

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Program - English

Mission Statement: The English Department of Seward County Community

College contributes to students' general education by providing the knowledge and skills necessary to perform personal, academic, and professional reading and writing tasks.

Outcomes	Assessment Tools	Results	Actions																
<p>Knowledge of Grammar and Usage - Directly related to Objective Students will demonstrate knowledge of grammar and usage skills needed to communicate effectively in writing. Outcome Status: Active Outcome Type: Curricular Start Date: 08/17/2010</p>		<p>Action Status: Action Complete Result Type: Problem/limitation I averaged the scoring of each class, and after informing them of the essay changes, I asked each class what conclusions could be drawn from this information.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Structure</th> <th>Correctness</th> <th>Content</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9:00</td> <td>1.72</td> <td>1.38</td> <td>1.56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10:00</td> <td>2.29</td> <td>2.71</td> <td>1.93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12:00</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.50</td> <td>1.75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, the essay scored as incompetent in all three classes. Though the grammar score from the 10 class should have been higher since few errors existed, the lack of errors still affected the scoring in the other two areas of the rubric. Few grammar errors appear to affect the overall impression of an essay's structure and content development. Students are doubtful about grammar issues. They will assume there are more errors than they recognize and will automatically score an essay lower on the correctness portion of the rubric. (12/14/2007) 		Structure	Correctness	Content	9:00	1.72	1.38	1.56	10:00	2.29	2.71	1.93	12:00	2.00	1.50	1.75	
	Structure	Correctness	Content																
9:00	1.72	1.38	1.56																
10:00	2.29	2.71	1.93																
12:00	2.00	1.50	1.75																
	<p>Direct - Comparison of pre/post competency test scores in Comp I Comparison of pre/post diagnostic mastery test scores in Pre-Comp II.</p>	<p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Benchmark Not Met In Comp I, 85% of students (217/318) improved on the post test. Three full-time instructors reported and seven out of adjuncts reported. Comp I met benchmark.</p>	<p>Action: The reporting for Comp I and PC II was combined with Developmental English merged with the English Department, but we should look at making</p>																

Outcomes	Assessment Tools	Results	Actions
	<p>Benchmark: 80% of PC II and Comp I course completers will show improvement on post-test score as compared to pre-test score.</p> <p>Schedule: Beginning and end of each semester.</p>	<p>In PC II, 31% of students (17/54) showed improvement, with 2 full-time instructors reporting. PC II did not meet benchmark. (05/23/2019)</p>	<p>separate outcomes for Comp I and PC II. PC II is far below the benchmark. Next fall, look at past history and discuss what should be done.</p> <p>Though Comp I met the benchmark, the English Department will switch to an electronic version of the test next fall. We piloted the test this spring and scores are much lower than on the paper version. May need to adjust the benchmark or work on practice testing/test prep with students. (05/23/2019)</p>
		<p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met 91% (265/290) of Comp I students finishing the course earned a grade of C or higher. Three full-time instructors and nine adjuncts reported. Increased reporting by adjuncts resulted in much larger pool of data. (05/21/2018)</p>	<p>Action: We will look at PC pre-post mastery in 2018-19 as part of our department goal to better align courses and possibly redesign PC II as we move more students into Comp I Plus. We should consider a separate outcome/benchmark for the PC II pre/post mastery. (05/21/2018)</p>
		<p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Not Met COMP I F 16-S 17: Two full-time and 5 adjunct instructors reporting</p> <p>Improved: 211/244: 86% No change/decline: 33/244: 14%</p> <p>PC II F 16-S 17 Developmental Instructors reporting Improved: 85/108 (79%) No change/decline: 23/108 (21%)</p> <p>(05/16/2017)</p>	
		<p>Action Status: Action Complete Result Type: Benchmark Met</p>	

Outcomes	Assessment Tools	Results	Actions
		<p>Scores reported by 3 full-time English instructors and 8 Adjunct/Outreach instructors: Improved: 255 82% Dropped/no change: 57 18% (05/17/2016)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met 12 INSTRUCTORS REPORTING, INCLUDING 10 OUTREACH/ADJUNCT 207 students improved/41 no change or lower, 248 total students 83% (05/20/2015)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met 336 total students/15 instructors (including 13 Adjunct/Outreach) for AY 13-14 278 students improved. 58 did not improve (no change/more errors than first testing) Result: 83% improved. (05/20/2014)</p>	
<p>Indirect - Comp I course grade Benchmark: 70% of students who complete Comp I will earn a grade of C or higher. Schedule: End of each semester.</p>		<p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Benchmark Met 79% of students completing the course passed with a grade of C or better. (200/253). Three full-time instructors and five out of eight adjuncts reported. (05/23/2019)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met AY 16-17 Instructors: 2 full-time, 1 adjunct (fall Adjunct/Outreach results not available) Total students:86 C or above: 73 (85%) D/F: 13 (15%) (05/16/2017)</p>	
		<p>Action Status: Action Complete Result Type: Benchmark Met 144 students 113 ABC 31 DF 78% (05/17/2016)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met</p>	
		<p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met</p>	

Outcomes	Assessment Tools	Results	Actions
		<p>111 of 123 total completing students (F14-S15) earned C, B, or A 90% (05/20/2015)</p> <p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Benchmark Met 124 total students/3 instructors for AY 13-14 C grade or higher: 108 D/F (not including W and MIA--students attending class until end of semester): 16 Result: 87% (05/20/2014)</p>	<p>Action: English instructors will meet at the start of Fall 14 semester to decide the definition of "Complete" for the purposes of this assessment (05/20/2014)</p>
<p>Critical Thinking - Critical Thinking rubric score for Comp II final exam in-class essay (students write a persuasive argument). Outcome Status: Active Outcome Type: Curricular Start Date: 08/17/2010</p>	<p>Direct - Critical Thinking rubric score for Comp II final exam in-class essay (students write a persuasive argument). Benchmark: 80% of students completing the course will score a 3-3-2 or higher on the critical thinking rubric. Schedule: End of each semester.</p>	<p>Action Status: Action Complete Result Type: Benchmark Met 80% of students (280/286) scored a 3-2-2 or higher on the Critical Thinking Rubric for the 2019 Comp II final exam essay. 2 full-time instructors and seven our of eight adjuncts reported. (05/24/2019)</p> <p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Directional Improvement 74.8% (176/235 students) scored a 3-3-2 or better Two full-time instructors and eight adjuncts reported. This is a much larger sample than we have reported in the past, due to increased response from adjuncts. (05/21/2018)</p> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Not Met 134 Total Students 2 full-time and 4 adjunct instructors reporting 99 students at 3-3-2 or better, 74% 35 students below 3-3-2, 26% (05/16/2017)</p> <p>Action Status: Action Complete Result Type: Benchmark Met 120 students/2 full-time instructors and 4 adjunct outreach 96 received 3-3-2+ 80% (05/17/2016)</p> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met 65 of 75 total students (F14-S15) scored 3-3-2 or higher. 87% (05/20/2015)</p>	<p>Action: We need to make time during 18-19 department meetings to do some norming using the critical thinking rubric. (05/21/2018)</p>
		<p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Benchmark Not Met</p>	<p>Action: Suggestion (to be proposed at first English meeting</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Tools	Results	Actions
	<p>Indirect - Comp II course grade Benchmark: 80% of students who complete Comp II will earn a grade of C or higher. Schedule: End of each semester.</p>	<p>Total students: 111 (3 instructors reporting for AY 13-14) Meet expectations (3-3-2 or higher): 80 Do not meet expectations: 34 Result: 70% (05/20/2014)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Benchmark Met 87% of Comp II students (273/313) completing the course earned a grade of C or higher. Two full-time instructors and eight out of eight adjuncts reported. (05/24/2019)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met 93.8% of students completing the course earned a C or better. (212/227 students). Three on-campus full-time instructors reporting and eight adjunct/outreach instructors reporting. This is more than a 10% increase over previous years, but all adjuncts reported data this year. (The completion rate for adjunct/outreach is usually close to 100%.) (05/21/2018)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met Instructors: 2 full-time, 5 adjunct C or higher: 142 (86%) D or below: 23 (14%) (05/16/2017)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: Action Complete Result Type: Benchmark Met 101 of 117 students passed the course with ABC (input from 3 adjunct/outreach instructors and 2 full-time English instructors) 86%/14% (05/17/2016)</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Met 76 of 93 total students earned C, B, or A.</p>	<p>of F 14): Individual rubric scores might be reported and tallied with breakdown available to instructors. Anomalous artifacts might then be pulled for discussion/modeling. (05/20/2014)</p> <p>Follow-Up: English/Developmental full-time instructors Fall 2014 (05/20/2014)</p>
			<p>Action: Our current benchmark is set for students who stay in the class and doesn't take into account Ws. Do we need rethink the benchmark and attempt to reduce the number of Ws, or would that be unrealistic? (05/21/2018)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Tools	Results	Actions
		<p>82% (05/20/2015)</p> <p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Benchmark Not Met 113 total students/3 instructors for AY 13-14 C grade or above: 87 D/F (does not include W or F for students enrolled but not present for final exam): 26 Result: 77% (05/20/2014)</p>	<p>Action: English Comp I and Comp II instructors will meet at the start of the Fall 14 term to determine a definition of "who complete the course." Will it include all W and F grades (as in IPEDS and NCCBP) or only the grades for students who attend until the end of the semester. (05/20/2014)</p>
<p>Writing skills - Students will demonstrate the ability to write effectively. Outcome Status: Active Outcome Type: Curricular Start Date: 05/31/2010</p>	<p>Direct - Writing rubric score on scholarship essay. All students enrolled in Pre-Comp I, Pre-Comp II, and Comp I will write the essay. On-campus instructors who teach PC I, PC II, and Comp I will score 30 anonymous artifacts selected at random and scores will be averaged. Benchmark: PC I and II essay averages will equal at least a 2.5 in structure, 2.0 in correctness, and 2.5 in content on the rubric. Comp I essay averages will equal at least a 2.75 in structure, 2.5 in correctness, and 2.75 in content.</p> <p>Schedule: Beginning and end of each semester.</p>	<p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Benchmark Met PC I and PC students (8 students) scored an average of 2.25 in structure, 2.25 in correctness, and 2.75 in content. PC I/II met benchmark in correctness and content, but not in structure. Comp I students (22 students) scored an average of 2.81 in structure, 2.54 in correctness, and 2.95 in content, meeting the benchmark in all 3 areas. This is the first time in several years that Comp I students met the benchmark. (05/23/2019)</p> <p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Benchmark Not Met PC I Average: 3 in structure/ 1.8 in correctness/ 2.6 in content (5 students). Benchmark met in structure & content, but not correctness. PC II Average: 2.5 in structure/ 1.8 in correctness/ 2.4 in content (9 students). Benchmark met in structure, but not in correctness or content. Comp I Average: 2.5 in structure/ 2.4 in correctness/ 2.5 in content (16 students). DNM benchmark in any area, but correctness average is better for Comp I than for PC I and II. (05/21/2018)</p>	<p>Action: This past year, we agreed to require students to stay the entire class period when writing this essay to see if scores improved, and they did. However, we also had a new instructor, and higher scores may reflect changes in instructors. (05/23/2019)</p> <p>Action: We corrected the problem from previous year of instructors not scoring the same number of artifacts. Each artifact was scored by two instructors, but of those instructors, two were new to SCCC. We may need to spend more time norming BEFORE scoring next year. We may also look at changing benchmark to number of students who make a certain score, rather than averaging all the scores. (05/21/2018)</p>
		<p>Action Status: No Action Required Result Type: Benchmark Not Met PC I: 2.2--2.0--2.7. Benchmark met in Correctness and Content/Audience.</p>	

Outcomes	Assessment Tools	Results	Actions
----------	------------------	---------	---------

PC II: 2.5--2.2--2.7. Benchmark met in all three rubric categories.

Comp I: 2.5--2.2--2.7. Benchmark not met. (05/16/2017)

Action Status: Action Plan in Progress

Result Type: Inconclusive

Problems with artifact selection and distribution resulted in some artifacts being scored by 4 instructors and some only once, making the following averages anomalous, at best. They were arrived at by averaging the average scores for artifacts at each level according to individual scorers results. The plan is to refocus this assessment in Fall 2016 with a more reliable distribution/scoring/collection procedure in place.

Comp I: 2.86 (ME), 2.29 (DNM), 2.42 (DNM)

PC I and II: 2.75 (ME), 2.42 (ME), 2.91 (ME).
(05/17/2016)

Action Status: No Action Required

Result Type: Inconclusive

Course	Form	Correctness		Content / Audience	
	Overall				
EG0403	2.0	1.8	2.7	6.5	
EG0603	2.7	2.4	2.4	7.5	
EG1103	2.6	2.5	2.6	7.7	
Grand Total		2.5	2.4	2.5	7.4

PC I DNM in Structure and Correctness/Exceeds in Content/Audience

PC II Exceeds in Structure and Correctness DNM in Content/Audience

Comp I Meets in Correctness/DNM in Structure and Content/Audience (05/20/2015)

Action Status: Action Complete

Result Type: Benchmark Met

2013-14

A. 30 50% A. 28 47% A. 27 45%

A. 20 33%

B. 30 50% B. 32 53% B. 33 55%

Outcomes	Assessment Tools	Results	Actions
		<p>B. 40 67% (05/22/2014)</p> <p>Related Documents: WAC EOY report AY 2013-2014.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Action Status: Action Plan in Progress Result Type: Inconclusive 4 Developmental/English Instructors S 14 PC AVE: 2.83 (MET) 2.55 (MET) 2.83 (MET)</p> <p>COMP I AVE: 2.43 (DNM) 2.27 (DNM) 2.37 (DNM) (05/21/2014)</p>	<p>Action: These score averages reflect only one semester of AY 13-14. Score collection for F13 was incomplete. Because of complaints about timing and workload of artifact scoring, English and Developmental instructors will redesign this assessment at the start of Fall 14 to allow for more equitable division of scoring responsibilities among full-time and part-time instructors. The goal remains to involve all instructors in the scoring process in the course of the AY and to have at least one joint session for norming every AY. (05/21/2014)</p>