

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

Written Communication (English 102), Spring 2011

Vicki Ehrhardt, Cristal Renzo, Brett Stumphy, Hetal Thaker, Amy Withrow, and Karen Woodring

STATEMENT OF INSTITUTION MISSION AND COLLEGE GOALS	SP Goal 5: Improve the process for assessing programs, courses, and student learning.
GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES (or student learning outcome/program competency)	<p>Written Communication: Write appropriately for audience, purpose and genre; demonstrate appropriate content, organization, syntax, and style; and acknowledge the use of information sources, according to convention.</p> <p>Information Literacy: Demonstrate the ability to find, evaluate, organize and use information effectively and ethically.</p> <p>(LO1. Demonstrate skill in using an accepted academic documentation style in the context of academic research LO2. Synthesize information and ideas from an appropriate variety of sources in developing sound and reasonable academic writing (i.e. exploratory, argument))</p>
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES	<p>SELECTION AND SUBMISSION OF ESSAYS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Random essays requested: 204• Random essays submitted: 110 (83-Traditional, 6-CHS, 17-Online, 4-Blended) TRFT- 28; TRPT - 55• Essays submitted by full-time instructors: 42• Essays submitted by part-time instructors: 68• Essays not submitted due to drops/lack of student submission: 16 <p>COLLECTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND READING OF ESSAYS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All essays were sent to one English faculty member: the Assessment Essay Collector.• All essays were assigned a unique identifier number to maintain anonymity of students and instructors.• All cover sheets were destroyed after unique identifier number was written on each essay.• Essays were distributed to and read by faculty at Four HACC campuses:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Harrisburg (6 readers) – 36 essays ○ Lancaster (6 readers) – 28 essays ○ York (8 readers) – 28 essays ○ Lebanon (4 readers) – 18 essays ● Each campus created its own procedure for assessment readings. ● All essays were read by two assessment readers. ● All essays assessed two learning outcomes (identified as LO1 and LO2 on graphs).
<p>ASSESSMENT RESULTS</p>	<p>LEARNING OUTCOME #1 (LO1)--demonstrate skill in using an accepted academic documentation style in the context of academic research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Traditional course delivery provided a 78.87% success rate, compared to 60.28% during Spring 2010. ● CHS course delivery provided an 87.50% success rate, compared to 31.58% during Spring 2010. ● Online course delivery provided a 100.00% success rate, compared to 55.00% during Spring 2010. ● Blended course delivery provided a 75.00% success rate, compared to 70.00% during Spring 2010. <p>LEARNING OUTCOME #2 (LO2)--synthesize information and ideas from an appropriate variety of sources in developing sound and reasonable academic writing (i.e. exploratory, argument).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Traditional course delivery provided a 75.35% success rate, compared to 73.83% during Spring 2010. ● CHS course delivery provided an 87.50% success rate, compared to 30.00% during Spring 2010. ● Online course delivery provided a 93.75% success rate, compared to 80.00% during Spring 2010. ● Blended course delivery provided a 75.00% success rate, compared to 60.00% during Spring 2010. <p>The Submission Rate between our first run in spring 2010 and second run in spring 2011 declined. A total</p>

	<p>of 110 ENGL102 essays were collected in spring 2011, compared with 137 ENGL 102 essays in Spring 2010.</p> <p>Approximately 82.63% (LO1) and 78.94% (LO2) of assessed essays met the expectations stated in those learning outcomes, compared to 58% (LO1) and 71% (LO2) of assessed essays during Spring 2010.</p> <p>Student performance based on type of instructor or type of instruction is not measurably different. The committee would like to discuss with the entire department whether it is important to continue assessing using the current methods of instruction (traditional, online, blended, & college in the high school) or if delivery should only include “traditional” and “virtual/blended”</p> <p>To address the disparity in assessment ratings by campus readers, the ENGL102 assessment committee recommends a college-wide norming/calibration exercise once a year to include both full time and part time instructors. We would also like all campuses to include both full time and part time instructors as readers for the ENGL102 assessment. Finally, we will be exploring the best way to submit, distribute, and score ENGL102 essays within D2L to have an assessment where no reader sees another reader’s notes or assessment to increase valid, reliable results.</p> <p>Disparity between two readers rating the same essay as average and weak for a given learning outcome declined from previous assessment readings. A 5%-8% disparity appeared in the Spring 2011 readings while an 11%-15% disparity existed during the Spring 2010 readings. Disparity between two readers rating an essay excellent and weak achievement remained very minimal.</p>
--	--

<p>USE OF THE RESULTS</p>	<p>Essays will be assessed within D2L using a web-based rubric to ensure Reader #2 is not being influenced by Reader #1.</p> <p>College-wide “norming” or calibration exercises will be held prior to readers scoring essays.</p> <p>The dramatic improvement of the assessment reflects the impact of changes created by the ongoing commitment of the English faculty. These results when considered in combination with the Written Communication Assessment completed in Spring of 2013, demonstrate improved writing skills across the curriculum.</p> <p>The continued collaboration with the Libraries has also demonstrated marked improvement in use of sources and proper citation techniques.</p>
<p>Additional Notes / Resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment Fall 2008 Final Report • Assessment Fall 2009 Final Report • Assessment Fall 2010 Final Report • Assessment Fall 2011 Final Report • Assessment Spring 2009 Final Report • Assessment Spring 2010 Final Report • Assessment Spring 2011 Final Report • ENGL 102 Assessment Rubric using two outcomes