

**Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College
COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Course Title and Number: ENL 101: English Composition I	Academic Term and Year of Assessment Activity: Spring 2012, Fall 2012, Spring 2013, Fall 2013, Spring 2014, Fall 2014, Spring 2015
Report Submitted By: Curtis Hakala	Number of Students Assessed: 235
Date Report Submitted: October 15, 2015	Number of Sections Included: 16
Course Delivery Format (list all modalities used in sections assessed. Ex: web based, VDL, traditional section, hybrid course, etc.): Traditional sections	

Course Role in the Curriculum
Provide a description of the role the course serves in the curriculum (i.e. general education requirement, program technical core, restricted elective, etc.). Note all as appropriate.
ENL 101 serves as an introduction to basic composition and is a general education requirement. The major thrust is directed toward achieving competency in writing a composition. Through lectures, class discussions, writing, and classroom presentation, the student will learn to integrate experience into thinking, reading, listening, and speaking. The student will be introduced to writing as a process: understanding audience and purpose, exploring ideas, composing, revising, and editing. Prerequisites include RDG 100 AND ENL 100 OR minimum acceptable test scores for placement in college-level English.

Assessment Methods
Provide a description of the assessment process used. Include description of instrument and performance standards in description. Note all methods.
Originally, ENL 101 (English Composition I) course outcomes were to be assessed on a cyclical basis beginning with the Fall 2008 semester. While ENL 101 course level assessments were created in 2009, 2010, and 2011, the extraction of useable data was limited by small sample sizes and a lack of comprehensive assessment of all course outcomes. Dependent upon assessment findings, a minimal amount of outcomes were assessed over multiple years to validate effectiveness of changes in curriculum or course materials from 2008-2011; however, after reviewing Higher Learning Commission (HLC) recommendations (i.e. increase sample sizes of assessment reports, assess all learning outcomes) a comprehensive, longitudinal study of ENL 101 course outcomes was launched beginning in Spring 2012 and ended in Spring 2015. As per HLC recommendations, all learning outcomes in ENL 101 were grouped under a general heading (Conceptual, Thesis, Development and Support, Structuring, and Language) as shown below:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conceptual: Students offer cogent analysis, shows command of interpretive and conceptual tasks required by assignment and course materials: ideas original, often insightful, going beyond ideas discussed in lecture and class. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Employ a recursive writing process that included prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading -- Compose expository essays (Descriptive, narrative, compare/contrast, argumentative, etc.) -- Write formal outlines 2. Thesis: Students' essays are controlled by clear, precise, well-defined thesis: is sophisticated in both statement and insight.

-- Write a clear thesis statement for each essay

3. Development and Support: Students use well-chosen examples; persuasive reasoning used to develop and support thesis consistently; uses quotations and citations effectively; and causal connections between ideas are evident.

-- Write unified, coherent, well-developed essays that use appropriately referenced valid resources to support arguments (i.e. 3-4 page research papers)

-- Develop and organize appropriate evidence

-- Use MLA documentation

-- Use library resources

-- Avoid plagiarism

4. Structuring: Students use appropriate, clear and smooth transitions; arrangement of paragraphs seems particularly apt; and conclusion restates thesis and makes logical assumptions.

-- Write topic sentences for individual paragraphs

-- Write appropriate introductory, body, and concluding paragraphs

-- Summarize and paraphrase information

-- Use appropriate transitions

5. Language: Students use sentences effectively; usually chooses words aptly; observes conventions of written English and manuscript format; makes few minor or technical errors; maintains consistent point of view; and eliminates second person perspective.

-- Write for academic audiences

-- Write and recognize independent clauses and dependent clauses

-- Uses consistent point of view and verb form (active voice)

-- Recognize and avoid sentence errors (especially sentence fragments; comma splices; run-on sentences; subject-verb agreement; incorrect verb and form; punctuation; pronoun reference and agreement; capitalization; and spelling) in their own writing

-- Use a variety of sentence structures

-- Distinguish restrictive and nonrestrictive modifiers

-- Use consistent verb tense

-- Recognize passive voice

-- Recognize semicolon usage

-- Eliminate second person

-- Avoid dangling modifiers

A grading rubric (See Attachment A) addressing all learning outcomes served as an indicator of student achievement of course learning outcomes. The grading rubric was incorporated across sixteen sections of ENL 101 during the assessment cycle. The minimum performance standard was set at 75%. At least 75% of the students must meet the common indicators provided by the grading rubric and achieve “B grade” benchmarks in order to attain learning outcome mastery. In the event that the minimum performance standard is not met, the unmet learning outcome will be targeted for further monitoring. The results may also trigger an evaluation of course materials supporting the learning outcome, revision of course materials, or further curriculum revision.

In the Spring 2012, Fall 2012, Spring 2013, Fall 2013, Spring 2014, Fall 2014, and Spring 2015 semesters, all learning learning outcomes were selected for assessment in sixteen sections of English Composition I. Both Curtis Hakala and Nicole Yurcaba taught eight sections each, and all learning outcomes were grouped under the five general headings mentioned earlier.

To assess all learning outcomes, final research papers and projects were analyzed across sixteen sections of English Composition I. Students enrolled in these sections completed a research paper and the learning outcomes were assessed using a grading rubric; 235 students were included in this sample (Curtis Hakala: 116 students; Nicole Yurcaba: 119). Results were compiled for each indicator denoting the percent of students meeting or exceeding the “B” grading rubric benchmark for each indicator. Findings from the data for each outcome are presented in the Results Section of this report.

Assessment Results

Provide a summary of results including tables/charts. Incorporate information from previous assessments as appropriate. Append additional pages if necessary. If appending, include notation in box to “See attached”.

Based on the existing data, seventeen of twenty-four learning outcomes were met; conversely, 29% of learning outcomes (7) failed to meet the 75% minimum performance standard. All learning outcomes under the **Conceptual, Thesis, and Development/Support** general headings met minimum performance standards, while two learning outcomes under **Structuring**, writing topic sentences (74%) and summarize/paraphrase information (68%), failed to successfully meet identified indicators established for the assessment activity. Under the general heading **Language**, five learning outcomes failed to meet the 75% correct criterion:

- Use consistent point of view and verb form (70%)
- Recognize and avoid sentence errors (67%)
- Distinguish restrictive and nonrestrictive modifiers (51%)
- Recognize passive voice (49%)
- Recognize semicolon use (71%)

More details about the outcomes are included in the Action Plan.

Course Level Assessment Summary of Outcomes, Indicators and Results Course Title and Number: Number of students in assessment sample = 235 Number of Sections in Assessment = 16 Add additional rows to table if necessary						
Learning Outcomes (Insert learning outcomes assessed during this cycle)	Curtis Hakala (8 Sections, 116 Students)	Nicole Yurcaba (8 Sections, 119 Students)	Indicator (Insert indicators used for each outcome: exam question, scoring rubric, etc. Be specific)	Percent of Correct Responses	Percent of Incorrect Responses	Performance Standard Met (75%)* (yes or no)
Outcome 1: Conceptual						
Employ a recursive writing process	93/116 80%	99/119 83%	Grading Rubric	192/235 82%	43/235 18%	Yes
Compose expository essays	109/116 94%	114/116 96%	Grading Rubric	223/235 95%	12/235 5%	Yes
Write formal outlines	101/116 87%	105/119 96%	Included with Research Paper	206/235 88%	29/235 12%	Yes
Outcome 2: Thesis						
Write a clear thesis	108/116 93%	102/116 87%	Grading Rubric	210/235 89%	25/235 11%	Yes
Outcome 3: Development and Support						
Write unified, coherent, well-developed essays	90/116 77%	94/119 78%	Grading Rubric	184/235 78%	51/235 22%	Yes
Develop and organize appropriate evidence	95/116 82%	92/119 77%	Grading Rubric	187/235 80%	48/235 20%	Yes
Use MLA documentation	114/116 98%	112/119 94%	Grading Rubric	226/235 96%	9/235 4%	Yes
Use library resources	112/116 97%	105/119 88%	Grading Rubric	217/235 92%	18/235 8%	Yes
Avoid plagiarism	113/116 97%	110/119 92%	Grading Rubric	223/235 94%	12/235 6%	Yes

Outcome 4: Structuring						
Write topic sentences	82/116 70%	93/119 78%	Grading Rubric	175/235 74%	60/235 26%	<u>No</u>
Learning Outcomes (Insert learning outcomes assessed during this cycle)	Curtis Hakala (8 Sections, 116 Students)	Nicole Yurcaba (8 Sections, 119 Students)	Indicator (Insert indicators used for each outcome: exam question, scoring rubric, etc. Be specific)	Percent of Correct Responses	Percent of Incorrect Responses	Performance Standard Met (75%)* (yes or no)
Write appropriate intro, body and concluding paragraphs	95/116 81%	100/119 84%	Grading Rubric	195/235 83%	40/235 17%	Yes
Summarize and paraphrase info	76/116 65%	84/119 71%	Grading Rubric	160/235 68%	65/235 32%	<u>No</u>
Use appropriate transitions	103/116 89%	96/119 80%	Grading Rubric	199/235 85%	36/235 15%	Yes
Outcome 5: Language						
Write for academic audiences	107/116 92%	100/119 84%	Grading Rubric	207/235 88%	28/235 12%	Yes
Write and recognize independent and dependent clauses	101/116 87%	110/119 92%	Grading Rubric	211/235 90%	24/235 10%	Yes
Use consistent point of view and verb form	74/116 63%	92/119 77%	Grading Rubric	166/235 70%	69/235 30%	<u>No</u>
Recognize and avoid sentence errors	77/116 66%	82/119 68%	Grading Rubric	159/235 67%	76/235 33%	<u>No</u>
Use a variety of sentence structures	109/116 94%	100/119 84%	Grading Rubric	209/235 89%	26/235 11%	Yes
Distinguish restrictive and nonrestrictive modifiers	65/116 56%	54/119 45%	Grading Rubric	119/235 51%	116/235 49%	<u>No</u>

Use consistent verb tense	87/116 75%	98/119 82%	Grading Rubric	185/235 79%	50/235 21%	Yes
Recognize passive voice	64/116 55%	52/119 43%	Grading Rubric	116/235 49%	119/235 51%	No
Learning Outcomes (Insert learning outcomes assessed during this cycle)	Curtis Hakala (8 Sections, 116 Students)	Nicole Yurcaba (8 Sections, 119 Students)	Indicator (Insert indicators used for each outcome: exam question, scoring rubric, etc. Be specific)	Percent of Correct Responses	Percent of Incorrect Responses	Performance Standard Met (75%)* (yes or no)
Recognize semicolon usage	79/116 68%	87/119 73%	Grading Rubric	166/235 71%	69/235 29%	No
Eliminate second person	95/116 82%	106/119 89%	Grading Rubric	201/235 86%	34/235 14%	Yes
Avoid dangling modifiers	88/116 76%	105/119 88%	Grading Rubric	193/235 82%	42/235 18%	Yes

* Please note if using a different minimum performance standard.

Conclusions

Provide a brief summary of conclusions derived based on analysis of data. Append additional pages if necessary. If appending, include notation in box to “See attached”.

In conclusion, this course level assessment of English Composition I finds that seventeen of twenty-four outcomes are being met at the minimum performance standard of 75%. Successful outcomes will continue to be examined in upcoming course assessments to ensure the proper emphasis will be maintained.

Under the general heading **Structuring**, one learning outcome – Write topic sentences for individual paragraphs – failed to meet the 75% correct criterion by one percentage point. N. Yurcaba’s eight sections of ENL 101 exceeded the 75% performance standard on the identified indicator, while C. Hakala’s eight sections fell five percentage points short of mastery. Therefore, C. Hakala will devote more class time and homework assignments to the importance of topic sentences when teaching ENL 101. Of main concern are the remaining six outcomes that failed to meet performance standards by more than one percentage point. These unmet learning outcomes will be discussed in detail under the Action Plan.

Previous Assessment Reports and Results

Date of Previous Assessment: Spring 2011

List of Outcomes Not Met: None

Summary of Actions Taken to Address Unmet Learning Outcomes: Append additional pages if necessary. If appending, include notation in box to “See attached”.

Because of changes to the ENL 101 Master Course Record Form, three learning outcomes from the Spring 2011 ENL 101 Course Level Assessment Report are no longer listed as current outcomes. One learning outcome, writing clear thesis statements, was reevaluated in this assessment activity and again met minimum performance standards (89%).

Action Plan and Date for Reassessment

Identify action plan for improvement or maintaining current performance levels including outcomes identified for re-assessment, curriculum revision, LOT proposal, new or revised course activities to reinforce learning outcomes, etc. Append additional pages if necessary. If appending, include notation in box to “See attached”.

Summarize and Paraphrase Information: Overall, students did not do poorly on this outcome, only missing mastery by 7%. Summarizing and paraphrasing are important cognitive skills that require students to reprocess information and express it in their own words; consequently, some students may have difficulty organizing the main ideas into logical categories and writing them into a unified paragraph. Additionally, sometimes there is so much information that students get lost in the details. To rectify this outcome “shortfall,” ENL 101 classes should include some of the following suggestions for integrating summarizing and paraphrasing skills into classroom work:

1. When reviewing material in class, ask questions that require students to summarize information.
2. Give students prepared summaries as models of what was covered in class during the week.
3. At the end of a lecture, or as a review of an assigned reading, require the class to create a summary through group discussion and write it on the board.
4. Ask students to present oral summaries as reviews of assigned readings or previous lectures.

Use Consistent Point of View and Verb Form: Students did not perform unsatisfactorily on this outcome, falling short of mastery by only 5%. College-level writers should be able to keep the elements in a sentence consistent, avoiding unnecessary changes in point of view and verb form. For many students, these error patterns occur when writers fail to ensure that any shift in person or verb form is motivated by meaning and audience. Unfortunately, some students simply have never been required to write formal research papers before attending Eastern; therefore, they sometimes have difficulty mastering the different stylistic conventions that apply to more academic writing assignments. In future sections of ENL 101, more online lab assignments on consistency of point of view and verb form, along with more thorough in-class coverage of Chapters 23 and 26, should help improve student performance.

Recognize and Avoid Sentence Errors: This learning outcome is rather large in scope, but after detailed analysis, a majority of sentence errors were either a result of comma splices or run-on sentences (38/76: 50%). Writers tend to create run-ons and comma splices when there are two sentences that are closely related to each other. Because they are closely related, it can be hard to recognize that they are both separate independent clauses and need to be punctuated as such. Understanding sentence structure helps in identifying and correcting comma splices and run-on sentences; therefore, in the future, instructors will add additional online lab assignments and allot more in-class instruction to help build skills in sentence clarity.

Distinguish Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Modifiers: Although this learning outcome has never been assessed at Eastern, restrictive and nonrestrictive modification is one of the more confusing topics in writing classes. Most students have a hard time remembering the terms “restrictive” and “nonrestrictive,” so in future classes it may be more helpful to focus on the role of punctuation. For example, when there is punctuation around the modifier – when it functions nonessentially – the modifier is just supplying additional, nonessential information. Using terms such as “essential” and “nonessential” instead of

restrictive and nonrestrictive could help remedy student confusion.

Recognize Passive Voice: Most concerning in this assessment is the inability of students to recognize the difference between active and passive voice. Overusing the passive voice can make student sentences discursive, somewhat lifeless, and confusing. Obviously, more instruction needs to be allotted to this important learning outcome and some of the following in-class activities could improve student achievement:

1. Give students specific quizzes on recognizing the difference between active and passive voice.
2. Have students go to any news website and look for news stories that have examples of the passive voice.
3. As an in-class exercise, give students sentences written in the passive voice and have them change the sentences into the active voice.

Recognize Semicolon Use: Barely missing mastery by 4%, a smaller amount of students seemed confused by semicolons, not really comprehending how and when to use them in their sentences. Being unable to recognize semicolon use is directly correlated with comma splice errors because both reflect a failure in independent clause recognition. Therefore, as previously mentioned with comma splices, instructors will add additional online lab assignments and allot more in-class instruction to help build skills in sentence clarity and independent clause “awareness.”

In addition to the aforementioned recommendations, future assessments of ENL 101 will include a panel of qualified graders to prohibit instructor bias and ensure grading consistency. In order to safeguard uniform standards across all class sections, Eastern is currently in the process of developing a standardized grading rubric and ENL 101 course, which will be embedded with course-level assessments of learning outcomes throughout the whole semester, thereby making it possible to monitor and track student learning not only for assessment purposes but for early detection of students at risk of not meeting important performance benchmarks. The grading rubric and standardized ENL 101 course will be resourced and shared with all instructors, and it is Eastern’s sincere belief that by closely regulating criteria, standards, and definitions of good writing from section-to-section, Eastern students will be provided with a more efficient, consistent, and improved gateway composition course.

This final report is distributed to all English faculty members. Any suggestions or comments from the faculty members will also be considered for any possible changes to the course to increase the attainment level of the outcomes. The proposed date for the next course-level assessment will be during the Spring 2017 semester although class-level assessments will be conducted each semester to determine the impact of instructional and curriculum changes.

**Assessment Committee Recommendation/Approval
(To be posted by Assessment Committee Chair)**

☒ Approved as presented

Date: 10/21/15

**LOT Recommendation/Approval
(To be posted by Assessment Committee Chair)**

☒ Approved as presented

Date: 10/26/15

Attachment A: Grading Rubric

Letter Grades	Conceptual	Thesis	Development and Support	Structuring	Language
A	Offers cogent analysis, shows command of interpretive and conceptual tasks required by assignment and course materials: ideas original, often insightful, going beyond ideas discussed in lecture and class	Essay controlled by clear, precise, well-defined thesis: is sophisticated in both statement and insight	Well-chosen examples; persuasive reasoning used to develop and support thesis consistently: uses quotations and citations effectively; causal connections between ideas are evident	Appropriate, clear and smooth transitions; arrangement of paragraphs seems particularly apt; conclusion restates thesis and makes logical assumptions	Uses sophisticated sentences effectively; usually chooses words aptly; observes conventions of written English and manuscript format; makes few minor or technical errors; maintains consistent point of view; eliminates second person perspective
B	Shows a good understanding of the texts, ideas and methods of the assignment; goes beyond the obvious; may contain one minor factual or conceptual inconsistency	Clear, specific, argumentative thesis central to the essay; may have left minor terms undefined	Pursues thesis consistently: develops a main argument with clear major points and appropriate textual evidence and supporting detail; makes an effort to organize paragraphs topically	Distinct units of thought in paragraphs controlled by specific and detailed topic sentences; clear transitions between developed, cohering, and logically arranged paragraphs that are internally cohesive	Some mechanical difficulties or stylistic problems; may make occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; a few spelling or punctuation errors or cliché; usually presents quotations effectively
C	Shows an understanding of the basic ideas and information involved in the assignment; may contain some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors	General thesis or controlling idea; may not define several central terms	Only partially develops the argument; shallow analysis; some ideas and generalizations undeveloped or unsupported; makes limited use of textual evidence; fails to integrate quotations appropriately	Some awkward transitions; some brief, weakly unified or undeveloped paragraphs; arrangement may not appear entirely natural; contains extraneous information	More frequent wordiness; several unclear or awkward sentences; imprecise use of words or over-reliance on passive voice; one or two major grammatical errors (subject-verb agreement, comma splice, etc.); effort to present quotations accurately
D	Shows inadequate command of course materials or contains significant factual and conceptual errors; does not respond directly to the demands of the assignment; confuses some significant ideas	Thesis vague or not central to argument; central terms not defined	Frequently only narrates; digresses from one topic to another without developing ideas or terms; makes insufficient or awkward use of textual evidence	Simplistic, tends to narrate or merely summarize; wanders from one topic to another; illogical arrangement of ideas	Some major grammatical or proofreading errors (subject-verb agreement; sentence fragments); language marred by clichés, colloquialisms, repeated inexact word choices; inappropriate quotations or citations format
F	Writer has not understood lectures, readings, discussion, or assignment	No discernible thesis	Little or no development; may list facts or misinformation; uses no quotations or fails to cite sources or plagiarizes	No transitions; incoherent paragraphs; suggests poor planning or no serious revision	Numerous grammatical errors and stylistic problems seriously distract from the argument

