|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Plan – Fill out sections 1 – 10 (Attach supporting assessment tools and documents)** | |
| 1. **Unit/Course/Gen Ed Team/Program:**   Humanities Division / ENGL 1102 | 1. **Reported By:** Rhonda Kelley |
| 1. **Date Submitted:** 05/16/16 | 1. **Assessment Cycle:** Spring 2016 |
| 1. **Related SGSC Strategic Plan Goal:** Goal 4: SGSC will develop academic program options to meet student and community needs | |
| 1. **Related Program/Unit Mission Statement:** The Humanities Division supports the mission of South Georgia State College as a multi-campus student-centered institution offering high quality associate degree programs. Accordingly, the Division challenges students to address the analytic, communicative, cultural, and philosophic foundations of the disciplines. The Division encourages students to think critically and creatively, to act with cultural and aesthetic awareness, and to communicate effectively in a free and open exchange of ideas. Further, the Division promotes scholarly, artistic, and creative activities both inside and outside the classroom that promotes expansion of knowledge and experience and encourages these qualities in the greater community. | |
| 1. **Related Unit Goal/Program Goal/Gen Ed Goal:** Area A1 (Communications): Students will adapt communication to purpose and audience using the conventions of standard written English. | |
| 1. **Student Learning Outcome # \_\_\_1\_\_\_ Administrative Outcome # \_\_\_\_\_\_**   **Outcome:** Students will be able to write a sophomore-level essay, demonstrating their facility with the developing an argument. | |
| 1. **Method of Assessment:**    Samples of the first and last essays will be scored with the common ENGL 1102 Essay Rubric (attached). 1/3 of each class will be randomly selected. | |
| 1. **Performance Targets:**   70% of assessed students will score at least a “C” or higher (at least 3.5 out of 5 possible points) on the last paper of the semester. | |
| **Assessment Report – Fill out sections 11 – 13 (Attach supporting data, assessment tools, artifacts and**  **documents)** | |
| 1. **Summary of Data Collected (Performance Results):**   Of 157 assessed 1102 students, 78% scored a “C” or better on SLO 1 (developing an argument). 78% indicates a noticeable improvement over the 52% who scored at least a ”C” on the first essay, and the performance target was met. | |
| 1. **Use of Results (Recommended Actions):** 2. The 26 point increase in percentage (from first to last papers) is a remarkable improvement, indicating that 1102 students are substantially improving in this area in the course of 1 semester. 3. In assessing ENGL 1101 this cycle, it was apparent that 1101 students struggled with “making and supporting arguments.” In 1102, we break down that one SLO into two separate SLOs (“developing an argument” and “supporting an argument”). Clearly 1102 students outperformed their 1101 peers in developing an argument. This progress is exactly what we expect to see over the course of a first year writing program. 4. At the next Assessment Team meeting in Fall 2016, we will discuss whether we want to increase the target for this SLO or move on to SLO 3 for Spring 2017. | |
| 1. **Budget Implications:**   None. | |
| **Closing the Loop – Fill out section 14 (Attach supporting evidence)** | |
| 1. **Closing the Loop:** 2. Last year (Spring 2015), we met our goal for SLO 1 (see summary of data at sub point a), but faculty were dissatisfied with the rubric and the use of the same, common prompt for both first and last essays.    1. SLO 1: First paper (38%); Last paper (70%) 3. We think that using our own prompts is more organic and more rigorous and that using a common scoring rubric ensures consistency. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Plan – Fill out sections 1 – 10 (Attach supporting assessment tools and documents)** | |
| 1. **Unit/Course/Gen Ed Team/Program:**   Humanities Division / ENGL 1102 | 1. **Reported By:** Rhonda Kelley |
| 1. **Date Submitted:** 05/16/16 | 1. **Assessment Cycle:** Spring 2016 |
| 1. **Related SGSC Strategic Plan Goal:** Goal 4: SGSC will develop academic program options to meet student and community needs | |
| 1. **Related Program/Unit Mission Statement:** The Humanities Division supports the mission of South Georgia State College as a multi-campus student-centered institution offering high quality associate degree programs. Accordingly, the Division challenges students to address the analytic, communicative, cultural, and philosophic foundations of the disciplines. The Division encourages students to think critically and creatively, to act with cultural and aesthetic awareness, and to communicate effectively in a free and open exchange of ideas. Further, the Division promotes scholarly, artistic, and creative activities both inside and outside the classroom that promotes expansion of knowledge and experience and encourages these qualities in the greater community. | |
| 1. **Related Unit Goal/Program Goal/Gen Ed Goal:** Area A1 (Communications): Students will adapt communication to purpose and audience using the conventions of standard written English. | |
| 1. **Student Learning Outcome # \_\_\_2\_\_\_ Administrative Outcome # \_\_\_\_\_\_**   **Outcome:** Students will be able to write a sophomore-level essay, demonstrating their facility with supporting an argument using evidence, analysis, and citations. | |
| 1. **Method of Assessment:**    Samples of the first and last essays will be scored with the common ENGL 1102 Essay Rubric (attached). 1/3 of each class will be randomly selected. | |
| 1. **Performance Targets:**   70% of assessed students will score at least a “C” or higher (at least 3.5 out of 5 possible points) on the last paper of the semester. | |
| **Assessment Report – Fill out sections 11 – 13 (Attach supporting data, assessment tools, artifacts and**  **documents)** | |
| 1. **Summary of Data Collected (Performance Results):**   Of 157 assessed 1102 students, 80% scored a “C” or better on SLO 2 (supporting an argument). 80% indicates a noticeable improvement over the 55% who scored at least a ”C” on the first essay, and the performance target was met. | |
| 1. **Use of Results (Recommended Actions):** 2. The 25 point increase in percentage (from first to last papers) is a remarkable improvement, indicating that 1102 students are substantially improving in this area in the course of 1 semester. 3. In assessing ENGL 1101 this cycle, it was apparent that 1101 students struggled with “making and supporting arguments.” In 1102, we break down that one SLO into two separate SLOs (“developing an argument” and “supporting an argument”). Clearly 1102 students outperformed their 1101 peers in supporting an argument. This progress is exactly what we expect to see over the course of a first year writing program. 4. At the next Assessment Team meeting in Fall 2016, we will discuss whether we want to increase the target for this SLO or move on to SLO 4 for Spring 2017. | |
| 1. **Budget Implications:**   None. | |
| **Closing the Loop – Fill out section 14 (Attach supporting evidence)** | |
| 1. **Closing the Loop:** 2. Last year (Spring 2015), we did not meet our goal for SLO 2 (see summary of data at sub point a), but faculty were dissatisfied with the rubric and the use of the same, common prompt for both first and last essays.    1. SLO 1: First paper (35%); Last paper (65%) 3. We think that using our own prompts is more organic and more rigorous and that using a common scoring rubric ensures consistency. | |

## ENGL 1102 Assessment Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Standards** | **Superior**  **(A)**  **5 points** | **Good**  **(B)**  **4 points** | **Acceptable**  **(C)**  **3.5 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **(D)**  **3 points** | **Not Acceptable**  **(F)**  **2.5 points** |
| **Argument: Thesis and Development (SLO 1)**  Contextualized and qualified thesis; original, nuanced, and sophisticated argument that develops clearly and reasonably; frame of reference and significance are convincingly stated. Argument anticipates and addresses both major and subtle objections. | Exceeds Standards | Meets Standards | Meets Some Standards | Meets A Few Standards | Standards Are Not Met |
| **Support: Evidence, Analysis, Citations (SLO 2)**  Evidence is pertinent to argument and deeply engaged; evidence drives argument.  Relationship between ideas and support is explained in a nuanced fashion. | Exceeds Standards | Meets Standards | Meets Some Standards | Meets A Few Standards | Standards Are Not Met |
| **Organization: Essay Structure and Paragraphs (SLO 3)**  Essay structure reflects  logical and organic  progression of  argument. Paragraph logic is expressed  through transitions and  signposting, and  furthers development of  argument. Paragraphs are well-organized and sentences flow.  Conclusion synthesizes the argument’s greater implications. | Exceeds Standards | Meets Standards | Meets Some Standards | Meets A Few Standards | Standards Are Not Met |
| **Grammar, Mechanics, and Spelling (SLO 4)**  The paper shows a comprehensive command of vocabulary, syntax, and grammar and contains appropriate and effective sentence structures. There is accuracy in mechanics and, when appropriate, citations. | Exceeds Standards | Meets Standards | Meets Some Standards | Meets A Few Standards | Standards Are Not Met |

Spring 2016 Assessment Data: English 1102

# Summary of Data for all reporting instructors

## English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 157

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 82 (52%) | 123 (78%) |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 86 (55%) | 125 (80%) |

# Raw Data from Reporting Instructors

## Rhonda Kelley: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 15

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 10 | 15 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 11 | 15 |

## Paula Fales: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 15

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 14 | 13 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 13 | 14 |

## Codrina Cozma: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 46

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 21 | 39 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 25 | 43 |

## Renee Byrd: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 1 | 1 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 1 | 1 |

## Thom Brucie: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 10

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 7 | 8 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 8 | 6 |

## Michael Talbott: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 30

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 14 | 22 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 12 | 20 |

## Joel Harper: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 23

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 6 | 12 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 6 | 12 |

## Elaine Stephens: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 10

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 9 | 10 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 9 | 10 |

## Brenda Whitley: English 1102

total number of students assessed: ­ 5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | First Paper | Last Paper |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 1: | 0 | 3 |
| students scoring at least 3.5 on SLO 2: | 1 | 4 |