General Education SLOA Summary

General Education Category: English and Speech

Semester: FA 14/SP 15/SU 15

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. All students are graded using a rubric common to both English and Speech classes. We capture the results of Outcome 1 through the collection and reporting of aggregate data gathered from the Research Paper or Informative Speech in all English and Speech classes with a General Education designation.

ENG Data collected for 775 students (696 on campus and 79 online) in FA 14:

	CONVE	NTIONS				RESEAR	СН						
Grade Received	Α	В	С	D	F	A	В	C	D	F			
Total Students: 696	256	280	164	49	29	277	232	176	58	40			
Percentage	33%	36%	21%	6%	4%	36%	30%	23%	7%	5%			
On-Campus	233	253	148	45	19	253	214	159	49	28			
On-Campus Percentage	33%	36%	21%	6%	3%	36%	31%	23%	7%	4%			
Online Total: 79	23	26	18	2	10	25	18	17	7	12			
Online Percentage	29%	33%	23%	3%	13%	32%	23%	22%	9%	15%			

	CONVENTIONS								Research					
Grade Received	Α	В	С	D	F	А	В	С	D	F				
Total: 672	198	257	151	51	23	210	227	147	56	32				
Percentages	29%	38%	22%	8%	3%	31%	34%	22%	8%	5%				
On Campus (481)	127	196	111	39	16	139	169	104	43	26				
On Campus Percentage	26%	41%	23%	8%	3%	29%	35%	22%	9%	5%				
Online (191)	71	61	40	12	7	71	58	43	13	6				
Online Percentage	37%	32%	21%	6%	4%	37%	30%	23%	7%	3%				

ENG Data collected for 672 students in SP 15 (481 On campus, 191 online):

ENG Data collected for 212 students in SU 15 (114 on campus, 98 online):

	CONV	ENTIONS			Research					
Grade Received	Α	В	С	D	F	Α	В	С	D	F
Total	77	76	42	14	3	91	55	44	11	11
Percentages	36%	36%	20%	8%	1%	43%	26%	21%	6%	6%
On Campus	57	40	14	3	0	67	26	16	1	4
On Campus Percentage	50%	35%	12%	3%	0%	59%	23%	14%	1%	4%
Online	20	36	28	11	3	24	29	28	10	7
Online Percentage	20%	37%	29%	11%	3%	24%	30%	29%	10%	7%

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 815 students in Fall 2014 (748 on campus, 67 online):

	Question 1		Question	Question 2		Question 3		4
	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect
	671	144	544	269	736	76	369	445
Total students:								
	82%	18%	67%	33%	90%	9%	45%	55%
% PASS/FAIL								
	612	136	500	246	675	70	342	405
On Campus Total								
On Campus	82%	18%	67%	33%	90%	9%	46%	54%
Percentage								
	59	8	44	23	61	6	27	40
Online Total								
	88%	12%	66%	34%	91%	9%	40%	60%
Online Percentage								

	Question	ו 1	Question	2	Question	3	Question 4	
	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect
	308	122	260	170	391	39	168	262
Total students:								
	72%	28%	60%	40%	91%	9%	39%	61%
% PASS/FAIL								
	229	90	192	127	293	26	121	198
On Campus Total								
On Campus	72%	28%	60%	40%	92%	8%	38%	62%
Percentage								
	79	32	68	43	97	13	47	64
Online Total								
	71%	29%	61%	39%	87%	12%	42%	58%
Online Percentage								

Data was collected for 430 students in Spring 2015 (319 in person, 111 online)*:

Data was collected for 112 students in Summer 2015 (**48 on campus, 64 online):

	Question 1		Question 2		Question 3		Question	4
	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect
	86	26	74	38	89	21	61	49
Total students:								
	77%	23%	66%	34%	79%	19%	54%	44%
% PASS/FAIL								
	37	11	27	21	34	13	26	22
On Campus Total								
On Campus	77%	23%	56%	44%	71%	27%	54%	46%
Percentage								
	49	15	47	17	55	8	35	27
Online Total								
	77%	23%	73%	27%	86%	13%	55%	42%
Online Percentage								

** This excludes courses that are piloting a new assessment for Outcome 2 from SP 15 to SP 16. There are approximately 130 students involved in the pilot.

Data Analysis

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

When: Numerous Meetings throughout the FA 13 / SP 14 academic year

Outcome 1

The data shows that 90% of students are above a C average in the Conventions category, which shows that most students, after a semester of working through the writing process, are able to attain a grade of C or higher on the Research paper; this is consistent with the Department's expectations. Once students have worked through the writing process to produce a final draft, the majority of them should be at about a B level in conventions. If we graded the rough drafts and recorded those scores, the scores would be remarkably different, but after a month of work on one paper, these grades are about what we would expect.

Likewise, 90% of students scored a C or higher in the Research section of the Informative Speech or Research Paper. The research section of the rubric contains several bullet points that are clearly objective evaluations regarding MLA Format, as well as a few subjective bullet points regarding the nuanced uses of sources to support an argument. It's possible that a student do everything right in terms of MLA. A norming session that took place during the FA 14 semester revealed different methodologies for grading this section, including the way that teachers grade source integration within the paragraphs. It is also possible that higher grades in research can be attributed to the implementation of the Research Ready Program in both ENG 101 and 112 classes. Students have expressed positive reviews for the program and suggest that it helps them to properly evaluate and integrate research sources.

There seems to be only a small difference between on-campus and online ENG classes, with just a few more B's (and fewer A's and C's) in the online classes.

SPD classes continue to show a high level of performance, and this is not surprising since there was discussion of making this a Pass/Fail class.

Outcome 2

For general education outcome 2, questions 1 and 3 produced positive results.

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

Only 65% 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. We still need to find a better tool to measure outcome 2, but we determined that we needed to keep the tool the same in year 13-14 to collect more meaningful data before changing it. The data from 13-14 is consistent with the data from 12-13.

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

Changes to Outcomes and Rubrics

We completed substantial work on our outcomes in 2014, and determined that there was a need to revise the assessment for this Outcome. Students in all General Education classes had been using the same assessment for all English and Speech General Education classes since Spring of 2012, and it became evident that this duplication of the assessment could unfairly influence the outcomes.

In SP 15, the Department met and selected new articles to pilot a revised version of Outcome 2 – the revised assessments allow faculty to choose between multiple reading selections, all of which measure Outcome 2. We are currently piloting four articles to determine efficacy of the assessments.

Norming and Data Analysis

We need to evaluate the sampling of papers we collected and hopefully some of us can attend the statewide conference entitled "The 21st Century Red Pen" and participate in discussions regarding the grading of papers.

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