Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	000	ENG 000 02/08/2023-Writing Center
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness
Faculty Preparer		Thomas Zimmerman
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		03/21/2019

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

Yes Fall 2018

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

Outcome: Write paragraphs or an essay appropriate to the student's level. Assessment tool: Capstone assignment in each workbook. Rubric of evaluative criteria used to assess the papers: 1. Adequate thesis statement or topic sentence. 2. Adequate support of thesis statement or topic sentence. 3. Correct standard English grammar. 4. Correct standard English punctuation and mechanics. 181 papers assessed. 148 scored a "C (73%) or better" evaluation on 3 of the 4 evaluation criteria. 33 did not. 148/181 = 82% success rate.

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

> The workbooks for each course are revised every summer for the next academic year. The English Department has done this for decades. Typical changes include updating MLA and APA rules and creating more current and relevant topics for writing.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Write paragraphs or an essay appropriate to the student's level.

- Assessment Plan

  - o Assessment Tool: Capstone assignment in each workbook

  - o Assessment Date: Winter 2022

  - o Course section(s)/other population: All

  - o Number students to be assessed: A random sample of 10% of students with a minimum of 100 students

  - o How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric

  - o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students must score 73% or better

  - o Who will score and analyze the data: English department faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2022	2022	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
3125	200

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

> I assessed 181 students for the last assessment of this course in 2019. For this year's assessment, I thought an even 200 students would make the math easier and provide a slightly larger sample.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

These are COVID-era semesters, Winter 2022 and Fall 2022. Students from DL, Virtual, and Face-to-Face sections were included in the assessment.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Eight different writing courses have ENG 000 as a co-requisite. Here are the courses and the assessment tools:

ENG 050/051: Summary-and-response paragraphs.

ENG 075: Summary-and-response paragraphs.

ENG 090/091: Five-paragraph essay.

ENG 100: Five-paragraph cover letter.

ENG 111: Six-paragraph essay with MLA or APA documentation.

ESL 168: Five-paragraph essay.

Here is the rubric of evaluative criteria I used to assess the student papers:

1. Adequate thesis statement or topic sentence.

2. Adequate support of thesis statement or topic sentence.

3. Effective organization.

4. Correct academic English grammar, punctuation, and mechanics.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

200 student papers assessed.

164 scored a "C (73%) or better" evaluation on at least 3 of the 4 evaluative criteria.

36 did not.

164/200 = 82% success rate.   (75% is the standard of success.)

Interestingly enough, this 82% success rate is the same as the success rate in the 2019 report.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Results per Rubric Item:

Thesis statement/topic sentence: 159/200 = 79.5%

Support: 159/200 = 79.5%

Organization: 169/200 = 84.5%

Grammar/punct/mechanics: 150/200 = 75%

As the percentages above suggest, the students demonstrated good skills.

This rubric is different from the one I used in 2019. This new rubric adds an item for Organization and combines Grammar/Punctuation and Mechanics into one item.

As I mentioned in the 2019 report, the Writing Center workbooks (which are now free OER pdfs) provide ample instruction and practice in the skills that we assess--so I'm not surprised by the high success rates.

One pleasant surprise was the success rate in Organization. I added Organization as a rubric item for this particular assessment because I had been noticing in recent semesters that students seemed to struggle with organizing their ideas.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Grammar/punctuation and mechanics had the lowest success rate, at 75%. This doesn't surprise me; I have noticed for years (decades!) that students struggle with this. I think it's not typically taught in high schools these days. I spent a lot of time on it when I taught high school in the 1908s--but that was a long time ago!

Right now, I am in the process of making a Writing Center Grammar and Style Guide OER, which will include worksheets/quizzes. I am hoping that instructors will use it in class to help students improve their skills.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

The intended change from the 2019 report was "Constant and continued updates and topics and MLA/APA documentation style in the workbook."

I did implement this change, and I think it helped. The finer points of these documentation styles require from students a lot of concentration/focus/attention to detail. However, I detected a slight improvement in this assessment sample.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

My overall impression is that this course does a good job of meeting the needs of students. This is the same sentence I began with in the 2019 report. I'm surprised that the 2023 success rate was as good as the 2019. I presumed that COVID would take its toll on student achievement--and, of course, we're all pretty sure that it did. However, as far as ENG 000 is concerned, we have been able to keep students at a good skill level.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

I will share this information and the action plan at the next department meeting.

The action plan is to continue to revise the Writing Center OERs every year. In fact, now that the department has total control over the publishing of them, we can revise them every semester if we see the need.

4.
Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Yearly revision of the Writing Center workbooks.	Because of the large number of students who enroll in ENG 000 and the large	2023

	As I've mentioned, all seven of these books are now free OERs that the department has created.	number of faculty who check student work for the course, we gather a lot of data on student achievement and skill-level. This encourages us to revise the Writing Center curriculum regularly.	

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

Thanks for your time and effort.

III. Attached Files

[2023 ENG 000 Assess Scoresheet 1](#)
[2023 ENG 000 Assess Scoresheet 2](#)
[2023 ENG 000 Assess Rubric](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Thomas Zimmerman **Date:** 04/18/2023
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz   **Date:** 04/20/2023
Dean: Scott Britten   **Date:** 05/01/2023
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron   **Date:** 06/19/2023

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	000	ENG 000 11/19/2018-Writing Center
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Thomas Zimmerman
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

    No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

    3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

    5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Write paragraphs or an essay appropriate to the student's level.

- Assessment Plan

    o   Assessment Tool: Capstone assignment in each workbook.

    o   Assessment Date: Winter 2013

    o   Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of 10% of sections.

    o   Number students to be assessed: 50% of students enrolled in selected sections with a minimum of 100.

    o   How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric.

    o   Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students must score a "C or better" evaluation on 3 of the 4 evaluative criteria.

- Who will score and analyze the data: English department faculty will blind-score the assignment and analyze the data.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2018		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
1809	181

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

I chose 181 papers (selected randomly), representing 10% of the total course enrollment.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I collected papers from on-campus, DL, and MM sections.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Seven different writing courses have ENG 000 as a co-requisite. Here are the courses and the specific assessment tools:

ENG 050/051: Summary-and-response paragraphs.

ENG 090/091: Five-paragraph essay.

ENG 100: Five-paragraph cover letter.

ENG 111: Six-paragraph essay with MLA or APA documentation.

(I was not able to collect any papers from ESL 168, the seventh course that has ENG 000 as a co-requisite.)

> Here is the rubric of evaluative criteria I used to assess the papers:
>
> 1. Adequate thesis statement or topic sentence
>
> 2. Adequate support of thesis statement or topic sentence.
>
> 3. Correct Standard English grammar.
>
> 4. Correct Standard English punctuation and mechanics.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

> Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u>
>
> 181 papers assessed.
>
> 148 scored a "C (73%) or better" evaluation on 3 of the 4 evaluative criteria.
>
> 33 did not.
>
> 148/181 = 82% success rate.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

> Results per Rubric Item:
>
> Thesis/topic sentence: 147/181=81%
>
> Support: 136/181=75%
>
> Grammar: 146/181= 81%
>
> Punct: 149/181=82%
>
> As the percentages above suggest, students demonstrated good skills in thesis statement/topic sentence formation as well as usage of Standard English grammar and punctuation. Even the rubric item with the lowest

success rate (support of thesis statement/topic sentence) met the standard of success. These results don't surprise me; the Writing Center workbooks (which are written by the English department) provide ample instruction and practice in these skills. I might add that the papers I assessed were not first drafts; they were revised papers (drafting and revision are required with most Writing Center assignments).

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Students met the standard of success in every area. However, the English department will continue to find ways to improve student success. In fact, we revise the Writing Center workbooks every spring/summer, using, until now, anecdotal evidence to address what we see as aspects of the books that we can improve. This first-ever formal assessment of the course provides somewhat objective corroboration of what we have believed for many years.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

As far as I know, this is the first time this course has been formally assessed. However, the course is assessed informally every spring/summer, when we revise the Writing Center workbooks for each corequiste course.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

My overall impression is that this course does a good job of meeting the needs of students. I attribute the slightly lower student success rate in the area of support of thesis statement/topic sentence to the difficulty that students have with MLA and APA research-writing techniques. These are sophisticated techniques, and many of our students are practicing them for the first time with their Writing Center assignments. The English department has been aware of this challenge for students for decades. In fact, we revise our MLA and APA instructional materials every spring/summer to try to present the concepts and applications as effectively as possible to students.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

> This information and the action plan will be shared with department faculty at a department meeting.
>
> The action plan is to continue to revise the Writing Center workbooks and other instructional materials every spring/summer, paying special attention to MLA and APA research-writing.

4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Constant and continued updates of topics and MLA/APA documentation style in the workbook.	The workbook needs to be updated to reflect changes and best practices in teaching writing.	2019

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

> 6.

III. Attached Files

ENG 000 Assessment Scoring Rubric
ENG 000 Assessment Results--Fall 2018

Faculty/Preparer:	Thomas Zimmerman	**Date:** 02/05/2019
Department Chair:	Carrie Krantz	**Date:** 02/07/2019
Dean:	Kristin Good	**Date:** 02/18/2019
Assessment Committee Chair:	Shawn Deron	**Date:** 03/21/2019