**#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:**

**Student Outcomes – Gen Ed**

To be completed by Departments and submitted to the BlackBoard assessment site.

|  |
| --- |
| **Department: ECTA Date: May 25, 2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis  of artifacts: Dr. Lisa Ashby, Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe** |
| **See Undergraduate Program Outcome Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Eds for:** a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1****). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*      We used the attached rubric and analyzed our data via question #5, “**How well does the paper use source information legally, ethically, and meet the appropriate citation standards?”** |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Are ECTA students able to locate, apply, and cite scholarly/appropriate sources in support of written or oral claims?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional*. Students in both English 102 (Experiences in Writing) and English 201 (Introduction to Literature) had the following results:59% assessed scored a 4 in this category.34% scored a 3.6% scored a 2. 0% scored a 1. 1.5 % scored at a 0.      *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* Almost 93% of students scored a 3 or higher on the assessed question. Overwhelmingly, this data demonstrates that students are successful at citations in ECTA general education courses. 4).  *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)      None. |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date*: May 31, 2016*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)*  Emailed to department members involved*Who were results shared with? (List names):*  Dr. Lisa Ashby, Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe, Dr. Gabriel Haley, Dr. Daniel Thurber, Prof. Bryan Moore, Prof. Tobin Beck, Dr. Erica Lamm |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?* Because the question we assessed asks instructors to evaluate citation information within these four components: ·         **use of citations and references**·         **choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting**·         **using information in ways that are true to original context**·         **distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution**for our next assessment cycle, we’d like to more clearly distinguish which of these four components are more problematic for students. Our plan is to create a rubric that will identify this idea more specifically.          *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* By identifying more specific issues and struggles students have with citations, we can plan our courses and information literacy delivery more intentionally.     *3.* **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the* **ACTION\*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). ECTA instructors often take more students into classes with intentional caps of 20-25. We noticed this semester that by adding more students past these caps, we had less time to work on drafts with students. Maintaining our departmental policy for student population will allow us to have more class time to work more specifically with students on citations and give them time and opportunity to converse with each other and read each other’s work to support peer understanding and critique where citations are concerned. Likewie, instructors can have more quality time to respond to student drafts than this semester allowed. This maintenance may have implications in terms of how many sections of our general education classes are required to meet our student population.             |
| ***If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.*** |
| ***What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?*****As already stated, we’d like to look more closely at the additional questions about citation implicit in question #5.**  |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe                                Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):      6/24/16** |
| **Department Chair notified/additional action needed:****BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:    na****Approved & Posted to Assessment site:      6/24/16** |

**Eng 102/201 Assessment Rubric**

**1. How well does the paper explore and develop its content?**

(4) Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.

(3) Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.

(2) Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.

(1) Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.

(0) Does not use appropriate or relevant content to develop even the simplest of ideas in some parts of the work.

**2. How well does the paper show consideration of audience, purpose & circumstances of writing?**

(4) Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.

(3) 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).

(2) Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).

(1) Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).

(0) Demonstrates no attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).

**3. How well does the paper reflect the conventions of the discipline and genre in which it is written?**

(4) 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

(3) Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices

(2) Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation

(1) Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.

(0) Does not attempt to use a consistent system for even the most basic organization and presentation.

**4. How well does the paper use sources & evidence to develop the writer's ideas in a text?**

(4) Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing

(3) Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.

(2) Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.

(1) Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.

(0) Does not demonstrate any attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.

**5. How well does the paper use source information legally, ethically, and meet the appropriate citation standards? Evaluate these 4 items:**

* **use of citations and references**
* **choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting**
* **using information in ways that are true to original context**
* **distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution**

(4) Student uses correctly all four of the information use strategies and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

(3) Student uses correctly three of the information use strategies and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

(2) Student uses correctly two of the information use strategies and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

(1) Student uses correctly one of the information use strategies and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

(0) Student does not make correct use of any of the four information use strategies or does not have an understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

**6. How well does the paper demonstrate control of syntax and mechanics?**

(4) Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.

(3) Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language has few errors.

(2) Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.

(1) Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

(0) Uses language that barely conveys any meaning due to extensive errors in usage.