question 2, which addresses organizational patterns. I would suspect those who missed question 2 missed it because they didn't understand the word "spatial." Question 4 remains a problem. This version of the question gave students even more problems than the previous version. Full-time faculty will need to meet during the FA 13 semester to analyze the data from questions 2 and 4.

The outcome 2 data for online classes, with the exception of question 4, would suggest that the students enrolled in these online classes have slightly better reading comprehension and analysis skills.

Present and future plan of action to better measure student achievement and course success:

Changes to Outcomes and Rubrics

During the 2012-2013 academic year, we made many changes to our outcomes and rubrics for all English classes. Because of this, the SP 13 semester was a time of great flux. We completed work on finalizing the 101 and 102 outcomes and rubrics (for full details on these decisions, see the previous SLOA summary) and then we developed new outcomes and rubrics for all other English classes, based on the foundation we built in the 101 and 102 documents. These new outcomes and rubrics for all English classes will be implemented FA 13.

Norming

In May 13, each of the full-time faculty members collected an A, B, C, D, and F paper, as determined by our use of the rubric. We compared the way we use the rubric, the resulting grades, and the feedback provided on student papers. We encouraged adjunct feedback about the new outcomes and rubric. Several of us piloted the rubric in summer classes, and we will implement the outcomes and rubric Fall 2013.

For ENG 102, we also piloted the rubric in summer classes and implemented the outcomes and rubric in Fall 2013. We will collect A, B, C, D, and F papers in Fall 2013 and compare the way we use the rubric, the resulting grades, and the feedback provided on student papers.

During FA13 workshop, full-time faculty will meet with adjunct faculty to discuss SLOA and grading. Full-time faculty will distribute examples of 101 and 102 essays graded using the new rubric. During the FA 13 semester, each instructor will submit one "C" paper, along with the completed rubric. Full-time faculty will evaluate these papers to determine to what extent grading practices are aligned.

Continued communication and norming sessions with our adjuncts will ensure valid data, 100% participation, and an alignment of English Department goals.