

2016 Assessment Plan for Composition I and II

The 2016 Assessment Plan:

The Composition I and II assessment plan for the 2016 academic year essentially followed the same as the one for the 2015 academic year, with the one difference being when the essays were read and scored by instructors.

- Research-based essays written by students and with identifying details redacted were collected proportionally by campus, course, etc. and placed in a Blackboard space during the Fall 2015 term.
- On Assessment Day, instructors met to participate in the reading and scoring of six essays for the purpose of norming, followed by pertinent discussion.
- In the week after Assessment Day, each instructor was directed to read and score a set of 18 essays, each set read twice by two instructors. To illustrate, for set A, an instructor read the first 9 essays as a primary reader and another instructor read the same nine as a secondary reader; the instructors then reversed roles for the other 9 essays within the same set.
- The Faculty Learning Outcome Leader then compiled the results of that scoring.

Response Rates to Initial Request for Essays:

On or before December 18, 2015, instructors were expected to submit 585 research-based essays. Of the 585, 375 were submitted.

- East: 152 essays received (40% of the 375)
- Lake Nona: 14 essays received (4%)
- Osceola: 72 essays received (19%)
- West: 115 essays received (31%)
- Winter Park: 22 essays received (6%)

Two hundred and ten essays were not submitted.

- Withdrawn students 56 (26.67% of the 210)
- Students' wish not to submit essays: 35 (16.67%)
- Submission of a corrupted file: 1 (.48%)
- Non-submission of artifacts by instructors: 118 (56.18%)

Response Rate to Scoring Request:

In the week after Assessment Day, only tenured and tenured-track instructors who were working the full summer term or Summer A were directed to read, score, and submit scores for the 18 essays assigned to them. Of the 360 essays assigned to such instructors, only 98 were read twice

(26%). The Faculty Learning Outcome Leader attributes this low response rate to one or a combination of these three reasons:

- A technological issue (One instructor submitted only the first and last essays in her set. However, perhaps she submitted the other 16, but the scores were not recorded.)
- A reduced number of emails sent to instructors (During the 2015 academic year, instructors stated that they wished to receive fewer emails from the Faculty Learning Outcome Leader, and he complied with that wish. However, perhaps additional emails are needed to motivate and remind instructors to complete their work.)
- A lack of motivation (Instructors are human. Perhaps there were other tasks that required their attention, and the essays were left unread.)

Composition I and II Faculty Goal:

For the 2016 academic year, English instructors decided on this faculty goal on Assessment Day 2015:

According to the items on the General Education Checklist, are Composition I and II students writing college-level essays?

On a related note, instructors can use selected results from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement 2015, which the Faculty Learning Outcome Leader posted on the Blackboard space for the English Assessment Plan for the 2016 academic year, to promote the faculty goal within their classes. For instance, 32% of respondents acknowledge that they prepare two or more drafts of a paper before submission of it; however, some instructors may question this finding because their students tend to submit rough drafts rather than polished essays. In this instance, instructors may wish to devote additional class time to rough drafts so that students realize what a rough draft actually is and write one accordingly, with the overall goal of adhering to the skills of college-level writing.

Results:

The results indicate that students are in fact writing college-level essays. With the exception of D1 and D2, the other 11 skills received a majority of “yes” votes.

A1 Critical Thinking – Influence of Context

Examines the relevance of appropriate contexts when presenting ideas.

- Yes: 73% (143 responses)
- No: 24% (48)
- N/A: 3% (5)

A2 Critical Thinking – Bias

Effectively analyzes own and others' assumptions.

- Yes: 63% (123 responses)
- No: 30% (60)
- N/A: 7% (13)

A3 Critical Thinking – Use of Evidence

Demonstrates a comprehensive synthesis or analysis of issues, ideas, artifacts, or events.

- Yes: 65% (128 responses)
- No: 34% (67)
- N/A: 1% (1)

B1 Information Literacy – Selection of Sources

Selects credible, relevant material from which to summarize, paraphrase, and/or quote.

- Yes: 75% (148 responses)
- No: 22% (43)
- N/A: 3% (5)

B2 Information Literacy – Integration of Sources

Effectively integrates source material with original ideas/writing.

- Yes: 60% (118 responses)
- No: 39% (76)
- N/A: 1% (2)

B3 Information Literacy – Citation of Sources

Properly attributes sources using in-text or parenthetical citations.

- Yes: 60% (118 responses)
- No: 39% (76)
- N/A: 1% (2)

B4 Information Literacy – Formatting References

Follows a standardized set of academic formatting/style conventions in a works cited or reference page.

- Yes: 73% (145 responses)
- No: 26% (50)
- N/A: 1% (1)

C1 Writing – Logic & Organization

Presents support for ideas in a coherent, well-ordered fashion.

- Yes: 77% (151 responses)
- No: 22% (43)
- N/A: 1% (2)

C2 Writing – Purpose

Conveys a sense of purpose through a clear thesis/point of view.

- Yes: 80% (158 responses)
- No: 19% (37)
- N/A: 1% (1)

C3 Writing – Accuracy

Uses varied, correct sentences with few grammatical or mechanical errors.

- Yes: 71% (141 responses)
- No: 28% (54)
- N/A: 1% (1)

D1 Cultural and Historical Understanding – Demonstrate Knowledge

Identifies specific historical events or cultural developments that are relevant for the discussion of artifacts.

- Yes: 52% (102 responses)
- No: 28% (54)
- N/A: 20% (40)

D2 Cultural and Historical Understanding – Application

Effectively uses historical events or cultural developments to develop specific arguments in the analysis of artifacts.

- Yes: 48% (94 responses)
- No: 31% (60)
- N/A: 21% (42)

Writing – Supporting an Argument (English only)

Demonstrates use of supporting ideas/details to form an argument.

- Yes: 82% (160 responses)
- No: 17% (33)
- N/A: 1% (3)

The 2017 Assessment Plan:

For the 2017 academic year, English instructors shall follow one similar to that of the 2016 academic year, with some tentative revisions, which include but are not limited to:

- Efforts to increase the submission rate of scored essays with an increased number of emails sent to instructors, with an examination of any current technological issues so that they are identified and eliminated for the next academic year, and with an effort to increase motivation among instructors
- A focus on problematic essays that do not indicate a clear-cut “yes” or “no” response, with identification and discussion of some such essays before Assessment Day 2017 by a small team, followed by a discussion of them on Assessment Day 2017 and a norming activity that reinforces the discussion of such essays, all with the aim of enhancing grading consistency among instructors
- The piloting of a checklist similar to the one piloted by Humanities colleagues during the 2016 academic year so that English instructors have additional guidance when scoring essays that fall between a clear-cut “yes” or “no” response