

|  |
| --- |
| **2021-2022 Assessment Report** |
| **Assessment Reporting Form:** This report is to show that academic assessment is occurring and that the results are being used to make changes to improve student learning. The assessment being reported could be for Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Measurable Student Level Outcome (MSLOs), and/or Course Common Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs). Each program should be assessing and gathering data for at least **two** PLOs OR **two** MSLOs that contain CSLOs each year. On the Baseline Assessment Reporting Form, please record the baseline for the percentage of students who are proficient in the student learning outcome(s) assessed and identify improvements that will be made to increase that percentage. Later, you’ll complete a follow-up assessment (recorded on a Follow-Up Assessment Reporting Form) to ascertain whether the adopted improvements resulted in an increased percentage of students proficient in the assessed learning outcome(s).  |
| **Course Details Due Oct. 21, 2021** |
| **1. Program name or course name and number**: English 102; College Composition II |
| **2. Division in which the program or course is located**:Literary Arts & Languages |
| **3. Date form completed**:12/20/21 |
| **4. Name of person completing report**:Karen Hindhede/Shelley Decker/Mary Kieser |
| **5. Semester and year in which the assessment was conducted**:Fall 2021 |
| **6. Number of student participants**:All ENG 102 sections (12 sections - 145 Students) |
| **7. Number of faculty/staff participants**:All PT & FT faculty teaching ENG 102 - faculty (Keeling, Silvia, Gelfand, Chabot, Zarifian, Decker, McKinney, Moulton, Petrey) |
| **8. What PLOs and/or MSLOs and CSLOs did you assess for this baseline assessment? (For clarity, please label each measure listed as a PLO, MSLO, or CSLO.)**We are evaluating the following MSLOs (which have the CSLOs tied to them in parenthesis).2. (Evaluation Level) Identify and evaluate rhetorical choices in a text, film, image, or presentation. (CSLO 2,4)3.(Evaluation Level) Identify and evaluate persuasive strategies including logical, ethical, and emotional appeals in written, oral, and visual media. (CSLO 1,2,4)7.(Synthesis Level) Incorporate research material into written work and oral presentations without plagiarizing through proper quoting, paraphrasing, and summarizing. (CSLO 2,3)8.(Application Level) Use an appropriate academic system of documentation proficiently. (CSLO 2) |
| **9. Describe the assessment method used and the criteria for successful achievement of student learning outcomes. (e.g., rubrics, licensing exam, internship, portfolio, exam, quiz, research paper, performance exam, EAC, etc.)**Fifteen vetted multiple-choice questions in the form of an assessment that will be required from all students taking ENG 102 to assess if they meet the four course outcomes listed above. Using EAC tool, we will pull the data from all ENG 102 courses in a compiled report. |
| **Program Results & Evaluation Due December 11, 2021** |
| **10. What percentage of the participating students were proficient in the PLOs, MSLOs or CSLOs?  What percentage of correct answers was determined as proficient? (For example, a student must answer 75% of the questions correctly to be considered proficient.)****75% is determined to be proficient. Here is the breakdown of the percentage of correct responses by question:** 1 **(rhetorical appeal - logos) 60%** 2 (rhetorical appeal - ethos) 83% 3 (rhetorical appeal - pathos) 96% 4 (plagiarism) – 85% (Passage to recognize NOT plagiarism.)5 **(plagiarism) 64% (Passage to recognize what IS plagiarism.)**6 (paragraph summary) – 77% (Recognized the best summary of a paragraph.)7 **(in-text citation) 51% (In-text citation focused on APA. Understood the basics but confused where the “year” goes in a citation.)**8 **(in-text citation) 60% (In-text citation focused on MLA. Students are confused about what goes in parenthesis in addition to the last names—et al. and page numbers.)** |
| **11. What changes/improvements were made or will be made in response to the outcomes of the assessment process?**This assessment determined 3 areas that students scored below the 75% determined to be proficient. These areas are: Rhetorical Appeal – Logos, identifying plagiarism, and in-text citations. |
| ***Feel free to attach your PLOs OR MSLOs and CSLOs and indicate which were assessed*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Feedback Rubric** |
| **Category** | **1 - Developing** | **2 – Satisfactory** | **3 - Exemplary** | **Score** | **Feedback** |
| **Outcomes Identified** | Outcomes to be assessed were not clear | Outcomes to be assessed were identified but were not aligned to CSLOs | PLOs or MSLOs to be assessed were identified and aligned with CSLOs |  |  |
| **Scope of Assessment** | The assessment was given by only one faculty member and/or to one class | The assessment was given by a few faculty members to several classes, but it was not district-wide | The assessment was given district-wide by all faculty teaching the course. |  |  |
| **Quality of Assessment** | The assessment did not have articulated criteria for assessment of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (e.g., rubrics, exemplary work). | The assessment somewhat articulated criteria for assessment of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (e.g., rubrics, exemplary work). | The assessment clearly articulated criteria for assessment of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (e.g., rubrics, exemplary work). |  |  |
| **Interpreting Results** | Data of assessment results was not provided. | Data of assessment results was provided and there was evidence that the results were somewhat analyzed | Data of assessment results was provided and there was evidence that the results were analyzed in depth |  |  |
| **Reflection and Future Action** | Reflection of the results of the assessment was not apparent and no changes and/or improvements based on them were identified. | Reflection of the results of the assessment was somewhat clear and one change and/or improvements based on them was identified. | Reflection of the results of the assessment was clear and several changes and/or improvements based on them were identified. |  |  |
| **Additional Comments:**  |



|  |
| --- |
| **Program Details May 30th** |
| **1. Program name or course name and number**:  |
| **2. Division in which the program or course is located**: |
| **3. Date form completed**: |
| **4. Name of person completing report**: |
| **5. Semester and year in which the assessment was conducted**: |
| **6. Number of student participants**: |
| **7. Number of faculty/staff participants**: |
| **8. What PLOs and/or MSLOs and CSLOs did you assess for this baseline assessment? (For clarity, please label each measure listed as a PLO, MSLO, or CSLO.)** |
| **9. Describe the assessment method used and the criteria for successful achievement of student learning outcomes. (e.g., rubrics, licensing exam, internship, portfolio, exam, quiz, research paper, performance exam, EAC, etc.)** |
| **10. What percentage of the participating students were proficient in the PLOs, MSLOs or CSLOs?  What percentage of correct answers was determined as proficient? (For example, a student has to answer 70% of the questions correctly to be considered proficient.)** |
| **11. What changes/improvements were made or will be made in response to the outcomes of the assessment process?** |
| **Additional Comments or feedback on the Assessment Process (Optional):** |