



» Welcome, Admin Admin

Log Out | Edit User Profile | About SAAC EZ

**Student Academic Achievement Committee (SAAC) EZ**

Title for this Assessment	ENG 101 Common Assignment
Short Description	Common Assignment for ENG101 09/10
Courses or Programs	ENG101
Semester of Assessment	Spring 2010 Fall 2010 Fall 2011
Last Action	Wednesday, June 22, 2011
Start Date	Thursday, January 28, 2010

**Spring 2010****What outcomes will be assessed?**

1. Analyze specific rhetorical contexts, including circumstance, purpose, topic, audience, and writer, as well as the writing's ethical, political, and cultural implications. (I, III) 2. Organize writing to support a central idea through unity, coherence, and logical development appropriate to a specific writing context. (II, IV) 3. Use appropriate conventions in writing, including consistent voice, tone, diction, grammar, and mechanics. (I, IV)

**Assessment Tool - What instrument will be used for the assessment?**

We choose to assess the following from the EMCC Writing Rubric: --Focus Issues --Support Issues --Organization Issues --Language Use Issues --Mechanics Issues

**Assessment Tool Supplement**

[Inscribing a Personal Artifact Assignment.doc](#)

**Data**

The complete results are attached; on a scale of 1, 2, 3 or 4, the results were: Focus 2.561905 Support 2.314286 Organization 2.409524 Language Use 2.504762 Mechanics 2.561905

**Data Supplement**

[Common Assignment Data with Norming.xlsx](#)

**Analysis: How did they do?**

All categories showed results around average; the lowest results were in the Support area.

**Analysis Supplement**

[ENG101 Assessment Cycle.doc](#)

[ENG101 Assessment Cycle.doc](#)**Team discussion/Improvement plans (if needed)**

We have made the following plans to continue this project: ½ Determine Next Steps (Focus, Best Practices, Implementation, Further Assessment) ½ We selected an issue to focus on -- working to improve Support Issues ½ We decided to solicit, collect, and compile best practices related to teaching support issues in ENG101, and then select a few best practices that we want to work with. We are starting this process. ½ We plan to integrate selected best practices into our curriculum, classes, writing center, etc. ½ Repeat Assessment Cycle ½ We plan to use the same assignment and procedure during the Spring semester, but we hope to have all English 101 sections involved in the project ½ We plan to use the same assessment procedures and then look to see if the students improved in this area ½ We will then determine if we wish to continue assessing ENG101 in the same way (or in a different way) or if we want to move our assessment efforts to another course.

Spring 2010 Timeline: Jan. 29th ½ Feb. 19th: Solicit and collect best practices  
Feb. 22nd: Select best practices that we want to implement + Decide on procedures for assigning the Common Assignment  
March/April: Implement Best Practices  
May: Collect Common Assignment Papers for Assessment

**Fall 2011****What outcomes will be assessed?**

This semester, we continued our overview, using the Focus, Support, Organization, Language Use, and Mechanics sections of the EMCC Writing Rubric. We had focused some attention on our teaching of Organization this semester.

**Assessment Tool - What instrument will be used for the assessment?**

We used the EMCC Writing Rubric -- attached

**Assessment Tool Supplement**

[48-WAC Rubric for Fall 2009.docx](#)

**Data**

See attached

**Data Supplement**

[48-Data and Results -- Feb. 2, 2011.xls](#)

**Analysis: How did they do?**

We found that our results remained largely unchanged from last semester, which still represents a substantial jump over our first assessment.

**Analysis Supplement**

[48-Common Assignment Schedule.doc](#)

**Team discussion/Improvement plans (if needed)**

We have now develop a plan (see attachment above) to continually assess ENG101 and 102; in future academic years, our assessments will be based on our Learning Outcomes. We hope that this will allow us to target more specific areas and to develop assessment activities that are a better fit in our classes.

**Fall 2010****What outcomes will be assessed?**

We are conducting a second round of assessment (see Spring 2010 semester), so we are using the same outcomes. 1. Analyze specific rhetorical contexts, including circumstance, purpose, topic, audience, and writer, as well as the writing's ethical, political, and cultural implications. (I, III) 2. Organize writing to support a central idea through unity, coherence, and logical development appropriate to a specific writing context. (II, IV) 3. Use appropriate conventions in writing.

including consistent voice, tone, diction, grammar, and mechanics. (I, IV)

#### **Assessment Tool - What instrument will be used for the assessment?**

We choose to assess the following from the EMCC Writing Rubric: --Focus Issues --Support Issues --Organization Issues --Language Use Issues --Mechanics Issues Since we had identified Support as a weakness that we wanted to focus on, we used the same writing assignment, but we development more material to help students develop adequate support. The document Planning Activity shows the material we developed, and it includes the writing assignment at the end. I'm unable to attach another document, so I can't include the EMCC WAC Writing Rubric.

#### **Assessment Tool Supplement**

[37-Planning Activity.doc](#)

#### **Data**

This semester Last semester Improvement Focus 2.95 2.56 .39 Support 3.09 2.31 .78 Organization 2.93 2.41 .52 Language Use 3.20 2.50 .69 Mechanics 3.05 2.56 .49 During our assessment sessions, we scored each of the five criteria based on the 1, 2, 3, or 4 scale from the WAC Rubric.

#### **Data Supplement**

[37-Data and Results -- Sept. 13 2010.xls](#)

#### **Analysis: How did they do?**

We were extremely pleased with the results. Our students showed significant improvement since last semester, with our greatest improvement in support, the criterion we concentrated our efforts on. We heard from students that they appreciated the planning activity, so it was gratifying to see that students scored higher in that criterion, and in the other four criteria, also. Some of this improvement could also be due to the fact that we had refined the writing prompt and had gone through the process of assigning the paper the semester before. Still, the papers were markedly improved, so it's doubtful that this factor was the sole contributing factor. During both semesters, the assessment ranking sessions have been very useful for the English faculty -- we have enjoyed the opportunity to norm our scoring with our colleagues (and get a chance to discuss what we value in writing and why), and we have found it empowering to work together to assess the writing skills of our students.

#### **Analysis Supplement**

#### **Team discussion/Improvement plans (if needed)**

The English faculty have been working on Learning Outcomes for English 101 and 102. We are in the process of finalizing those, and we plan, in the future, to base our assessment of ENG 101 and 102 on these outcomes. In order to keep moving forward on our assessment efforts, we have decided to do one more cycle of assessing ENG 101 using this some approach -- this semester, we will be involving the adjunct instructors and focusing (preassessment) on organization (instead of support.)