

UW Colleges Assessment Planning and Reporting Form 2005-2006

Email your reports to SAC@uwc.edu

Department	English
Assessment Coordinator(s)	Greg Ahrenhoerster and Cassandra Phillips

NOTE: Please attach relevant supporting information used to complete the Report Summary Sheet.

PART 1: Assessment of General Education Outcomes

Section 1: Identify the Proficiencies and Performance Indicators Assessed

❖ at the **Planning** stage, mark the performance indicators to be assessed in the left hand column below

	Proficiency	Performance Indicators	Courses Fall Semester	Courses Spring Semester
	Proficiency	Performance Indicators		
	A. Analytical Skills	1. Interpret and synthesize information and ideas.	ENG 098 ENG 101 ENG 102	ENG 101 ENG 102
	D. Aesthetic Skills	1. Engage with and critically reflect on a work of creative expression.		ENG 201 ENG 203 ENG 204 ENG 250 ENG 261 ENG 263 ENG 267 ENG 277 ENG 278 ENG 279 ENG 280 ENG 290 ENG 370

Section 2: Explain how, in general, the institutional rubric was applied to assessment activities. Please attach examples of assessment activities (i.e. modified rubric, assignment, questions) and measurements used to place individuals into the three categories (exceeds, meets, fails to meet). **When completing this section, it may be best to explain the results by course (or course cluster if there were similar tools or results) rather than by instructor.**

In ENG 098, 101 and 102, Proficiency A1 was assessed by having each instructor look at the next-to-last or last essay of the semester, whichever one was the “major” essay of the course. The assignments varied greatly, depending on the course and instructor, but all assignments required the student to use information from an outside source. Each instructor applied the following rubric with specific indicators of different performance levels (exceeds, meets, doesn’t meet expectations) to the selected essay.

A1. Performance Indicator: Interpret and synthesize information and ideas.

Exceeds Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthesizes information and ideas (i.e. evidence, statements, graphics, and questions) very well • Interprets the information and ideas accurately
Meets Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthesizes information and ideas (i.e. evidence, statements, graphics, and questions) adequately • Interprets most of the information and ideas accurately
Does not meet Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to synthesize information and ideas (i.e. evidence, statements, graphics, and questions) • Fails to interpret information and ideas accurately

In upper-level writing and literature courses (201, 203, 204, 250, 261, 263, 267, 277, 278, 279, 280, 290, 370) Proficiency D1 was assessed by having each instructor choose an assignment from the last few weeks of the semester that required the students to engage critically with a creative work and assessed the students’ performance. The assignments varied greatly depending on the course and instructor. Each instructor applied the following rubric with specific indicators of different performance levels (exceeds, meets, doesn’t meet expectations) to the selected assignment.

D1. Performance Indicator: Engage with and critically reflect on a work of creative expression

Exceeds Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student approaches a work of creative expression with openness and interest • The student demonstrates an awareness of the creative contexts the author or artist has worked in and the creative choices s/he has made
Meets Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student approaches a work of creative expression with a combination of resistance and openness, disinterest and interest • The student demonstrates some awareness of the creative contexts the author or artist has worked in and the creative choices s/he has made
Does not meet Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student approaches a work of creative expression with resistance, lack of interest or prejudice • The student does not demonstrate an awareness of the creative contexts the author or artist has worked in and the creative choices s/he has made

Proficiency	Exceeds	Meets	Fails to meet
A.1	564 (32%)	888 (50%)	308 (18%)
D.1	192 (42%)	221 (48%)	43 (9%)

Section 3: Use of Results

1. **Use by instructors** - Summarize the ways individual instructors plan to use assessment results to improve the instructional process.

The majority of feedback by individual instructors has been about the departmental SoTL project pertaining to peer review (see Part 2 of this report).

2. **Use by department** - What changes will you and/or the department assessment committee recommend to your department. Include changes to:
 - a. assessment process

As far as improving the process is concerned, we think each campus needs to make it part of their regular procedures to sit down with new hires (lecturers and faculty) and explain assessment. Most department members who have been around for even a few years seem to be comfortable with the process, but new hires are almost always confused by it. We have found the process very difficult to explain via e-mail, but relatively easy when explaining it to someone on my campus in person.. Most new hires (especially lecturers) do not attend the fall department meeting, so there is no opportunity to explain the process to them in person. This explanation could be done by the Associate Chair on each campus or someone designated by the Associate Chair. This conversation should probably occur about two-thirds of the way through the semester (not at the beginning), so it is closer to the time that assessment takes place.

- b. proficiencies selected

We recommend looking at A1 in Fall 2007 in order to follow up on our concerns with ENG 101 (see "Course of Action" below)

- c. performance indicators used to measure proficiency
- d. assessment activities
- e. evaluative rubrics
- f. student performance in a specific course (if there is something that stands out with department discussion.

Our recommendation, which was made at the spring 2006 department meeting was that attention should be paid to ENG 101 (see below).

3. **Course of action** - After discussion of the results by the department, what course of action will **the department** take to improve student performance with respect to the assessed proficiency?

The most notable aspect about the institutional assessment was that in Fall 2005 we were assessing the same proficiency (A1--Interpret and synthesize information and ideas) that we assessed in Fall 2003

(although back then A1 was called “Analyze, synthesize, evaluate and interpret information and ideas”). This allowed us to compare the old data with the new.

What was particularly striking is that for ENG 098 and ENG 102, the numbers were nearly identical:

Class	ENG 098 (2003)	ENG 098 (2005)	ENG 102 (2003)	ENG 102 (2005)
Exceeds Exp.	21%	20%	35%	34%
Meets Exp.	66%	64%	50%	50%
Fails to meet	13%	16%	15%	16%

But, for ENG 101, the numbers dropped off noticeably:

Class	ENG 101 (2003)	ENG 101 (2005)
Exceeds Exp.	36%	27%
Meets Exp.	52%	55%
Fails to meet	12%	18%

This matter was discussed at the spring 2006 department meeting.

Two departmental issues are related to this change:

- 1) The cut off scores on the English Placement test were changed between 2003 and 2005. This may have resulted in weaker students placing into ENG 101.
- 2) In Spring 2005, the department changed the course description of ENG 101 to require the introduction of formal documentation towards the end of the semester. This means that the essay that the students were being assessed on in 2005 was likely a slightly more complicated assignment than the one they were being assessed on in 2003. In addition, the expectations of instructors likely changed.

ENG 101 remains on the departmental radar screen as a result of these assessment findings. This matter will continue to be discussed at future department meetings, and will likely be the subject of a breakout session at the spring 2007 department meeting.

PART 2: Assessment of Department-Specific Outcomes

❖ at the Planning stage, complete section 1

Section 1: Identify department-specific learning objectives.

Outcomes/Performance Indicators	Courses Fall Semester	Courses Spring Semester
1. After taking a composition course in the English Department, any student should be able to address effectively the purpose and audience expectations for any written assignment and write clearly, fluently, and in a well-organized manner.		
2. After taking any literature course in the English department, a student will be able to choose or respond to a selected passage of textual evidence relevant to a specific topic, do a close reading of that passage, and interpret the passage’s significance and relationship to the piece as a whole, as relevant to the topic.		

	3. After taking a class in literature, students will identify key passages that contribute to textual complexity and acknowledge the value of ambiguities and tensions in a text.		
	4 After taking a composition course in the English department (and in some cases, a literature course), a student will be proficient at reading his/her peers' essays and providing helpful feedback.	ENG 098 ENG 101 ENG 102 ENG 251	ENG 098 ENG 101 ENG 102 ENG 203 ENG 261
	5. After taking a composition course in the English department (and in some cases, a literature course), a student will be proficient at critically analyzing comments made by peers during peer review.	ENG 098 ENG 101 ENG 102 ENG 251	ENG 098 ENG 101 ENG 102 ENG 203 ENG 261

Section 2: Insert the rubrics used here and explain how the rubric or standards were used to assess each outcome or performance indicator. Please attach examples of assessment activities (i.e. modified rubric, assignment, questions) and measurements used to place individuals into the three categories (exceeds, meets, fails to meet). **When completing this section, it may be best to explain the results by course (or course clusters if there were similar tools or results) rather than by instructor.**

As a direct result of our participation in the UW Colleges conference entitled “*An Investigation of the Nexus between the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and the Assessment of Student Learning*” the English Department Assessment Committee conducted an SoTL project over the course of the academic year as our assessment activity. Ultimately, our goal is to improve student learning in peer review. We designed an assessment project that identifies specific areas of peer review that need more attention and opens the door to further study.

A more detailed explanation of our project is provided in the appendix.

The data from our 2005-2006 departmental assessment does not fall into the categories of “Exceeds, Meets, or Fails to Meet Expectations.” For this reason, we are not using the table below. Our data is included in the 12 tables in the appendix.

At this point, and as evidenced by the data in the appendix, we feel that the department is successful in terms of improving student learning through peer review. For example, and in regards to objective four, the majority of students find their feedback from peer review to be helpful in the revision process (see tables 1 and 2). For example, students consider the peer review feedback to reflect the goals of the instructor and of the course (see table 2). In regards to objective five, we found that most students were able to critically analyze their feedback (see critical development in table 10). We do, however, see room for improvement, which has led us to focus even more closely on the peer review session for the 2006-7 cycle. For example, we would like to see higher numbers in terms of how many students receive content-based peer reviews vs. grammar and mechanics (see all tables).

Departmental Outcome/Performance Indicator	# Exceed	# Meet	# Do Not Meet
1. See Appendix			
2. See Appendix			
3. See Appendix			

Section 3: Use of results.

- 1. Use by instructors** - Summarize the ways individual instructors plan to use assessment results to improve the instructional process.

As we discovered through our project (and as evidenced in the tables at the end of this report), almost all instructors in the English department use some kind of peer review. Through department/committee discussions and instructor surveys, we found that instructors will use the assessment results in a variety of ways. The three most recognized ways in which instructors plan to use the assessment results include:

- Spend more time developing peer review strategies during course planning
- Spend more time in class training students for peer review
- Spend more time reflecting and sharing ideas with colleagues regarding peer review

In response to our faculty surveys, we will focus on providing more specific feedback in regards to improving student learning during the peer review process during the 2006-7 assessment cycle.

- 2. Use by department** - What changes will you and/or the department assessment committee recommend to your department. Include changes to:
 - assessment process**
We recommend no changes at this time. We had a very high turnout, and instructors were generally pleased with the process.
 - proficiencies selected**
We recommend no changes at this time.
 - performance indicators used to measure proficiency**
For the 2006-2007 assessment cycle, we recommend focusing on more specific areas of peer review in order to improve student learning. These areas are noted in tables at the end of this report.
 - assessment activities**
We recommend that instructors and students practice close readings of texts during the peer review process in order for us to get better insight on how to improve student learning.
 - evaluative rubrics**
See above response.
 - student performance in a specific course (if there is something that stands out with department discussion.**
We recommend no changes at this time.
- 3. Course of action** - After discussion of the results by the department, what course of action will the department take to improve student performance with respect to the assessed proficiency?

During the course of the 2005-2006 assessment cycle, we assessed our students' ability to use peer review to assess writing. We were interested in exploring what worked and what we could improve upon during the peer review process. In addition to spending more time discussing and identifying peer review strategies at department meetings, we decided to continue to assess peer review in the 2006-2007 cycle. We would like to focus on several reoccurring issues that came up during our project in order to become even more specific as to how to improve student learning in peer review. Some of these areas include:

- a. student training
- b. time spent on peer review for a specific paper as well as for the course in general
- c. student attitudes toward peer review (trust)
- d. peer review assessment.

Our faculty members have articulated that they would like to hear/see even more information in regards to successful peer review within the English department, especially from the perception of students. As a result, we will look more closely at student essays, revision, and the peer review workshop to see how students address/deal with the issues above. We would like to continue to assess the best environments for successful student learning during peer review.

PART 3: Additional Assessment and Contributions

Section 1: Please discuss activities that were supported by the assessment budget for the department assessment committee. In particular outline the department assessment committee activities for the academic year.

The assessment committee met in June of 2005 to plan the project and draft assessment tools; this meeting was paid for by a one-time funding grant from Central Office.

\$1000 was spent on the full-department assessment meeting on April 2, 2005 at UW Marshfield. At this meeting, the data gathered in the fall semester was thoroughly discussed. A guest speaker was brought in to facilitate a discussion of peer review.

Approximately \$300 was used to pay for a student worker to help us input the survey data into an Excel file.

Section 2: Please discuss activities that were supported by the assessment budget for overall department assessment activities. In particular outline the department assessment activities for the academic year.

At both the fall and spring department meetings, we had a session devoted to assessment activities.

Section 3: Please ask for and include in the report information from department members about any other assessment activities they have conducted, particularly in conjunction with grant-funded innovations. Also ask for and describe briefly any additional contributions to assessment such as publications, presentations, qualitative classroom innovations (**such as** Scholarship of Teaching and Learning activities), and other items relating to assessment that the department wishes to note.

- Professor has written an article, "Will They Still Respect Us in the Morning: "A Study of How Students Write after They Leave the Composition Classroom." It has been accepted for

publication by Teaching English in the Two-Year Colleges. The article, which will appear in the September 2006 issue, reports on work he and Cassandra Phillips did collecting data on whether students "transfer" skills they learned in first year composition courses to writing assignments in subsequent courses in other disciplines.

- Professor has written an article, "Teaching African-American Cinema in Middle America: The Challenge of Central Wisconsin" that he is submitting to *TETYC*.
- Professor is working with Professor (COM ARTS) on a SoTL project on why students read...or don't. The preliminary findings were presented at last year's ISSOTL (International Society for SoTL) in Vancouver. They will be presenting the next stage of methodology (assessing strategies developed as a result of the first round of data collection) and findings at this year's ISSOTL in Washington, DC.
- Professors are finishing up a lesson study on reading for complexity. They presented the preliminary methodology of this project as an example of disciplinary SoTL at last year's ISSOTL (International Society for SoTL) in Vancouver, and presented the mid-year findings at the CASTL (Carnegie Academy for SoTL) Colloquium in May. They will be presenting the final project findings at this year's ISSOTL in Washington, DC.
- Professors are also involved in a lesson study introducing students to literary studies. This lesson study is online. They've completed the first classroom observation and will do the next one this fall. They did a poster session at the CASTL Colloquium in May and will be presenting initial findings at this year's ISSOTL in Washington, DC.
- Professor is beginning a new System-wide SoTL project with Professor (Geography) from the Colleges, a psych prof from Stout, and a psych prof from River Falls on teaching race/diversity metacognitively.
- Professor is working on a year-long project on teaching and learning in literary studies as a Wisconsin Teaching Scholar.
- Professors developed a linked English 101 course that shared assignments and a D2L site across four campuses. At the end of this course, they distributed a survey for students to help make some decisions about how to revise the course. They have presented their reflections on the course and their findings in March at CCCC's in Chicago (along with Janet LaBrie and John Pruitt), and in May at the UWC Colloquium.

PART 4: Historical Trends

Section 1: History of General Education activities. Please add more rows as necessary. This should be an on-going list copied from each previous report.

Proficiency	Year Assessed	Results	Year Assessed	Results	Year Assessed	Results
A1	2003 - 04	E = 35.1% M = 49.8% F = 15.1%	2005 - 06	E = 32.0% M = 50.5% F = 17.5%		E = M = F =
C2	2004 - 05	E = 33.9% M = 52.5% F = 13.5%		E = M = F =		E = M = F =
D1	2005 - 06	E = 42.1% M = 48.5% F = 9.4%		E = M = F =		E = M = F =

Section 2: History of department learning objective activities. Please add more rows as necessary. This should be an on-going list copied from each previous report.

Objective	Year Assessed	Results	Year Assessed	Results	Year Assessed	Results
1. Address purpose and audience expectations	2003 -- 04	E = 48.9% M = 41.3% F = 9.8%	2004 -- 05	E = 42.7% M = 45.0% F = 12.3%	Closed	E = M = F =
2. Select passage and do close reading.	2004 – 05	E = 43.1% M = 44.5% F = 12.4%	Closed	E = M = F =		E = M = F =
3. Identify key passages.	2004 – 05	E = 41.1% M = 46.0% F = 13.0%	Closed	E = M = F =		E = M = F =