General Education Outcomes Assessment	
General Education Student Learning Outcome	**Courses Assessed**
1. **Students develop higher order thinking skills.** Higher education goes beyond memorization and basic comprehension. Students must be able to apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate what they learn. While most first and second year college courses lay a foundation of basic knowledge of the subject matter, students will also be challenged to use their intellect, to think critically, to solve problems and/or to wrestle with complex issues.	PSYC 2003 BIOL 1544 ECON 2013
2. **Students gain greater awareness of cultural perspectives.** One of the traditional goals of a college education is to expand students' understanding of the world by presenting them with diverse ideas and attitudes. In America's pluralistic society, awareness of cultural perspectives is essential. An important element of this understanding is recognition of one's own culture and the impact it has on one's perspective. Across the curriculum, students will be exposed to different cultural perspectives to enhance their ability to understand and interact with others.	MUSI 1003 PLSC 2003
3. **Students can write clear, coherent, well-organized documents, which are substantially free of errors.**	ENGL 1013 BIOL 2214 ENGL 63
4. **Students can read selections at the college level.** Students can describe the main ideas and supporting ideas in their reading. Students can evaluate written materials objectively.	HIST 2003 HIST 1033 ENGL 2213 READ 33
5. **Students develop effective oral communication skills.** A college graduate should be able to speak effectively. Most NWACC students will develop public speaking skills to inform and persuade others. Some professional program students will focus on interpersonal communication skills essential in performing job-related duties. All students should have opportunities to improve their oral communication skills across the curriculum through class presentations and small group activities.	COMM 1303 OSIM 1103
6. **Students can achieve mathematical literacy.** College graduates should be able to understand and use numerical relationships and basic analysis of data in their roles as consumers, citizens, scholars, and professionals. Graduates should possess the computational, algebraic and quantitative skills necessary to solve problems and evaluate complex situations.	MATH 1204 MATH 1003 MATH 53 CHEM 1104
7. **Students can use computers proficiently.** Because of society's increasing use of computer technology, college graduates must be able to use a computer. Employers are expecting computer skills in those they hire. For most students, proficiency means the ability to create, update and manipulate word-	CISQ 1103 ARHS 1003

processing documents, spreadsheets, presentations, and databases. Students will be able to use email for communication and a browser to navigate the Internet. Other students will gain proficiency in specific computer applications related to their field of study.	
8. **Students can employ a variety of sources to locate, evaluate, and use information.** In support of personal, professional, and academic goals, students should be able to recognize a need for information and locate it. They must then be able to effectively evaluate the reliability and relevance of that information.	ENGL 1023 DRAM 1003

Outcome 1: Students develop higher order thinking skills.

Outcome Description: Higher education goes beyond memorization and basic comprehension. Students must be able to apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate what they learn. While most first and second year college courses lay a foundation of basic knowledge of the subject matter, students will also be challenged to use their intellect, to think critically, to solve problems and/or to wrestle with complex issues.

Courses Selected for Assessment: PSYC 2003—General Psychology, BIOL 1544—Principles of Biology, ECON 2013—Principles of Macroeconomics

Principles of Macroeconomics (ECON 2013):			
Course Description: This course is an introduction to the major areas of modern economic theory, American capitalism, pricing system, national income accounting, fiscal policy, monetary policy, money and banking and general price levels.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2013 total	**11**	**174**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	7	109	
--Fall 2013 Online	4	65	
Fall 2014 total	**12**	**269**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	8	178	
--Fall 2014 Online	4	91	
Fall 2015 total	**14**		
--Fall 2015 Face to Face	8		
--Fall 2015 Online	6		
Fall 2016 total	6	90	
--Fall 2016 Face to Face	4	66	
--Fall 2016 Online	2	24	

Principles of Macroeconomics Reporting for General Education Results					
Name of Person Completing Assessment: Frulio/Davis					
Department: BCIS					
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	6	6	4	8	6
Total Number of Students Assessed	80	116	62	135	91
Percentage of Total Students Assessed	62.99%*	66%	34.8%		

Performance Target for Face to Face Students	Average > 70%; 50% Proficient	Average> 70%; 50% proficient	Average> 70%; 50% proficient	Average> 70%; 50% proficient	
Average Face to Face Students Score **	62%	87%	78%	52%	58%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed					
Performance Target for Online Students	Average > 70%; 50% proficient	Average> 70%; 50% proficient	Average> 70%; 50% proficient	Average> 70%; 50% proficient	
Average of Online Students score				46%	65%

Means of Assessment (Method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

Faculty developed an end of course assignment containing 10 critical thinking problems in Economics administered to all students enrolled in Macroeconomics or Microeconomics during the Fall and Spring Semester. This is a formative internal assessment. They answer 3 multiple choice and 2 essay relating to GDP, inflation, supply and demand, monetary policy, and unemployment impacts for example.
*F2F vs. Online not broken down before this time

Results and Analysis:

Fall 2011 34% of students are proficient
Fall 2012 13% of students are proficient
Fall 2013 19% of students are proficient
Fall 2014 31% of students are proficient
Fall 2015 30% of students are proficient
Fall 2016 51% of students are proficient
While students have not met the goal for average score in a few previous years, the percentage of students who score proficient (over 70%) is not high. (Targets were met in Fall 2013 and Fall 2014).   Students have struggled with both higher order thinking and math skills in the Economics courses. ECON courses are allowable social science electives which often attract first semester students. A prerequisite was added to insure that students have the appropriate skills to succeed.
2016 – adding the pre-requisite has helped greatly in improving scores.

Strengths:
This assessment represents a level of higher order thinking required for a student entering a junior level of coursework.

Weaknesses:

The assessment has sometimes been administered to students for extra credit points in some sections causing students to only answer questions which can be easily answered and skipping others. These questions will be embedded in required assignments in the future.

Proposed Action(s): A prerequisite was added to both Macro and Micro Econ to ensure that students have the appropriate skills to succeed. A third Economics class with no pre-requisites was made available for students who are not required by their majors to take Macro/Micro in Fall 2016.	
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): N	

General Psychology (PYSC 2003):			
Course Description: An investigation into basic principles and theories of behavior in the areas of learning, memory, perception, development, biological basis of behavior, motivation and emotion, personality, stress, abnormal behavior and social and interpersonal relationships.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2012 total	**37**	**905**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	24	631	
--Fall 2012 Online	13	274	
Fall 2013 total	**37**	**908**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	25	613	
--Fall 2013 Online	12	294	
Fall 2014 total	**32**	**722**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	21	496	
--Fall 2014 Online	11	226	
Fall 2015 total	**23**	**489**	
--Fall 2015 Face to Face	15	354	
--Fall 2015 Online	8	135	
Fall 2016 total	**20**	**462**	
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			
--Fall 2016 Online			
General Psychology Reporting for General Education Results			
Name of Person Completing Assessment: Lenora Sotlar Clouse			
Department: Behavioral Sciences			

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed		20	27	23	20
Total Number of Students Assessed			621	306	462

Percentage of Total Students Assessed Scoring Proficient		83%	59%	81%
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	75%	70%	70%	70%
Average Face to Face Students Score **		87%	94%	95%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed		92%	73%	95%
Performance Target for Online Students	75%	70%	70%	70%
Average of Online Students score		86%	94%	82%

Means of Assessment (Method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

We use a standardized critical thinking writing assignment developed by our full time psychology faculty. It requires students to identify a psychological science article and answer a number of critical thinking questions in essay form to demonstrate their ability to analyze scientific findings from a reputable academic source. We gather all the student data we can, requiring all instructors in all sections to use this assignment and report their results. The numbers above represent our best effort at a complete representation of our students' performance on this instrument.

Results and Analysis:
We are pleased with the results, as they do indicate that our students are capable of thinking critically about academic research in the psychological field.

Strengths:

In the General Psychology classes our students are encouraged to develop an understanding of what is means to think critically and area given opportunities to do so and to improve their critical thinking skills.

Weaknesses:

Measuring critical thinking and the development or improvement of this skill is highly subjective. It is difficult to develop an assessment mechanism that all faculty feel adequately measures critical thinking. Even if we identify a good mechanism, the process of judging this (the grading) process is still somewhat subjective.

Proposed Action(s):

We are always looking for new and improved ideas for how to promote critical thinking for all students in the classroom and through assignments. We will continue to dedicate time, once a semester, to check in with faculty and see how they are doing and what new ideas may be brewing regarding assessing critical thinking in General Psychology courses.

Was Proposed Action from Previous Cycle Effective? (Y/N)
Yes, the new assessment assignment was effective. As a faculty we conceived of these assessments and agreed on their use; however, we continue to encourage new ideas for assessing critical thinking and will continue to try new things in an effort to continuously improve.
Yes, faculty involvement was up this past cycle.

Detailed Explanation:
We will stay abreast of current trends in applied psychology regarding critical thinking as well as methods for assessing critical thinking. And, we will meet once per semester, as a faculty, to share practices, provide

mentoring for each other, and check in on the assessment process as it pertains to General Psychology course level assessment and learning outcomes and this particular General Education Outcome:

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

Principles of Biology I (BIOL 1544):

Course Description: Principles of Biology is an introductory college level course that surveys various levels of organization from atoms to biomes. The course introduces students to basic principles that provide a background for understanding biological issues in society and a foundation for further study. Topics of study include the scientific method; the chemistry of life; cell structure & function, metabolism, cell reproduction, genetics, DNA structure & function, evolution, basic ecological principles.

Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2013 total	**38**	**860**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	30	674	
--Fall 2013 Online	8	186	
Fall 2014 total	**36**	**792**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	27	619	
--Fall 2014 Online	9	173	
Fall 2015 total	**36**	**764**	
--Fall 2015 Face to Face	25	562	
--Fall 2015 Online	11	202	
Fall 2016 total			
--Fall 2016 Face to Face	27	582	
--Fall 2016 Online	10	182	

Principles of Biology I Reporting for General Education Results					
Name of Person Completing Assessment: Matt Connior					
Department: Life Sciences					
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed				7	35
Total Number of Students Assessed				197	506
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed				33.8%	78%
Performance Target for Face to Face Students				70%	70%
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient				54.2%	75%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed				3.5%	85%
Performance Target for Online Students				70%	70%
Percentage of online Students Scoring Proficient					80%
Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):					

Critical thinking assessment where students were required to apply the scientific method to an experimental study. Students were required to develop a set of hypotheses, develop an experimental design (which included the independent and dependent variables), state which variables were held constant, and identify and correctly use lab equipment to design the experiment. This assessment was administered during the final exam time. Target performance was set at 70% or better.

Results and Analysis:

Face to face: 309 of 395 students (78%) achieved the target goal of 70% or better.

Online: 198 of 232 students (85%) achieved the target goal of 70% or better.

The Fall 2016 was the first implementation required for all sections of this critical thinking assessment. All sections should have been assessed; however, there were a few sections that were not assessed.

Strengths:

Overall, students were strong in the recognition and use of the lab equipment to design an experiment.

Weaknesses:

Overall, students had difficulty in correctly developing the hypotheses and identifying the independent and dependent variables. However, students simply reversed or switched the hypotheses or the variables when they were incorrect.

Proposed Action(s):

We will continue to require this assessment to be administered to every section of POB in the future. We also have manipulated the points so that students that switch or reverse the hypotheses and/or variables still get partial credit. We are also looking into implementing this assessment to be completed administered through blackboard. This will overall improve the target goal of achieving 70%.

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

Outcome 2: Students gain greater awareness of cultural perspectives.

Outcome Description: One of the traditional goals of a college education is to expand students' understanding of diverse ideas and attitudes. In America's pluralistic society, awareness of

cultural perspectives is essential. An important element of this understanding is recognition of one's own culture and the impact it has on one's perspective. Across the curriculum, students will be exposed to different cultural perspectives to enhance their ability to understand and interact with others.

Courses Selected for Assessment: ==SOCI 2013—General Sociology==; MUSI 1003—Music Appreciation; PHIL 2003—Introduction to Philosophy; PLSC 2003—American National Government

Sociology (SOCI 2013):				

Course Description: A general introduction to the basic concepts, theories, and perspectives of sociology. Topics include the nature of society and the foundations of social interaction and social life, including social groups, culture, social class, social institutions and social change. Emphasis is placed on current research in sociology, globalization, diversity and multiculturalism.

Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2013 total			
--Fall 2013 Face to Face			
--Fall 2013 Online			
Fall 2014 total			
--Fall 2014 Face to Face			
--Fall 2014 Online			
Fall 2015 total	**7**	**175**	
--Fall 2015 Face to Face	5	135	
--Fall 2015 Online	2	40	
Fall 2016 total	**7**	**132**	
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			
--Fall 2016 Online			

Sociology Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Lenora Sotlar Clouse

Department: Behavioral Sciences

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed				7	7
Total Number of Students Assessed				137	132
Percentage of Total Students Assessed				76%	132

Performance Target for Face to Face Students				50%	95%
Average Face to Face Students Score **				83%	50%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed				83%	89.5%
Performance Target for Online Students				50%	95%
Average of Online Students score				79%	50%
Percentage of Online Students Scoring Proficient					77%

Means of Assessment (Method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

The sociology faculty have agreed to use one of two assessment mechanisms. One involves reading Horace Miner's *Body Ritual Among the Nacirema* and then write a paper examining a cultural practice that may appear commonplace to us but is viewed differently by others. The other option involves an assignment detailing and examination of the Health Care System as it pertains to cultural practices within the institution of medicine.

Results and Analysis:

Strengths:

Students achieved the performance goal.

Weaknesses:

The assignment is not always enjoyable for the student and not all faculty agree on the mechanism to be used to assess awareness of cultural perspectives.

Proposed Action(s):

Continue to encourage faculty participation and encourage the production of new ideas for assessment mechanisms. One idea that was proposed during faculty discussions this cycle was to use an alternative method for assessing cultural awareness (possibly in addition to the previous method) in which students are observed and evaluated by the instructor and peers before, during, and after participating in role plays designed to heighten cultural awareness. The idea is that they will look at growth in cultural awareness throughout the course, beyond simply whether it is there or not during the time of the assessment.

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

American National Government (PLSC 2003):
Course Description: The organization, functions, institutions, and problems of the federal government will be studied including the United States Constitution, Congress, the Presidency and federal bureaucracy, and the judicial system. Additional study will be given to political parties, public opinion, interest groups, voting and elections, Supreme Court decisions, and other political aspects and activities of government.

Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	

Fall 2014 total	**17**	**334**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	12	233	
--Fall 2014 Online	5	101	
Fall 2015 total			
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			
Spring 2016 total	4	52	
Spring 2016 Face to Face	4	52	
Spring 2016 Online			
Fall 2016 total	**7**	**75**	
--Fall 2016 Face to Face	7	75	
--Fall 2016 Online			

American National Government Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment:

Department:

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed				4	7
Total Number of Students Assessed				52	75
Percentage of Total Students Assessed					
Performance Target for Face to Face Students				70%	70%
Average Face to Face Students Score **				84.6%	92%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed					
Performance Target for Online Students					
Average of Online Students score					

Means of Assessment (Method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):
Diversity Assessment, Matching Test, Multiple Choice

Results and Analysis:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Proposed Action(s):

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y					

Course Name and Course Number/Code: MUSIC APPRECIATION, MUSI 1003

Course Description: A general survey of the art of music and its Western European historical roots.

Enrollment Data

Term	Number of Sections	Number of Students
Spring 2016	**11**	**220**

Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: STEVE COOPER					
Department: PERFORMING & VISUAL ARTS; MUSIC					
Terms:	SP 16				
Total Number of Sections Assessed	11				
Total Number of Students Assessed	55				
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	65%				
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	80%				
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	68%				
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	36%				
Performance Target for Online Students	80				
Percentage of Online Students Scoring Proficient	85%				

Means of Assessment (Method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):
Random selection of 5 student scores on similar research/writing projects were chosen from each section of the course.
A grade of B (80%) was chosen arbitrarily as the target for this assessment.

Results and Analysis:
A higher percentage of students (85%) reached the target mark of a B (80%) on the project than did the face-to-face students (68%). Overall, a significant portion of the students (74%) reached the target mark of B (80%) on the project.

Strengths: Overall grade distribution on the projects was strong, with only 4 of 55 students failing the project.

Weaknesses: A difference between online and face-to-face success was noted.

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Yes
The target score of 80 was reached by 74% of the student projects that were examined.

Proposed Action(s): Monitor difference in future terms between online and face-to-face methodology.	
Was Proposed Action from Previous Cycle Effective? (Y/N) Detailed Explanation:	

Outcome 3: Students can write clear, coherent, well-organized documents, which are substantially free of errors.

Outcome Description:

Course Selected for Assessment: ENGL 1013 – Composition I; BIOL 2214 – Anatomy and Physiology; ENGL 63

Anatomy and Physiology I (BIOL 2214):		
Course Description: The first of two courses examining basic human anatomy and fundamentals of human physiology. Topics covered include an overview of body organization, tissues, the integument, skeletal, muscular, nervous and endocrine systems. Three hours lecture and three hours lab weekly.		
Enrollment Data		
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*
Fall 2013 total	**11**	**238**
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	11	238
--Fall 2013 Online	0	0
Fall 2014 total	**15**	**353**
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	15	353
--Fall 2014 Online	0	0
Fall 2015 total	**14**	**347**
--Fall 2015 Face to Face	10	256
--Fall 2015 Online	4	91
Fall 2016 total		
--Fall 2016 Face to Face		
--Fall 2016 Online		
Anatomy and Physiology I Reporting for General Education Results		
Name of Person Completing Assessment: Daryl Lancaster & Carey Chaney		
Department: Science		

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	
Total Number of Sections Assessed		4	6	NA	
Total Number of Students Assessed	206	59	106		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	100	53	31		
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	70	70	70		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	89	97	75		
Percentage of Online Students Assessed		47	49		

| Performance Target for Online Students | | 70 (64% proficient) | 70 (78% proficient) | | |

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

Anatomy and Physiology faculty are currently developing a common rubric for evaluating information literacy writing assignments. Tentative "in progress" rubric is below and is subject to change:

Information Literacy rubric

Student Learning Outcomes: Students completing this course will:

- Recall and apply facts, vocabulary and relationships consistent with courses taught nationally.
- Use scientific reasoning to comprehend, evaluate and solve problems pertaining to course content.
- **<u>Locate and use information sources to further their knowledge of anatomy, physiology and health.</u>**
- Identify select anatomical structures on laboratory specimens.
- Properly use microscopes, lab instrumentation and techniques to study human structure and function.

"one size fits all Information literacy rubric

Info Literacy outcome	Full points (4)	Majority points (3)	Half credit (2)	Minimal credit (1)	No credit
Students can locate the information requested	All information is provided	Not all, but more than half of the information is provided	About half of the information is provided	Less than half of the information is provided	None of the information is provided
Students can use the number of different sources requested	The full number are used and perhaps more	Not all but more than half the number are used	About half of the number are used	Less than half of the number are used	No sources are used
Student use sources that are appropriate	All are appropriate	Not all but more than half are appropriate	About half are appropriate	Less than half are appropriate	None are appropriate
Student list their sources in the format requested	All are listed in the format requested	Not all, but more than half are listed in the format requested	About half are listed in the format requested	Less than half are listed in the format requested	None are listed in the format requested
Students cite sources in the format requested	All are cited properly	Not all but more than half are cited properly	About half are cited properly	Less than half are cited properly	None are cited properly

Results and Analysis:

Strengths:

None, since this assessment is still under development.
Weaknesses:
Proposed Action(s): Discontinued assessment for 2016. Exploring a tool to evaluate information literacy, a general education outcome listed on the standard course outline for the course
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): NA

English Composition I (ENGL 1013): <mark>IN TRACDAT</mark>					
Course Description: Guiding the student through the process of writing with regular practice and analysis of effective writing, this first course of the composition sequence emphasizes the writing of clear, concise, developed academic prose. Generally students are expected to follow the rules of Standard Edited English, to understand paragraph development, and to write a research assignment involving the integration of sources.					
Enrollment Data					
Term	*Number of Sections*		*Number of Students*		
Fall 2012 total	**93**		**1698**		
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	83		1530		
--Fall 2012 Online	10		168		
Fall 2013 total	**75**		**1430**		
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	64		1218		
--Fall 2013 Online	11		212		
Fall 2014 total	**96**		**1846**		
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	82		1599		
--Fall 2014 Online	14		247		
Fall 2015 total	**35**		**75**		
--Fall 2015 Face to Face					
--Fall 2015 Online					
Spring 2016 total	**46**		**100**		
--Spring 2016 Face to Face	40				
--Spring 2016 Online	20 (20 ECE)				
English Composition Reporting for General Education Results					
Name of Person Completing Assessment: Jacqueline Jones					
Department: English					

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	61	60	50	35	46
Total Number of Students Assessed	120	120	129	75	100
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	21%	21%	21%	21%	100%

Performance Target for Face to Face Students	3.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	79%	93%	88%	86%	82%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	12%	Not available	Not available		
Performance Target for Online Students	2.0 on holistic rubric	Not available	Not available		

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

Writing Assignment. In each section of ENGL 1013, faculty members collected the last set of multi-source papers written by students. The papers from each set were read and scored by three assessors and were scored using the holistic rubric. The three scores for each essay were then averaged. The assessors for 2015-1016 were Dr. Lindsay Hutton, Lorraind Bach, and Mary Angelino.

Writing Outcome	Students can write clear, coherent, well-organized documents, which are substantially free of errors.
Proficient 3	These papers focus on a central idea, a thesis, and support that position with moderate elaboration and explanation based on research. Organization is generally clear. A competency with language is apparent, even though there may be some errors in mechanics, usage, or sentence structure. A variety of reliable, relevant and scholarly information resources appropriate to assignment are selected. The sources are consistently cited via assigned style guide with occasional errors.
Adequate 2	These papers focus on a central idea, a thesis, and support that position, but with some elaboration or evidence. Organization is clear enough to follow without difficulty. A control of language is apparent, even though there may be numerous in mechanics, usage, or sentence structure. Mostly reliable and relevant information resources appropriate to assignment are selected. The sources are generally cited via assigned style guide, although there may be numerous technical errors.
Inadequate 1	These papers are unfocused, have minimal support, and/or lack clear movement or connectedness. There is a pattern of errors in mechanics, usage, or sentence structure that significantly interferes with the understanding of the writer's ideas. Sources are selected with minimal regard for reliability (e.g. websites lacking evidence of authoritative scholarship or substantiated claims). Sources are cited with minimal regard to assigned style guide or not cited.

Results and Analysis:

With average score of 2.4 (2.35) on the 3.0 scale, the assessed papers were well above the 2.0 benchmark. 82% of students scored within or above the adequate range on the scale. The following chart indicates the average scores of the 100 papers assessed.

2014-2015	Students compose focused, coherent, and developed writing. Students adopt voice, style, and tone appropriate to the rhetorical situation. Students control surface features such as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.
Assessment Scores	2.4 (2.35)
Percentile Breakdown	3-2.6 = 29 (29%) 2.5-2 = 53 (53%)

	1.9-1.6 = 16 (16%) 1.5-1 = 2 (2%)	

Strengths:
- Students understand the concept of moving from the broad to the specific (beginning with a general, tone/context setting statement, then moving into topic background, and toward the specific argument/thesis).
- Students understand the need for a thesis and recognized that they must provide evidence and/or their opinions need to be "backed up" with "facts" from sources.
- Students succeed in organizing essays and creating effective paragraph coherency. Structures are fairly clear and correspond to genre expectations.
- Students are able to locate credible and relevant sources to support their ideas.
- Students are aware of the convention of citing sources / presenting quotes or information from sources into their writing.
- Students are capable of correctly formatting papers and citing sources in MLA style.

Weaknesses:

FY 2012
Thesis statements were often fixtures in the introduction rather than statements of original ideas; support of the thesis was occasionally disjointed or overly reliant of logical appeals; conclusions occasionally failed to show critical engagement with the topic or give the paper a sense of completeness; and students often summarize the sources rather than connect the information concretely to the thesis.

FY 2013
Student need improvement in the following areas: development of the idea itself, applying the five-paragraph structure in more complicated organizational structures, use of floating quotations, thinking-on-the-page (analysis, explanation, and exploration), incorporating source information into the context of students' own discussions.

FY 2014
Some of the essays met the requirement minimally without really exploring the topic. In some cases, students did not move past initial invitation of a subject-little to no depth. Students seek mostly to engage that information or those opinions that support or bolster their opinion. They do not spend much time investigating, engaging, questioning, ruminating, discussing, illuminating, probing, doubting, or otherwise thinking about conflicting points of view or pieces of information.   Along this same line, students do not generally develop ideas past a relatively "safe" position. Reluctance to take intellectual risk. Students need to incorporate quotations into sentences. Sources listed were at times only loosely or superficially connected, or unilateral as a group, and these are areas for improvement.

FY 2015
Students begin so broadly that it weakens the argument. Students are often stuck in a basic pattern of discussion that does not move beyond a "what sources say" mentality and into their own in-depth discussion of a topic. They do not seem to fully understand how to add to, challenge, analyze, or further the information so that it advances collective knowledge on the subject. They seem to either find passages that agree with their position, report them as fact, and then move on, or they find passages they outright disagree with, then use them to negate the opposing perspectives. Students demonstrate difficulty in synthesizing sources including integration of writer's own ideas. Students view quotes as facts.

Proposed Action(s):

Proposed Action(s):
- Instructors should make "library research day" a priority. In Comp I, students should be introduced to the library, its resources (both in person and on its website), and should meet a librarian. Instructors should have librarians come to class for a day to help students with research. If class time is allotted for this, students will be more likely to spend time researching (vs. outside of class where they're less likely to conduct research) and will learn to find and distinguish between reliable and unreliable sources.
- Instructors should ask students to take the paper in steps that are centered on its process and assign activities that will build and layer on critical thinking skills. Instructors should consider building in short conferences to cover partial or entire rough drafts.
- Instructors should vary the "controversial" issues Comp I students are allowed to write about; or, at least, have them explore a new/interesting spin on a divisive issue. Many of the "death penalty", "abortion", "legalizing marijuana" papers used the same sources; this may influence students to plagiarize from each other or steal papers from the web.
- When presented with assignments that appear to have *strict* structures or structural guidelines, students have more success establishing a voice of authority. Two assignments stood out in this regard: one asks students to create a dialogue between people on opposing sides of an issue, the other asks students for an argument synthesis—the students had an issue and two arguments (one for each "side")—and the student had to summarize both arguments, weight them, and argue for one of them, joining his/her ideas with the other writer's ideas. Both of these assignments had clear "moves" or restrictions in form. And, in both cases, the student writers excelled in creating an authoritative voice.
- Students overall comprehension and use of their sources Overall comprehension and use of sources increased significantly if students completed an annotated bibliography. (Some Annotated Bibliographies were included with the submissions instead of a Works Cited. If the Annotated Bibliographies were omitted, the essays would no longer have works cited entries.) The committee recommends activities such as annotated bibliographies in the brainstorming and revision stages that help students move out of their comfort zone in regards to considering the viewpoints of others and critically examining their own logic.
- Instructors should seek out models that demonstrated effective techniques in order to foster discussions and lessons on the power of language, prose, and authority of voice. The committee believes that models should be dissected and discussed in chunks and paired with in-class activities versus attempting to dissect and discuss the models in their entirety and then pairing with in-classes activities. Chunking class-time will keep students focused on the rhetorical techniques and moves.
- Instructors should encourage students to attend Writing Center workshops and utilize the various consultation methods, and instructors and students can set up a Writing Center referral in Success Planner for specific concerns or practice.
- As a department, continue to collect and share resources, innovative assignments and activities, games, handouts, etc. related to writing.

Proposed Action Completion Date: May 2017

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

Intermediate Writing (ENGL 63):			
Course Description: The study and practice of sentence structure rules, critical thinking skills, writing as a step-by-step process, and basic grammar. Students will learn to express ideas and opinions in clear, organized paragraphs and essays. Students will also learn and use word processing as it applies to academic writing. Successful completion allows a student to enter English Composition I.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	

Fall 2012 total	**17**	**352**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	16	330	
--Fall 2012 Online	1	22	
Fall 2013 total	**30**	**575**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	29	559	
--Fall 2013 Online	1	16	
Fall 2014 total	**32**	**575**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	31	556	
--Fall 2014 Online	1	19	
Fall 2015 total			
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			
Fall 2016 total			
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			
--Fall 2016 Online			

Intermediate Writing Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Curtis Harrell

Department: English

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	Course not assessed due to major curriculum change	19	16		
Total Number of Students Assessed	NA	265	360		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	NA	59%	69%		
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	NA	70% submit a passing portfolio	70% submit a passing portfolio		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	NA	88%	87%		
Percentage of online Students Assessed	NA	53%	70%		
Performance Target for Online Students	NA	70% submit passing portfolio	70% submit a passing portfolio		
Percentage of Online Student Scoring Proficient	NA	86%	79%		
Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):					

Results and Analysis:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Proposed Action(s):

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

Outcome 4: Students can read selections at the college level.

Outcome Description: Students can describe the main ideas and supporting ideas in their reading. Students can evaluate written materials objectively.

Course Selected for Assessment: HIST 2003 – History of the American People to 1877; HIST 1033 – World Civilizations to 1500; ENGL 2213 – Survey of World Literature to 1650; READ 33 – College Reading

Survey of World Literature to 1650 (ENGL 2213):

Course Description: Students in this course read the oldest of literatures. Typically the course includes the generally accepted literary masterpieces of western culture. While such literature is removed from the student's experience by time, history, and culture, its ties to contemporary life are more compelling than its differences. These issues are frequently addressed as the student learns to read, interpret, and analyze this literature.

Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2012 total	**13**	**193**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	8	102	
--Fall 2012 Online	5	91	
Fall 2013 total	**13**	**190**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	8	107	
--Fall 2013 Online	5	83	
Fall 2014 total	**11**	**188**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	7	110	
--Fall 2014 Online	4	78	
Fall 2015 total	**5**	**76**	
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			
Fall 2016 total			
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			
--Fall 2016 Online			

World Literature to 1650 Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Jacqueline Jones & Curtis Harrell

Department: English

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	Course not assessed		5	5	
Total Number of Students Assessed	NA		76	76	
Percentage of Total Students Assessed	NA		100%	100%	
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	NA	4.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	Exceed 2.0 on holistic rubric	
Average Face to Face Students Score **	NA			100%	
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	NA		100 %	100%	
Performance Target for Online Students	NA	4.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	Exceed 2.0 on holistic rubric	
Average of Online Students score				100%	

Means of Assessment (Method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

At the end of the term, assigned faculty have students write a 2 page reflective narrative in response to the following prompt:

Write a two-page reflection discussing what you learned about the culture in one or more of the texts we read this semester. You might consider what you found surprising? interesting? troubling? amusing? challenging? familiar? OR unusual?

The papers from each set were read and scored by a department assigned assessor and scored using the rubric below.

	Criteria
Exceeds Expectation 3	Directly addresses the key concept introduced in the writing prompt, evinces a sophisticated understand of its salient features and their various cultural manifestations, and offers an insightful or comprehensive understanding of its historical or cultural significance. Accurately relate the text references in the writing prompt to multipole contextual differences dimensions, including the history, polity, and/or social structure of the culture that produces it. Marshals multiple, well-chosen and specific textual references to support its claims and offers fresh and/or subtle insights that do more than reflect classroom discussion.
Meets Expectation 2	Clearly addresses the key concept but may demonstrate an incomplete or partially inaccurate understanding of its defining characteristics and/or a vague understanding of it historical or cultural significance. Accurately relates the text referenced in the writing prompt to at least one dimension of the culture that produced it. Supports claims with textual references, but these references may be vague, limited in number, or merely reflective of classroom discussion.
Fails to Meet Expectation 1	May fail to address the key concept raised in the writing prompt; it may fail to identify or incorrectly identify its defining characteristics; it may fail to demonstrate an understating of the concept's historical or cultural significance. May fail to address the cultural context in which the text was produced and read; may fail to address the context in sufficient detail; may make inaccurate or unsupported claims about the work's cultural context. Provides few and/or inaccurate references to the text; connections made between the concept and text are rudimentary or too poorly expressed to evaluate.

Results and Analysis:

2213 Results/Fall 2014	Number	Avg		
Face to Face	61	2.5		
Online	15	2.0		
Overall	78	2.4		

Strengths:

Learning outcome clearly demonstrates student learning in this course

Weaknesses:

Assessment tool will be re-designed to more specifically demonstrate student learning.
Lack of consistency in plan for the administration of the assessment tool.

Proposed Action(s):

1. Communicate to the Assessment Committee that the General Learning Outcome for Reading is inappropriate for this course
2. Change the assessment tool: Re-write the essay prompt to include all three course outcomes
   a. Students identify characteristics, elements, and literary devices of major genres and movements from ancient times to 1650.
   b. Students demonstrate reading comprehension and critical thinking through class discussion and projects.
   c. Students relate their own experiences to social and cultural issues raised in class and the texts.
3. Develop a more consistent plan for the administration of the assessment tool. Some students are completing it as a timed, in-class assignment, but others are completing it as a take home assignment.
4. Assign World Literature faculty to a single departmental peer group.
5. Share results with World Literature faculty.

Proposed Action Completion Date:

1. Item 1: Fall 2015
2. Item 2: Fall 2016 assessment
3. Item 3: Fall 2016 assessment
4. Item 3: Fall 2015
Item 4: Spring 2016, meeting with literature faculty

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

History of the American People to 1877 (HIST 2003):			
Course Description: Exploration of aspects in American history beginning with European backgrounds; discovery and settlement; concluding with the Civil War and Reconstruction. This survey encompasses the constitutional, political, social and economic development of the United States prior to 1877.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2012 total	**23**	**445**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	16	338	
--Fall 2012 Online	7	107	
Fall 2013 total	**18**	**368**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	13	256	
--Fall 2013 Online	5	112	
Fall 2014 total	**20**	**332**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	12	215	
--Fall 2014 Online	8	117	
Fall 2015 total			
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			
Fall 2016 total			
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			

--Fall 2016 Online			

History of the American People to 1877 Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment:					
Department:					
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed					
Total Number of Students Assessed					
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed					
Performance Target for Face to Face Students					
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	70%				
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	82%				
Performance Target for Online Students					

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

Results and Analysis:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Proposed Action(s):

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N):

College Reading (READ 33):			
Course Description: An upper level reading course designed to help students gain skills they can apply to college textbook and everyday reading requirements. Vocabulary, comprehension, and thinking and study strategies are emphasized along with an introduction to the library. Successful completion allows entry into reading-intensive college level studies.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2012 total	**12**	**252**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	12	252	
--Fall 2012 Online	0	0	
Fall 2013 total	**10**	**230**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	10	230	

--Fall 2013 Online	0	0	
Fall 2014 total	**15**	**299**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	15	299	
--Fall 2014 Online	0	0	
Fall 2015 total			
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			
Fall 2016 total			
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			
--Fall 2016 Online			

College Reading Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Curtis Harrell

Department: English

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	Course not assessed	15	15	13	
Total Number of Students Assessed	N/A	194	218	213	
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	N/A	Not available	74%	94%	
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	N/A	Test score of 70	70%	70% on post-test	
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	N/A	38%	69%	73%	
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Performance Target for Online Students	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

Fall 2015

Students were given the nationally-administered Aplia Diagnostic Reading Exam at the beginning and end of the semester. This exam measures benchmarked reading performance in the following areas: Understanding Structure/Main Ideas and Supporting Details, Patterns of Organization, Word Knowledge, and Critical Reading Comprehension Skills.

Results and Analysis:

Fall 2015

73% of students scored at proficiency level on the Aplia post-test students' averaged scores.

Strengths:

Fall 2015

Using the Aplia pre- and post-test diagnostic exam continues to be the preferred assessment instrument for this course.

Weaknesses:

Fall 2015

Use more of the pre-test results as a diagnostic tool for enhancing curriculum.

Proposed Action(s):
Fall 2015 The Aplia pre-and post-test diagnostic exam is comprehensive in its assessment of reading strategies and accurately benchmarked. Reading instructors utilized diagnostics for supplemental instruction referrals individualized to each student's specific skill deficiencies. Overall, this resulted in an increased course success rate more than 10% higher than previous semesters. As a result of the assessment findings from this semester, the higher threshold of reading students were identified as needing less remediation. Fall 2016 plans include identifying this higher threshold of students through diagnostics earlier and reducing their remedial requirements from a three hour course instead to a one hour supplemental reading course that pairs in a co-requisite model with English Composition I. Additional proposed actions for Fall 2016 include more thorough use of the pre-test initial diagnostics to individualize student remediation requirements and instruction using the targeted supplemental instruction in order to lessen any unnecessary remediation burden for students who can be successful in a co-requisite model.
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

World Civilizations to 1500 (HIST 1033):			
Course Description: This survey of World Civilizations offers students a global and comparative perspective on the emergence and development of civilizations to 1500.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2012 total	**11**	**264**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	8	197	
--Fall 2012 Online	3	67	
Fall 2013 total	**10**	**226**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	7	158	
--Fall 2013 Online	3	68	
Fall 2014 total	**9**	**217**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	6	155	
--Fall 2014 Online	3	62	
Fall 2015 total			
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			
Fall 2016 total			
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			
--Fall 2016 Online			
World Civilizations to 1500 Reporting for General Education Results			
Name of Person Completing Assessment:			
Department:			

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed					

Total Number of Students Assessed					
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed					
Performance Target for Face to Face Students					
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	70%				
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	100%				
Performance Target for Online Students					
Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):					
Results and Analysis:					
Strengths:					
Weaknesses:					
Proposed Action(s):					
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N):					

Outcome 5: Students develop effective oral communication skills.

Outcome Description: A college graduate should be able to speak effectively. Most NWACC students will develop public speaking skills to inform and persuade others. Some professional program students will focus on interpersonal communication skills essential in performing job-related duties. All students should have opportunities to improve their oral communication skills across the curriculum through class presentations and small group activities.

Courses Selected for Assessment: COMM 1303—Public Speaking; OSIM 1103—Business Communications

Business Communications (OSIM 1103):
Course Description: A presentation of the principles of effective oral and written communications. Provides a discussion of verbal and nonverbal communication, resume and interview preparation, business letter writing, dictation skills, business reports, presentations and case studies.
Enrollment Data

Term	Number of Sections		Number of Students	
Fall 2012 total	**3**		**48**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	2		21	
--Fall 2012 Online	1		27	
Fall 2013 total	**3**		**41**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	2		18	
--Fall 2013 Online	1		23	
Fall 2014 total	**2**		**31**	
--Fall 2014Face to Face	1		8	
--Fall 2014 Online	1		23	
Fall 2015 total	**3**		**44**	
--Fall 2015 Face to Face	2		21	
--Fall 2015 Online	1		23	
Fall 2016 total	**3**		**49**	
--Fall 2016 Face to Face	1		13	
--Fall 2016 Online	2		36	

Business Communications Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment:

Department:

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	3	3	2	3	3
Total Number of Students Assessed	45	38	31	44	49
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	82%	83.8%	75%	71%	92%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Performance Target for Online Students	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project	50% of students should be proficient on capstone project
Percentage of Online students scoring proficient				57%	78%

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

Students that did not withdraw or were not considered "FA" were assessed through their capstone presentation. The assessment instrument is a multi-tiered project which includes an oral presentation. The presentation is

evaluated on content, delivery and use of technology. This is the first presentation opportunity for business students.

Results and Analysis: Fall 2011: 56% of face to face students were proficient; 90% of online students were proficient Fall 2012: 82% of face to face students were proficient; 88% of online students were proficient Fall 2013: 83.8% of face to face students were proficient: 91% of online students were proficient Fall 2014: Fall 2015: 71% of F2F students were proficient, while 57% of online students were proficient. Fall 2016: 92% of F2F students were proficient, while 78% of online students were proficient. All performance targets were met for this objective and course.
Strengths: Students have consistently met the proficiency and average goals for this assessment. The assignment and assessments are designed for a student who has perhaps never made a lengthy presentation on an in-depth topic before. (20 minutes) The students are assessed on delivery, content and use of technology. After this course students should be prepared for more in-depth presentations and for Junior/Senior level strategy presentations.
Weaknesses: 2015--Recent downward trends suggest students are not a prepared to make presentations. More opportunities have been added to the curriculum in key core courses. Assessments indicate some improvement in presentation skills in 2016-17.
Proposed Action(s):   More opportunities have been added to the curriculum in key core courses to allow students the opportunity to better develop presentation skills throughout the business programs.

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y	

Public Speaking (COMM 1303):		
Course Description: Application of the communication techniques needed to organize and deliver oral messages in a public setting.		
Enrollment Data		
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*
Fall 2011 total	**43**	**879**
--Face to Face	29	652
--Online	14	227
Fall 2012 total	**38**	**775**

--Face to Face	27	604
--Online	11	171
Fall 2013 total	**36**	**796**
--Face to Face	26	586
--Online	10	210
Spring 2014 total	36	627
--Face to Face	26	497
--Online	10	130
Spring 2015 total	**42**	**821**
--Face to Face	28	607
--Online	14	214
Spring 2016 total	**41**	**823**
-Face to Face	27	616
-Online	14	207

Public Speaking Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Marc Turner

Department: Communication

	AY 2012	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Total Number of Sections Assessed	Course did not exist	Course did not exist	24	26
Total Number of Students Assessed	N/A	N/A	336	246
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	N/A	N/A	70%	30%
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	N/A	N/A	70% will score a satisfactory (70%) or better on each competency of the informative speech rubric.	70% will score a satisfactory (70%) or better on each competency of the informative speech rubric
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	N/A	N/A	82%	81%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	N/A	N/A	70%	90%
Performance Target for Online Students	N/A	N/A	70% will score a satisfactory (70%) or better on each competency of the informative speech rubric.	70% will score a satisfactory (70%) or better on each competency of the informative speech rubric

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

NCA-Informative Speech Rubric

Results and Analysis:

AY 2014

Competency One: 76% -Speech Topic	Competency Six: 83% - Language
Competency Two: 83% -Thesis Statement	Competency Seven: 79%- Paralanguage
Competency Three: 80% - Supporting Material	Competency Eight: 70%- Articulation
Competency Four: 72% - Cites Sources	Competency Nine: 82% -Body Movement
Competency Five 85% - Speech Organization	Competency Ten: 84% - Engages audience

AY 2015

Competency One: 79%	Competency Six: 80%
Competency Two: 85%	Competency Seven: 81%
Competency Three: 76%	Competency Eight: 72%
Competency Four: 71%	Competency Nine: 79%
Competency Five: 88%	Competency Ten: 81%

AY 2016

Competency One: 83%	Competency Six: 79%
Competency Two: 77%	Competency Seven: 77%
Competency Three: 81%	Competency Eight: 74%
Competency Four: 74%	Competency Nine: 76%
Competency Five: 81%	Competency Ten: 80%

Strengths:

AY 2014

Speech structure: effective introductions, transitions, and conclusions.

Meeting time constraints, citing sources

AY 2015

Thesis statement, speech organization, language, body movement, engaging audience

AY2016

Speech topic, supporting material, speech organization, engaging audience

Weaknesses:

AY 2014

Speech topic, citing sources, paralanguage, articulation

AY 2015

Supporting material, citing sources, articulation, body movement

AY 2016

Thesis statement, citing sources, language, paralanguage, articulation, body language

Proposed Action(s):

AY 2014

Continue with informative speech rubric. Possibly use post-test next assessment.

Faculty shared exercises for meeting time constraints and citing sources.

AY 2015

Continue with informative speech rubric.

AY 2016

Actions not presented
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y
AY 2014-Y
AY 2015-Y
AY 2016-Y

Outcome 6: Students can achieve mathematical literacy.

Outcome Description: College graduates should be able to understand and use numerical relationships and basic analysis of data in their roles as consumers, citizens, scholars, and professionals. Graduates should possess the computational, algebraic and quantitative skills necessary to solve problems and evaluate complex situations.

Courses Selected for Assessment: MATH 1204—College Algebra; MATH 1003—Math for AAS General Education; MATH 53—Beginning Algebra; CHEM 1104—College Chemistry I

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4" align="center">College Chemistry (CHEM 1104):</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Course Description: The first course of a two-semester sequence designed to provide background for further study in such majors as pre-agriculture, pre-professional, prescience, pre-engineering or mathematics. The course provides an introduction to the study of inorganic, organic, analytical, and physical chemistry from a more concentrated viewpoint than offered in CHEM 1024. Three hours lecture and three hours laboratory weekly.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4" align="center">Enrollment Data</td></tr>
<tr><td><i>Term</i></td><td><i>Number of Sections</i></td><td><i>Number of Students</i></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Fall 2013 total</td><td>11</td><td>200</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>--Fall 2013 Face to Face</td><td>11</td><td>200</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>--Fall 2013 Online</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Fall 2014 total</td><td>10</td><td>182</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>--Fall 2014 Face to Face</td><td>10</td><td>182</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>--Fall 2014 Online</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Fall 2015 total</td><td>10</td><td>176</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>--Fall 2015 Face to Face</td><td>10</td><td>176</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>--Fall 2015 Online</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Fall 2016 total</td><td>11</td><td>175</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>--Fall 2016 Face to Face</td><td>175</td><td>175</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>--Fall 2016 Online</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4" align="center">College Chemistry Reporting for General Education Results</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Name of Person Completing Assessment:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Department:</td></tr>
</table>

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	8	9	10	10	11
Total Number of Students Assessed	132	140	159	176	175

Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	73.7%	78.1%	79.9%	80.7%	67%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Performance Target for Online Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

15 Multiple choice questions which involved 3 questions directly related to mathematical literacy. These questions required students to evaluate written problems then utilize algebraic skills and a scientific calculator to solve scientific problems. These questions were asked at the end of the semester as either a separate assessment or as part of the final exam. Target performance for the composite performance for all three questions is 70% or better.

Results and Analysis:

Students can achieve mathematical literacy. (Q2, Q6, Q7)	Fall 2014 #Correct Student Responses	Fall 2014 %Correct Student Responses	Fall 2015 #Correct Student Responses	Fall 2015 %Correct Student Responses	Fall 2016 #Correct Student Responses	Fall 2016 %Correct Student Responses
Question 2	132	83.0%	151/176	85.8%	120/175	69%
Question 6	146	91.8%	160/176	90.9%	138/175	79%
Question 7	103	64.8%	115/176	65.3%	91/175	52%
Composite		79.9%	426/528	80.7%	349/525	67%

Fall 2016: Overall 67% of the students responded correctly on the three questions, which is a decrease compared to the previous 4 years that saw gradual increases.

Strengths:
Fall 2016: Students performed strongly in the areas of unit analysis and determining the number of moles, with 69% and 79% of students responding correctly in those respective areas. Of the 11 sections assessed, 9 sections showed students scored above the target for both questions.

Weaknesses:
Fall 2016: Students performed weakly in the area of stoichiometric calculations, with 52% responding correctly. Only 3 sections out of 9 scored at or above the target, showing that this skill needs reinforcement and practice.

Proposed Action(s):

Fall 2016: Continue to emphasize practice on stoichiometry through homework, quizzes, in-class practice, etc. to ensure students get additional exposure to the topic. Faculty can choose the method and whether it counts toward their grade.
Chemistry faculty would like to increase the number of mathematically-related questions from 3 up to 4 and possibly consider either a molarity or gas law calculation. We also discussed the idea of a 2-step calculation that involves higher-order thinking skills. Implementation of one or more discussed proposals will take place within the next 2 semesters.

Was Proposed Action from Previous Cycle Effective? (Y/N) **Fall 2016:** No, since we saw a dramatic drop from our 4 year improvement. Detailed Explanation: **Fall 2016:** Several CRNs seemed to have below typical performance and probably affected overall performance of all sections combined.	
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y	

College Algebra (MATH 1204):					
Course Description: An overview of the fundamental concepts of algebra. Topics include linear and quadratic equations and inequalities; the Cartesian plane and graphing using graphing utility functions, graphs and models; polynomial and rational functions; exponential and logarithmic functions; systems of equations, inequalities and matrices; and sequences and series. Computer assisted, WWW, or hybrid versions of this course may be offered in addition to the traditional format.					
Enrollment Data					
Term	*Number of Sections*		*Number of Students*		
Fall 2012 total	**70**		**1440**		
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	63		1293		
--Fall 2012 Online	7		147		
Fall 2013 total	**67**		**1333**		
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	7		1181		
--Fall 2013 Online	60		152		
Fall 2014 total	**71**		**1407**		
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	63		1277		
--Fall 2014 Online	8		130		
Fall 2015 total					
--Fall 2015 Face to Face					
--Fall 2015 Online					
Fall 2016 total					
--Fall 2016 Face to Face					
--Fall 2016 Online					
College Algebra Reporting for General Education Results					
Name of Person Completing Assessment:					
Department:					
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	70	67	67		
Total Number of Students Assessed	591	749	847		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	100% of A, B, C in Math 1204	100% of A, B, C in Math 1204	95% of A, B, C in Math 1204		
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	70%	70%	70%		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	*	44% of students met	56% of students met criteria		

		criteria on 67% or more outcomes	on 67% or more outcomes		
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	100% of A, B, C in Math 1204				
Performance Target for Online Students	70%	70%	70%		
Percentage of Online Students Scoring Proficient	*	51% of students met criteria on 67% or more outcomes	57% of students met criteria on 67% or more outcomes		
Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):					
Results and Analysis:					
Strengths:					
Weakness:					
Proposed Action(s):					
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N):					

Math for AAS General Education (MATH 1003):			
Course Description: This course is designed to meet the needs for a college level mathematics course for AAS programs. It is recommended that students intending to earn a baccalaureate degree take College Algebra. This course will include a review of basic arithmetic skills such as ratios, proportions, percents, and metric conversions focusing on applications of these topics. The primary focus of the course may include a variety of skills from areas such as financial mathematics, estimation, regression analysis, statistics, math history, and math as art. This is a very application oriented course with a project component and is designed to be flexible to accommodate the differing needs of people in various AAS programs. Some sections have a required EAST lab component to build team and technology skills. A WWW version of this course may be offered in addition to traditional format.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2012 total	**4**	**106**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	2	56	

--Fall 2012 Online	2		50	
Fall 2013 total	**7**		**172**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	3		81	
--Fall 2013 Online	4		91	
Fall 2014 total	**8**		**162**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	4		79	
--Fall 2014 Online	4		83	
Fall 2015 total				
--Fall 2015 Face to Face				
--Fall 2015 Online				
Fall 2016 total				
--Fall 2016 Face to Face				
--Fall 2016 Online				

Math for AAS General education Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment:

Department:

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	4	7	8		
Total Number of Students Assessed	50	97	102		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	100% of A, B, C in Math 1003	100% of A, B, C in Math 1003	100% of A, B, C in Math 1003		
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	70%	70%	70%		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	*	98	98		
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	100% of A, B, C in Math 1003	100% of A, B, C in Math 1003	100% of A, B, C in Math 1003		
Performance Target for Online Students	70%	70%	70%		
Percentage of Online Students Scoring Proficient	*	96	93		

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

Results and Analysis:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Proposed Action(s):

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N):

Beginning Algebra (MATH 53):			
Course Description: This developmental algebra course covers linear equations and inequalities, and quadratic equations, graphing lines in a plane, slope, exponential properties, polynomial operations, factoring, rational operations, and emphasizing interwoven problem solving. Computer assisted, WWW, and hybrid versions of this course may be offered in addition to the traditional format.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2012 total	**38**	**803**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	34	713	
--Fall 2012 Online	4	90	
Fall 2013 total	**33**	**792**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	29	696	
--Fall 2013 Online	4	96	
Fall 2014 total	**33**	**729**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	29	639	
--Fall 2014 Online	4	90	
Fall 2015 total			
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			
Fall 2016 total			
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			
--Fall 2016 Online			

Beginning Algebra Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment:

Department:

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	38	34	33		
Total Number of Students Assessed	413	373	377		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	100% of A, B, C in MATH 0053	100% of A, B, C in MATH 0053	100% of A, B, C in MATH 0053		
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	70%	70%	70%		
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	*	59%	53%		
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	100% of A, B, C in MATH 0053	100% of A, B, C in MATH 0053	100% of A, B, C in MATH 0053		
Performance Target for Online Students	70%	70%	70%		
Percentage of On line Students Scoring Proficient	*	65%	82%		

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):
Results and Analysis:
Strengths:
Weaknesses:
Proposed Action(s):
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N):

Outcome 7: Students can use computers proficiently.

Outcome Description: Because of society's increasing use of computer technology, college graduates must be able to use a computer. Employers are expecting computer skills in those they hire. For most students, proficiency means the ability to create, update and manipulate word-processing documents, spreadsheets, presentations, and databases. Students will be able to use email for communication and a browser to navigate the Internet. Other students will gain proficiency in specific computer applications related to their field of study.

Courses Selected for Assessment: CISQ 1103—Introduction to Computer Information Systems; ARHS 1003—Art Appreciation

Introduction to Computer Information Systems (CISQ 1103):		
Course Description: An orientation to the terminology and applications of computers and the Internet. Commercial software packages used will include Windows, word processing, spreadsheet, business presentations and database applications. This course will satisfy the hands-on computer requirements of most degree plans.		
Enrollment Data		
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*
Fall 2012 total	**32**	**717**
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	24	531
--Fall 2012 Online	8	186
Fall 2013 total	**31**	**690**
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	20	437
--Fall 2013 Online	11	253
Fall 2014 total	**32**	**599**

--Fall 2014 Face to Face	20	401
--Fall 2014 Online	12	198
Fall 2015 total	**27**	**491**
--Fall 2015 Face to Face	17	314
--Fall 2015 Online	10	177
Fall 2016 total	**23**	**418**
--Fall 2016 Face to Face	13	270
--Fall 2016 Online	10	148

Introduction to Computer Information Systems Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Davis

Department: BCIS Academic Assurance

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	32	31	32	27	23
Total Number of Students Assessed	425	649	628	391	418
Percentage of Total Students Assessed	NA	100%	100%	79%	48%
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	Average=70%; 50% Proficient	Average=70%; 50% Proficient	Average=70%; 50% Proficient	Average=70%; 50% Proficient	Average=70%; 50% Proficient
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient**	75%	58%	80%	62%	72%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	NA	NA	NA	NA	65%
Performance Target for Online Students	Average= 70%; 50% Proficient	Average= 70%; 50% Proficient	Average= 70%; 50% Proficient	Average= 70%; 50% Proficient	Average=70%; 50% Proficient
Percentage of Online Students Scoring Proficient				62%	59%

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

SAM assessment of Microsoft Office Word, Excel, PowerPoint and Access

Results and Analysis:
Fall 2011 Average: 85%; 69% of students were proficient
Fall 2012 Average: 87%; 75% of students were proficient
Fall 2013 Average: 100%; 57.95% were proficient
Fall 2014 Average: 100%; 80% were proficient
Spring 2015 Average: 71%, 62% of students were proficient.
Fall 2016 Average: 81% ; 59% of students were proficient in online classes.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

18% of students did not buy access to the assessment tool. The cost of the textbook and software has been over $225.

Many students elect not to take the assessment if they do not need the points, particularly on the last two sections.

Proposed Action(s):

Fall 2016—a new site-license tool is being tried to attempt to get more students access to the full learning environment.

Faculty are considering ways to make the assessment a mandatory part of the course.

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

Art Appreciation (ARHS 1003):			
Course Description: A general introduction to the visual arts. Lectures on art theory and an introduction to art history, plus demonstrations, films, slides, and field trips.			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2012 total	**20**	**419**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	7	166	
--Fall 2012 Online	13	253	
Fall 2013 total	**18**	**386**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	6	145	
--Fall 2013 Online	12	241	
Fall 2014 total	**18**	**338**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	7	149	
--Fall 2014 Online	11	189	
Fall 2015 total			
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			

Spring 2016 total				
--Spring 2016 Face to Face				
--Spring 2016 Online				

Art Appreciation Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Carol Cooper/Stephanie Lewis

Department: Art

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	20	21	23	14	
Total Number of Students Assessed	Pre-test 314 Post-test 213	Pre test141 Post-test 106	Exit Exam	210	
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	Not available	Not available	Not Available	100%	
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	Post-test: 80% achieve 70% or above on post-test	75% to score 70 or above	70% score 70 or above	70% will score 70% or better	
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	85%	73%	70%	66%	
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not Available	
Performance Target for Online Students	Not available	69%	73%	70% will score 70% or better	

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

FY 2015
Exit exam

Results and Analysis:

FY 2015
Only 66% of students scored 70% or above on the exit exam. Two sections were not assessed due to Blackboard glitch and instructor illness.

Strengths:

FY 2015
None Noted

Weaknesses:

FY 2015
Faculty identified assessing more than one outcome in an exit exam is not as effective in determining student learning. Faculty will re-examine the outcome(s) assessed, assessment tools, and revise as needed.

Proposed Action(s):	
Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y	

Outcome 8: Students can employ a variety of sources to locate, evaluate, and use information.

Outcome Description: In support of personal, professional, and academic goals, students should be able to recognize a need for information and locate it. They must then be able to effectively evaluate the reliability and relevance of that information.

Courses Selected for Assessment: ENGL 1023 – Composition II; DRAM 1003 – Introduction to Theatre

Introduction to Theatre (DRAM 1003):			
Course Description:			
Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2011 total	**4**	**90**	
--Fall 2011 Face to Face	2	46	
--Fall 2011 Online	2	44	
Fall 2012 total	**3**	**68**	
--Fall 2012 Face to Face	1	25	
--Fall 2012 Online	2	43	
Fall 2013 total	**4**	**83**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	1	25	
--Fall 2013 Online	3	58	
Fall 2014 total	**2**	**38**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	1	22	
--Fall 2014 Online	1	16	
Fall 2015 total	3	32	
--Fall 2015 Face to Face	3	32	
--Fall 2015 Online			
Fall 2016 total			
--Fall 2016 Face to Face			

--Fall 2016 Online				

Introduction to Theatre Reporting for General Education Results

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Ashley Edwards

Department: Theatre

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	4	3	2	3	
Total Number of Students Assessed	76	59	76	32	
Percentage of Total Students Assessed	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	80% achieve 3.5 on 5 pt. rubric	80% achieve 3.5 on 5 pt. rubric	80% achieve 3.5 on 5 pt. rubric	75% score 3.0 or higher on rubric	
Average Face to Face Students Score **	88%	84%	87%	82%	
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	
Performance Target for Online Students	80% achieve 3.5 on 5 pt. rubric	80% achieve 3.5 on 5 pt. rubric	80% achieve 3.5 on 5 pt. rubric	75% score 3.0 or higher on rubric	
Average of Online Students score				81%	

Means of Assessment (Method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):

Individual project

Students were assigned a play and developed a design concept to include scenery, lighting, costumes, and overall design.

Results and Analysis:

82% in face-to-face classes met the benchmark of 3.0
81% of online students met the benchmark of 3.0

Strengths:

Students demonstrate understanding of overall design concept and how all the elements of production must be consistent. Students demonstrate understanding of completing credible research on the background of a play.

Weaknesses:

Lack of theatre facilities to provide hands-on for students. Students lack a basic grasp of constructing elements of theatre for a production.

Proposed Action(s):

Continue with design assignment for assessment purposes.

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y

English Composition II (ENGL 1023):

Course Description: This course continues the writing; reading, research and critical thinking skills developed in Composition I. Students will write in multiple genres and gain further practice in the analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of complex texts.

Enrollment Data			
Term	*Number of Sections*	*Number of Students*	
Fall 2013 total	**33**	**710**	
--Fall 2013 Face to Face	23	497	
--Fall 2013 Online	10	213	
Fall 2014 total	**37**	**742**	
--Fall 2014 Face to Face	25	520	
--Fall 2014 Online	12	222	
Fall 2015 total			
--Fall 2015 Face to Face			
--Fall 2015 Online			
Spring 2016 total	**40**	**100**	
--Spring 2016 Face to Face	22		
--Spring 2016 Online	10 online (8 ECE)		

English Composition II Reporting for General Education Results					

Name of Person Completing Assessment: Jacqueline Jones

Department: English

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Total Number of Sections Assessed	29	34	50	37	40
Total Number of Students Assessed	120	120	129	75	100
Percentage of Face to Face Students Assessed	21%	20%	Unknown	Unknown	100%
Performance Target for Face to Face Students	3.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	
Percentage of Face to Face Students Scoring Proficient	80%	79%	88%	86%	83%
Percentage of Online Students Assessed	15%	20%	Unknown	Unknown	100%
Performance Target for Online Students	3.0 on holistic rubric	3.0 on holistic rubric	2.o on holistic rubric	2.0 on holistic rubric	
Percentage of Online Students Scoring Proficient					83%

Means of Assessment (method of selecting students and tool used for evaluation):
Writing Assignment. In each section of ENGL 1023, faculty members collected the last set of multi-source papers written by students. The papers from each set were read and scored by three assessors and were scored using

the rubric below. The three scores for each essay were then averaged. The assessors for 2015-2016 were Dr. Lindsay Hutton, Lorraine Bach, and Mary Angelino.

Writing Outcome	**Students can write clear, coherent, well-organized documents, which are substantially free of errors.**
Proficient 3	These papers focus on a central idea, a thesis, and support that position with moderate elaboration and explanation based on research. Organization is generally clear. A competency with language is apparent, even though there may be some errors in mechanics, usage, or sentence structure. A variety of reliable, relevant and scholarly information resources appropriate to assignment are selected. The sources are consistently cited via assigned style guide with occasional errors.
Adequate 2	These papers focus on a central idea, a thesis, and support that position, but with some elaboration or evidence. Organization is clear enough to follow without difficulty. A control of language is apparent, even though there may be numerous in mechanics, usage, or sentence structure. Mostly reliable and relevant information resources appropriate to assignment are selected. The sources are generally cited via assigned style guide, although there may be numerous technical errors.
Inadequate 1	These papers are unfocused, have minimal support, and/or lack clear movement or connectedness. There is a pattern of errors in mechanics, usage, or sentence structure that significantly interferes with the understanding of the writer's ideas. Sources are selected with minimal regard for reliability (e.g. websites lacking evidence of authoritative scholarship or substantiated claims). Sources are cited with minimal regard to assigned style guide or not cited.
Information Literacy Outcome	**Students can employ a variety of sources to locate, evaluate, and use information.**
Proficient 3	Student selects a variety of reliable and relevant sources appropriate to the rhetorical situation. Student effectively integrate sources into his or her prose. Student relies on information or perspectives for support, argue with or challenge information and perspectives, and/or actively engage information or perspectives in the process of idea formation and articulation. Student cites sources with occasional errors.
Developing 2	Student selects a limited number of reliable and relevant sources appropriate to the rhetorical situation. Student integrate sources into his or her prose with several technical errors. Student somewhat relies on information or perspectives for support, argue with or challenge information and perspectives, and/or actively engage information or perspectives in the process of idea formation and articulation. Student cites sources with several errors.
Novice 1	Student selects a minimal number of reliable and relevant sources appropriate to the rhetorical situation. Student poorly integrate sources into his or her prose. Student shows minimal regard for the use of information or perspectives for support, argue with or challenge information and perspectives, and/or actively engage information or perspectives in the process of idea formation and articulation. Student cites sources with numerous errors.

Results and Analysis:

Writing Outcome 1: With average score of 2.3 (2.31) on the 3.0 scale, the assessed papers were above the 2.0 benchmark. 83% of students scored within or above the adequate range on the scale. The following chart indicates the average scores of the 100 papers assessed.

Writing Outcome 2: With average score of 2.3 (2.27) on the 3.0 scale, the assessed papers were above the 2.0 benchmark. 80% of students scored within or above the adequate range on the scale. The following chart indicates the average scores of the 100 papers assessed.

Strengths:

- Students are aware of the benefits in using a successful/enticing "hook" in their introductory paragraphs; they attempt to relate to the reader by asking questions/describing alternate realities.
- Students are able to focus on a purpose and create a unique thesis statement.
- Students cite sources correctly on their Work Cited pages and are aware of the importance of documentation.
- Students are well-versed in the mechanics of integrating sources.
- Students make good connections between literature and reality, though they may struggle to clearly articulate those connections (sometimes unable, stylistically, to communicate the meaning of the connection or insight).
- Students succeed in analyzing poems, short stories, plays, and essays.
- Students understand the concept of moving from the broad to the specific (beginning with a general, tone/context setting statement, then moving into topic background, and toward the specific argument/thesis).
- Students are able to follow a clear point-by- point organization and craft coherent paragraphs.
- Students are able to locate a variety of quality sources, including literary criticism, within the databases with relative ease.
- Students recognize that they must address counterarguments.

Weaknesses:
- Students clearly understand the general to specific pattern, but sometimes the movement from the general to the specific is clunky or murky at best, leaving the reader to try and trace the connection.
- Students struggle to maintain a detailed, insightful discussion for the assigned length (anywhere from 3 to 8 pages). Sustaining a thoughtful, critical examination or consideration of a topic is difficult. Students fall into pointless repetition. Even with the advantage of outside sources (advantageous as talking points, sure to boost the word count), students *run out of things to say.*
- Students struggle with actually understanding what they are using, particularly criticism. They are often using the criticism in an overly simplistic way and failing to engage the ideas of the critic and synthesize them with their own ideas about the work. Additionally, the sources often seem too generic or limited (again, perhaps, a result of not fully understanding either the works or the criticism, so encyclopedia entries or internet articles are relied on too heavily).
- Students encounter problems in analyzing and interpreting texts and rely way too much on summary instead of discussion, parroting of secondary sources is common as is creating "quote farms."
- Students struggle to synthesize ideas about multiple literary works. Often, their comparisons and synthesis are shallow (for example: "this story is about X kind of love, and this poem is about Y kind of love…these works of literature show different kinds of love"—the situation that is different in each work becomes the focus, not the underlying connection or separation (between like situations or scenarios).
- Few students demonstrate distinctive or persuasive style. Persuasive essays are constructed with an awareness of supporting points and some nods towards opposing views, but do not use language as an additional persuasive tool.
- Students struggle with more complex sentence structure, with wordiness, with the overuse of the "be" verb, with passive voice, with comma splices, with apostrophes, and with basic editing.

Proposed Action(s):

- Instructors should consider broadening the scope of the final paper to relate the topic of the literature to issues outside of literary criticism. Instructors could design assignments that ask students to use the literature as a way to see/examine social issues or current events.
- Instructor should craft (and share!) assignments that encourage / force students to find and articulate more specific, in-depth connections between literary works and between reality and literary works.
- To help with the challenge of interpreting literature, instructors should design in-class activities and assignments around the practice of close-reading, journaling, and small and large group discussions.
- Instructors should take time to conference with students on partial or entire rough drafts.

- Instructors should craft assignments that ask students to recognize powerful language and give them opportunities to craft language that is rhetorically effective, and these assignments should emphasize the role of anticipating audience response in crafting communications.
- Instructors should create activities, exercises, or interactive games to brush up on surface errors in syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Also, instructors should encourage students to attend Writing Center workshops and consultations.
- As a department, continue to collect resources, innovative assignments and activities, games, handouts, etc. related to writing.

Proposed Action Completion Date: May 2017

Outcome Was Met? (Y/N): Y
Was Proposed Action from Previous Cycle Effective? (Y/N) Y
Detailed Explanation:
Listed below are examples submitted by faculty, Jacqueline Jones describing how faculty close the loop in assessment for English Comp I and English Comp II:

- Celebrate Learning Session on interesting, active teaching approaches
- Department Peer Mentoring, explored scaffolding of assignments
- Fall/Spring English Department Meetings
- Fall/Spring ECE Department Meetings
- Monthly Composition Newsletters
- Instructional Activities shared on the English Department's Blackboard Resource Page (BRP) and K:Drive
- Composition Chit-Chat on effective feedback
- Chit-Chat on instructor-facilitated peer review
- Composition Chit-Chat on style and voice
- Lunch & Learn on ramification and student learning
- Student Workshops at Writing Center
- Web resources added to the Writing Center's website
- Web resources added to the Libraries website
- Books and media on topics related to assessment findings purchased for the Library
- Student models selected for *Expressions/Reflections*
- Faculty, self-reflections on instructional techniques during Faculty Performance Reviews
- Instructional Activities collected during Faculty Performance Reviews