English. To demonstrate writing as a purpose-driven process of communication within specific contexts.

Prepared by: Jennifer Enoch, Program Coordinator	Date: June 5, 2023
Approved by: Dr. Greg Handel, Provost	Date: June 5, 2023

Northwestern State Mission: Northwestern State University is a responsive, studentoriented institution committed to acquiring, creating, and disseminating knowledge through innovative teaching, research, and service. With its certificate, undergraduate, and graduate programs, Northwestern State University prepares its increasingly diverse student population to contribute to an inclusive global community with a steadfast dedication to improving our region, state, and nation.

Northwestern Core Curriculum: In January 2018, under the direction of the Provost, the General Education Committee completed a deliberate and systematic 18-month review of the University Core Curriculum to ensure its alignment with policy 2.16 Statewide General Education Requirements, Louisiana Board of Regents. As a result, the University modified its General Education Core Curriculum ensuring the courses selected were introductory, survey, or appreciation courses and not tied to a specific degree program. The current broad-based core curriculum leverages six key competencies central to the University's mission and is consistent with the Louisiana Board of Regents' requirements for general education. The selection of courses encompasses the knowledge and abilities that Northwestern believes are essential to college graduates.

The requirements are designed to improve students' writing and speaking; provide students with mathematical skills at the level of college algebra and above; strengthen students' understanding of biological, physical, social, and behavioral sciences; and develop an appreciation and knowledge of the arts and humanities. These courses provide the breadth of a student's educational program while the degree program requirements provide the depth of education. The goal of the core curriculum is for undergraduate students, depending on their respective degree program, to obtain appropriate learning outcomes for this general education competency.

Purpose: The purpose of the English Core Competency is to improve students' writing ability. The two-course sequence of English 1010: Rhetoric and Composition I and English 1020: Rhetoric and Composition II aim to develop students' writing ability so that they can demonstrate writing as a purpose-driven process of communication within specific contexts. The knowledge and skills developed through the first-year writing sequence are applicable to the wide variety of writing students will do in upper-level courses and in the workplace.

Methodology:

1. The instructor(s) will collect one portfolio of written work including a reflective letter from each student enrolled in English 1010 in the fall semesters and English 1020 in the spring semesters.

- 2. The instructor(s) will assess the student portfolios using the course-appropriate rubrics appended to this document to determine how well the applicable outcomes are met.
- 3. The assessor(s) will collect rubric-based data from the instructors and analyze the programmatic data to determine whether the applicable outcomes are met.
- 4. Faculty will meet during the fall on-call week to discuss the results and determine the actions that need to be taken in response to the evaluation. Individual meetings will be held with faculty during on call week, if necessary. The Writing Program Administrator, in consultation with faculty and the department advisory committee, will propose changes to measurable outcomes, assessment tools for the next period, and, where needed, curriculum and program changes.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO).

SLO 1. Students will write a variety of types of texts for diverse audiences, purposes, and contexts.

Measure 1.1 (Direct – Skill)

Target: 80% of student portfolios assessed will score 2 (acceptable) or higher on Rubric 1.1.

At the end of each fall semester, instructors will evaluate student portfolios from all students enrolled in English 1010 that semester, using the standardized rubric 1.1 (attached). Portfolios should consist of student selections of 1) at least two of the formal essays students have written during semester with some evidence of the writing process that led to those essays, 2) at least three informal pieces, such as in-class work or homework, students have written during the semester, and 3) a reflective letter. At least one assignment should evidence collaboration with classmates (e.g., peer review, group assignment). This portfolio should demonstrate the student's ability to compose a variety of types of texts for diverse audiences, purposes, and contexts and will be evaluated based on Rubric 1.1 (attached), which is based on the ENGL 1010 course objectives. At minimum, the contents should include:

- Cover Page
- Table of Contents
- Reflective Statement
- Formal Writing Assignment #1: Final Version and Evidence of Process
- Formal Writing Assignment #2: Final Version and Evidence of Process
- Informal Writing #1
- Informal Writing #2
- Informal Writing #3

At least 80% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1010 (639)	Portfolio	80%	Fall 2022

Findings:

AC 2022-2023 578/639* student assignments (90%) scored 2+. Target met. AC 2021-2022 759/832* student assignments (91%) scored 2+. Target met.

*Results include 210 dual enrollment students. **Results include 394 dual enrollment students.

Analysis:

In AC 2021-2022, the target was met with 91.2% (759/832) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessment. That year, no individual rubric item stood out as a significant area of concern across the program. The 832 students assessed represented 76% of students enrolled, an increase of 2% from AC 2020-2021. The number of dual enrollment students assessed decreased in AC 2021-2022, as only 65% of dual enrollment classes reported data. 100% of courses taught by faculty directly employed by NSU returned data, but only 2% (2/10 sections) taught by non-NSU faculty in high school settings reported data.

In AC 2022-2023, the target was met with 90.4% (578/639) of students evaluated scoring a 2 or higher on the assessment, a slight decrease of less than1%. Students performed well on this measure in general; however, looking at specific rubric items suggest that students continue to be less successful in two areas across the program: 1010.8: Understand basic rhetorical strategies used in the development of writing and 1010.7: Identify, understand, and discuss textual features and strategies and how they function as agents of effective communication. In AC 2023-2024, additional training will be provided in the teaching of critical reading and rhetorical analysis.

In AC 2022-2023, the 639 students assessed represented 76% of the students enrolled, matching the assessment rate from AC 2021-2022. The number of students participating in assessment has continued to rise as students return to campus after COVID 19. COVID 19 greatly impacted the number of students completing the course, with the completion rate dropping from 84% in Fall 2020 to 74% in Fall 2021.

It is also worth noting that the dual enrollment courses assessed represent 50% (11/22) of courses offered: 87.5% (7/8) of courses taught by faculty directly employed by NSU reported data, while 29% (4/14) of courses taught in high schools reported data. In Fall 2022, a new reporting system was introduced in which instructors submit their data through an online form rather than emailing their data to the program coordinator. Many high school instructors reported difficulties with the online form in its first semester. Additional training was provided in Spring 2023, and the reporting numbers increased to 60% of high school instructors reporting data.

Decision:

Finding from AC 2022-2023 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 1 through Measure 1.1, with 90.4% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric, a number consistent with AC 2021-2022 results. Training on the portfolio assessment and reporting was effective in increasing participation overall and will be part of the annual training for faculty teaching ENGL 1010.

In AC 2022-2023, 76% (639/837) of students in ENGL 1010 in the Fall 2022 were evaluated, a number consistent AC with 2021-2022. As such, we continue to stress the importance of assessment to both faculty and students. The assessment rate should continue to improve in AC 2023-2024 as students continue to return to in-person classes. Training will be increased and refined at all instruction sites as part of the effort to increase collection and reporting of assessment data to ensure instruction is consistent across the program.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will maintain the expectation that 80% of students will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AC 2023-2024. Based on the analysis of the 2022-2023 results the following changes will be implemented to drive improvement in 2023-2024. Refined training will be provided to further assist faculty in collecting and reporting assessment data. Additional outreach will be made to encourage dual enrollment instructors working in the K-12 setting to submit assessment reports. Additional training in teaching critical reading and rhetorical analysis will also be offered to drive improvements in SLOs 1010.7 and 1010.8.

Measure 1.2 (Indirect – Reflection)

Target: 80% of student portfolio letters assessed will score 2 (acceptable) or higher on Rubric 1.2.

At the end of each fall semester, instructors will evaluate student portfolio letters from all students enrolled in English 1010 that semester, using the standardized rubric 1.2 (attached). The portfolio letter should be a reflection on the student's work from the semester as it is evidenced in the portfolio. Students should describe their composing processes, explain what writing they have done over the course of semester, referencing each of the samples in the portfolio as well as other work from the semester, and reflect on their development as a writer through the coursework. Ultimately, the letter should demonstrate that students have thought carefully about their writing as both completed products and active processes completed in response to specific contexts and will be evaluated based on Rubric 1.2 (attached), which evaluates reported student learning based on the ENGL 1010 course objectives. At least 80% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1010 (639)	Portfolio Letter	80%	Fall 2022

Findings:

AC 2022/2023	580/639* student assignments (90%) scored 2+.	Target met.
AC 2021-2022	780/832** student assignments (94%) scored 2+.	Target met.

*Results include 210 dual enrollment students. **Results include 394 dual enrollment students.

Analysis:

In AC 2021-2022, the target was met with 94% (780/832) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessment. That year, no individual rubric item stood out as a significant area of concern across the program. The 832 students assessed represented 76% of students enrolled, an increase of 2% from AC 2020-2021. The number of dual enrollment students assessed decreased in AC 2021-2022, as only 65% of dual enrollment classes reported data. 100% of courses taught by faculty directly employed by NSU returned data, but only 2% (2/10 sections) taught by faculty in high school settings reported data.

In AC 2022-2023, the target was met with 90.7% (580/639) of students evaluated scoring a 2 or higher on the assessment, a decrease of 3%. Students performed well on this measure in general; however, looking at specific rubric items suggest that students continue to be less successful in two areas across the program: 1010.8: Understand basic rhetorical strategies used in the development of writing and 1010.7: Identify, understand, and discuss textual features and strategies and how they function as agents of effective communication. Additional training in AC 2023-2024 will be provided in the teaching of critical reading and rhetorical analysis.

In AC 2022-2023, the 639 students assessed represented 76% of the students enrolled, matching the assessment rate from AC 2021-2022. The number of students participating in assessment has continued to rise as students return to campus after COVID 19. COVID 19 greatly impacted the number of students completing the course, with the completion rate dropping from 84% in Fall 2020 to 74% in Fall 2021.

It is also worth noting that the dual enrollment courses assessed represent 50% (11/22) of courses offered: 87.5% (7/8) of courses taught by faculty directly employed by NSU reported data, while 29% (4/14) of courses taught in high schools reported data. In Fall 2022, a new reporting system was introduced in which instructors submit their data through an online form rather than emailing their data to the program coordinator. Many high school instructors reported difficulties with the online form in its first semester. Additional training was provided in Spring 2023, and the reporting numbers increased to 60% of high school instructors reporting data.

Decision:

Findings from AC 2022-2023 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 1 through Measure 1.1, with 90.7% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric, a number consistent with AC 2021-2022 results. Training on the portfolio assessment and reporting was effective in increasing participation and will be part of the annual training for faculty teaching ENGL 1010.

In AC 2022-2023, 77% (639/837) of students in ENGL 1010 in Fall 2022 were evaluated, a 1% increase from AC 2021-2022. As such, we will continue to stress the importance of assessment to both faculty and students. The assessment rate should continue to improve in AC 2023-2024 as students continue to return to in-person classes. Training will be increased and refined at all instruction sites as part of the effort to increase collection and reporting of assessment data to ensure instruction is consistent across the program.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will maintain the expectation that 80% of students will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AC 2023-2024. Based on the analysis of the 2022-2023 results the following changes will be implemented to drive improvement in 2023-2024. Refined training will be provided to further assist faculty in collecting and reporting assessment data. Additional outreach will be made to encourage dual enrollment instructors working in the K-12 setting to submit assessment reports. Additional training in teaching critical reading and rhetorical analysis will also be offered to drive improvements in SLOs 1010.7 and 1010.8.

SLO 2. Students will perform writing as a process of planning, researching, prewriting, drafting, evaluating, and revising to develop and strengthen their compositions.

Measure 2.1 (Direct – Skill)

Target: 80% of student portfolios assessed will score 2 (acceptable) or higher on Rubric 2.1.

At the end of each spring semester, instructors will evaluate student portfolios from all students enrolled in English 1020 that semester, using the standardized rubric 2.1 (attached). This portfolio, a process portfolio, is a collection of a student's work on the researched argument assignment that is the culmination of the English 1020 course. This collection should consist of evidence of the student's composition process, from initial planning through drafting and revision to the final version, and a reflective letter. Among this evidence should be evidence of some peer review activity. This portfolio should demonstrate the student's ability to perform writing as a purpose-driven process that leads to a researched essay and will be evaluated based on Rubric 2.1 (attached), which is based on the ENGL 1020 course objectives. The minimum contents should include:

- Cover Page
- Table of Contents
- Reflective Statement

- Planning Materials (e.g., freewriting, notes, idea maps, etc.)
- Shaping/Organizing Materials (e.g., thesis statements, outlines, etc.)
- Rough Draft with Comments (self-review, tutor review, and/or instructor review)
- Evidence of Collaborative Activity
- Working Bibliography of Research
- Final Version of Researched Argument Essay

At least 80% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1020 (577)	Portfolio	80%	Spring 2023

Findings:

AC 2022-2023	545/577* student assignments (94.4%) scored 2+.	Target met.
AC 2021-2022	625/714** student assignments (87.5%) scored 2+	Target met.

*Results include 232 dual enrollment students. **Results include 317 dual enrollment students.

Analysis:

In AC 2021-2022, the target was met with 87.5% (625/714) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessments. No individual rubric item stood out as a significant area of concern across the program. 80.5% (714/887) of enrolled students were assessed, and the training provided on implementing the assessment portfolio and reporting data was refined for AC 2022-2023. In Spring 2022, 68% of dual enrollment sections were assessed. Overall, these numbers illustrate that the training implemented in Spring 2021, which was directly tailored to instructors working in K12 settings, worked to assist faculty in understanding how to collect and report data more effectively. Outreach and training for K12 instructors was refined for AC 2022-2023.

In AC 2022-2023, the target was met with 94.4% (545/577) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessments, an increase of 6.9% from AC 2021-2022. Students performed well on this measure in general; however, looking at specific rubric items suggest that students continue to be less successful in two areas across the program: 1020.1: Write purpose-driven, evidence-based, argumentative texts and 1020.10: Synthesize research materials to situate and contextualize their own writing within the existing discourse surrounding their topic. Additional training in critical reading and synthesis be provided in AC 2023-2024.

In Spring 2021, the 577 students assessed represented 78% (577/739) students enrolled, a decrease of 2.5% from AC 2021-2022. The percentage of dual enrollment courses assessed increased, as 75% of dual enrollment sections were assessed compared to 68% in AC 2021-2022. The variance in numbers can partially be explained by a change in reporting systems. In Fall 2022, a new reporting system was instituted

in which instructors report their data using an online form rather than emailing the data directly to the program coordinator. Both faculty directly employed by NSU and those teaching in high schools reported some difficulty becoming used to the new system. Training was provided in Spring 2022 and will be refined for AC 2023-2024.

Decision:

Findings from AC 2022-2023 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 2 through Measure 2.1, with 94.4% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric.

Based on the analysis of the 2022-2023 results and to improve reporting of assessment of instruction at all NSU instructional sites, in 2023-2024 the Writing Program Administrator will work with the Dual Enrollment areas on campus to improve reporting from instructors credentialed through NSU but employed by and working in K12 settings. Training will be increased and refined at all instruction sites as part of the effort to increase collection and reporting of assessment data to ensure instruction is consistent across the program.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will maintain the expectation that 80% of students will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AC 2023-2024. Based on the analysis of the 2022-2023 results the following changes will be implemented to drive improvement in 2023-2024. Refined training will be provided to further assist faculty in collecting and reporting assessment data. Additional outreach will be made to encourage dual enrollment instructors working in the K-12 setting to submit assessment reports. Additional training in teaching critical reading and synthesis will be provided to drive improvements in SLOs 1020.1 and 1020.10.

Measure 2.2 (Indirect – Reflection)

Target: 80% of student portfolio letters assessed will score 2 (acceptable) or higher on Rubric 2.2.

At the end of each spring semester, instructors will evaluate student portfolio letters from all students enrolled in English 1010 that semester, using the standardized rubric 2.2 (attached). The portfolio letter should be a reflection on the student's work on the researched argument assignment as it is evidenced in the portfolio. Students should describe their composing processes, explain their rhetorical and stylistic choices, and reflect on their development as a writer through the project. Ultimately, the letter should demonstrate that students have thought carefully about their writing as both completed products and active processes completed in response to specific contexts and will be evaluated based on Rubric 2.2 (attached), which evaluates reported student learning based on the ENGL 1020 course objectives. At least 70% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1020 (577)	Portfolio Letter	80%	Spring 2023

Findings:

AC 2022-2023	526/577* student assignments (91%) scored 2+.	Target met.
AC 2021-2022	608/714* student assignments (85%) scored 2+	Target met.

*Results include 232 dual enrollment students. **Results include 317 dual enrollment students.

Analysis:

In AC 2021-2022, the target was met with 85% (608/714) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessments. No individual rubric item stood out as a significant area of concern across the program. 80.5% (714/887) of enrolled students were assessed, and the training provided on implementing the assessment portfolio and reporting data was refined for AC 2021-2022. In Spring 2022, 68% of dual enrollment sections were assessed. Overall, these numbers illustrate that the training implemented in Spring 2022, which was directly tailored to instructors working in K12 settings, worked to assist faculty in understanding how to collect and report data more effectively.

In AC 2022-2023, the target was met with 91% (526/577) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessments, an increase of 6% from AC 2021-2022. Students performed well on this measure in general; however, looking at specific rubric items suggest that students continue to be less successful in two areas across the program: 1020.10: Synthesize research materials to situate and contextualize their own writing within the existing discourse surrounding their topic and 1020.11: Document and integrate research materials in their own writing in a way that clearly designates source materials as separate from, but in relation to their own arguments. Additional training in teaching critical reading and source integration will be provided in AC 2023-2024.

In Spring 2022, the 577 students assessed represented 78% (577/739) students enrolled, a decrease of 2.5% from AC 2021-2022. The percentage of dual enrollment students assessed increased, as 75% of dual enrollment sections were assessed compared to 68% in AC 2021-2022. The variance in numbers can partially be explained by a change in reporting systems. In Fall 2022, a new reporting system was instituted in which instructors report their data using an online form rather than emailing the data directly to the program coordinator. Both faculty directly employed by NSU and those teaching in high schools reported some difficulty becoming used to the new system. Training was provided in Spring 2022 and will be refined for AC 2023-2024.

Decision:

Findings from AC 2022-2023 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 2 through Measure 2.1, with 91% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric.

Based on the analysis of the 2022-2023 results and to improve reporting of assessment of instruction at all NSU instructional sites, in 2023-2024 the Writing Program Administrator will work with the Dual Enrollment areas on campus to improve reporting from instructors credentialed through NSU but employed by and working in K12 settings. Training will be increased and refined at all instruction sites as part of the effort to increase collection and reporting of assessment data to ensure instruction is consistent across the program.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will maintain the expectation that 80% of students will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AC 2023-2024. Based on the analysis of the 2022-2023 results the following changes will be implemented to drive improvement in 2023-2024. Refined training will be provided to further assist faculty in collecting and reporting assessment data. Additional outreach will be made to encourage dual enrollment instructors working in the K-12 setting to submit assessment reports. Additional training in teaching critical reading and source integration will be provided to drive improvements in SLOs 1020.10 and 1020.11.

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Improvements Based on Analysis of Results. The following reflects all the changes implemented in AC 2022-2023 to drive the continuous process of seeking improvement. These changes are based on the knowledge gained through the analysis of the AC 2021-2022 results.

- Conducted training of faculty in our new approach to assessment improved participation and student success as faculty were better prepared to administer, collect, evaluate, and report on assessments.
- Conducted refined training in the integration of collaboration, rhetorical analysis, and reading instruction in the coursework and assessment for all instructors of English 1010 and English 1020, particularly in online settings.
- Continued development of processes and procedures to train dual enrollment instructors employed by and working in K12 settings in the use and reporting of assessment data.

Plan of Action Moving Forward.

Our dedication to continual improvement for SLOs 1 and 2 will lead to the following refinements to the courses and assessments in the General Education Core Curriculum English area (ENGL 1010 and ENGL 1020 courses):

- Conduct training in rhetorical analysis, critical reading, synthesis and source integration in order to drive improvement in SLOs 1010.7, 1010.8, 1010.3, 1020.1, 1020.10, and 1020.11.
- Revised training in the administration, collection, evaluation, and reporting of assessment data for both SLOs and all four measures for all faculty teaching

English 1010 and 1020.

• Continued development of processes and procedures to train dual enrollment instructors employed by and working in K12 settings in the use and reporting of assessment data.

Attachment A: General Education Core Curriculum: English (Core Competency #1) Assessment Rubric for Direct Assessment (SLO 1.1)

Standards	Artifact(s)	Target 3	Acceptable 2	Not_Acceptabl e 1	Scor e
ENGL 1010.1 – Write texts	Samples of formal and informal	Demonstrate the student's ability to	Demonstrate the student's ability to	Fail to demonstrate the student's	
with a variety	student	write	write for a	ability to write	
of purposes .	writing	effectively for a wide variety of purposes.	variety of purposes.	for a variety of purposes.	
ENGL 1010.4	Samples of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fail to	
– Write in a	formal and informal	the student's awareness	the student's awareness	demonstrate the student's	
variety of	student	of diverse	of audience	awareness of	
rhetorical	writing	audiences and	and rhetorical	audiences and rhetorical	
situations		rhetorical	situation.	situations.	
tailored to a		situations.			
variety of					
audiences.					
ENGL 1010.5	Samples of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fail to	
– Write with	formal and informal	the student's ability to	the student's ability to	demonstrate the student's	
respect to	student	recognize	recognize	ability to	
expectations	writing	and meet the many	and meet the expectations	recognize and meet the	
of genre,		expectations	of their	expectations of	
format,		of their writerly	writerly contexts.	their writerly contexts.	
structure,		contexts.			
style, and					
surface					
features					
appropriate to					

Rubric 1.1 – English 1010 Writing Portfolio Rubric

the writer's					
context.					
ENGL 1010.8	Samples of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fail to	
– Understand	formal and	the student's	the student's	demonstrate	
basic	informal student	ability to employ	ability to employ	the student's ability to	
rhetorical	writing	rhetorical	rhetorical	employ	
strategies		strategies effectively in	strategies in their writing.	rhetorical strategies in	
used in the		their writing.		their writing.	
development					
of writing.					
ENGL 1010.3	Samples of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to	
- Construct	formal student	the student's ability to	the student's ability to	demonstrate the student's	
clear thesis	writing	construct a	construct a	ability to	
statements.		clear thesis statement.	thesis statement.	construct a thesis	
		Statement.	Statement.	statement.	
ENGL 1010.6	Samples of formal	Demonstrate the student's	Demonstrate the student's	Fail to demonstrate	
– Demonstrate	student	ability to	ability to	the student's	
knowledge of	writing	employ the conventions	employ the conventions	ability to employ the	
the		of Standard	of Standard	conventions of	
conventions of		American English with	American English.	Standard American	
Standard		minimal	English.	English.	
American		error.			
English in					
formal writing.					
ENGL 1010.2	Samples of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate the student's	Fail to	
- Understand	formal student	the student's varied use of	use of	demonstrate the student's	
and develop	writing with evidence of	strategies for	strategies for	use of	
flexible	process	planning, drafting, and	planning, drafting, and	strategies for planning,	
strategies for		revising	revising	drafting, and	
writing as an		when composing.	when composing.	revising when composing.	
open process .					

ENGL 1010.9	Sample of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
– Practice	student	s the	s the	demonstrate
	writing that	student's	student's	the student's
collaboration.	evidences collaboratio	ability to work	ability to work with	ability to work with their
	n	productively	their	classmates.
		with their	classmates.	
		classmates.		
ENGL 1010.7	Reflective	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
– Identify,	letter	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's
understand,		ability to	ability to	ability to
and discuss		recognize and discuss	recognize and discuss	recognize and discuss
textual		elements in	elements in	elements in
features and		their own writing and	their own writing and	their own writing and
strategies		writing	writing	writing
and how they		processes and how	processes.	processes.
function as		they affect		
agents of		their ability to communicat		
effective		e effectively		
communicatio		and efficiently.		
n.				
ENGL	Portfolio as	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
1010.10 -	a whole	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's
Employ		ability to	ability to	ability to
electronic		compose and produce	produce products	compose or produce
technologies		products	using	products using
that aid in		using electronic	electronic technologies	electronic technologies.
writing.		technologies		

Attachment B: General Education Core Curriculum: English (Core Competency #1) Assessment Rubric for Indirect Assessment (SLO 1.2)

Rubric 1.2 – Enalish	1010 Writing Portfolio	Letter Rubric (Indirect)

To what extent	Target 3	Acceptable 2	Not_Acceptable 1	Score
does the	-			
statement				
address learning				
about				
ENGL 1010.1 -	Response	Response	Response	
Writing texts with	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection	
a variety of	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
purposes.	and personalization of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	and personalization of, the concept. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	personalization of, the concept. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.	
ENGL 1010.4 –	Response	Response	Response	
Writing in a	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection	
variety of	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
rhetorical	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.	
situations	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when	
tailored to a	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.	
variety of	provided, as	provided, as		
audiences.	applicable.	applicable.		
ENGL 1010.5 –	Response	Response	Response	
Writing with	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection	
respect to	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
expectations of	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.	
genre, format,	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when	
structure, style,	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.	

and surface	provided, as	provided, as	
features	applicable.	applicable.	
appropriate to the			
writer's context.			
ENGL 1010.8 -	Response	Response	Response
Understanding	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
basic rhetorical	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
strategies used	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.
in the	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when
development of	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.
writing.	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.	provided.
ENGL 1010.3 -	Response	Response	Response
Constructing	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
clear thesis	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
statements.	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.
	of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	of, the concept. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	Examples, when applicable, are not provided.
ENGL 1010.6 -	Response	Response	Response
Demonstrating	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
knowledge of the	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
conventions of	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.
Standard	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when
American	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.
English in formal	provided, as	provided, as	
writing.	applicable.	applicable.	
ENGL 1010.2 –	Response	Response	Response
Understanding	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
and developing	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
flexible strategies	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.

for writing as an open process .	of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	of, the concept. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	Examples, when applicable, are not provided.
ENGL 1010.9 – Practicing collaboration.	Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on, and personalization of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and personalization of, the concept. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalization of, the concept. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.
ENGL 1010.7 –	Response	Response	Response
Identifying,	demonstrates an	demonstrates a	demonstrates a lack of reflection
understanding,	in-depth reflection on,	general reflection on,	on, or
and discussing	and	and	personalization of,
textual features	personalization of, the standard.	personalization of, the concept.	the concept. Examples, when
and strategies	Clear, detailed	Appropriate	applicable, are not
and how they	examples are provided, as	examples are provided, as	provided.
function as	applicable.	applicable.	
agents of			
effective			
communication.			
ENGL 1010.10 -	Response	Response	Response
Employing	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
electronic	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
technologies	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.
that aid in writing.	of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	of, the concept. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	Examples, when applicable, are not provided.

Attachment C: General Education Core Curriculum: English (Core Competency #1) Assessment Rubric for Direct Assessment (SLO 2.1)

Standards	Artifact(s)	Target	Acceptable	Not_Acceptab	Scor
		3	2	le	e
				1	
ENGL 1020.1	Final version	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to	
– Write	of the research	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's	
purpose-	argumentativ	ability to	ability to	ability to write a	
driven,	e essay	write an effective	write a researched	researched argumentative	
evidence-		researched	argumentativ	essay.	
based,		argumentativ e essay.	e essay.		
argumentativ					
e texts.					
ENGL 1020.3	Final version	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to	
– Write with	of the research	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's	
awareness of	argumentativ	awareness	awareness	awareness of a	
rhetorical	e essay	of a specific audience	of general audience	audience and rhetorical	
situations		and	and	situation.	
tailored to		rhetorical situation.	rhetorical situation.		
specific					
audiences.					
ENGL 1020.4	Final version	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to	
– Write with	of the research	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's	
respect to	argumentativ	ability to	ability to	ability to	
expectations	e essay	recognize and meet the	recognize and meet the	recognize and meet the	
of genre,		many	expectations	expectations of	
format,		expectations of their	of their writerly	their writerly context.	
structure,		writerly	context.		
style, and		context.			
surface					

Rubric 2.1 – English 1020 Process Portfolio Rubric

fasting		[1	
features					
appropriate to					
the writer's					
context.					
ENGL 1020.5	Final version of the research argumentativ	Demonstrate s the student's ability to	Demonstrate s the student's ability to	Fails to demonstrate the student's ability to	
	e essay	employ the	employ the	employ the	
knowledge of the		conventions of Standard	conventions of Standard	conventions of Standard	
conventions of		American	American	American	
Standard		English with minimal	English.	English.	
American		error.			
English in					
formal writing.	<u> </u>		-		
ENGL	Final version of the	Demonstrate s the	Demonstrate s the	Fails to demonstrate	
1020.10 -	research	student's	student's	the student's	
Synthesize	argumentativ e essay	ability to present their	ability to present their	ability to present their	
research	c coody	own ideas	own ideas	own ideas	
materials to		within the	within the	within the	
situate and		larger conversation	larger conversation	larger conversation	
contextualize		surrounding	surrounding	about the topic	
their own		the topic through	the topic through	through synthesis of	
writing within		effective	synthesis of	research.	
the existing		synthesis of research.	research.		
discourse					
surrounding					
their topic.					
ENGL 1020.7	Final version	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to	
- Read and	of the research	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's	
respond	argumentativ	ability to	ability to	ability to read,	
critically to a	e essay	read, understand,	read, understand,	understand, and respond to	

variety of		and respond	and respond	source
texts.		to source	to source	materials.
IEXIS.		materials in	materials.	
		a critical and strategic		
		way.		
ENGL	Final version	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
1020.11 –	of the research	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's
Document	argumentativ	ability to	ability to	ability to
and integrate	e essay	document research	document research	document research
research		materials	materials	materials
materials in		correctly according to	correctly according to	correctly according to
their own		the conventions	the conventions	the conventions of
writing in a		of MLA style,	of MLA style,	MLA style,
way that		including correct use	including correct use	including correct use of
clearly		of	of	quotations,
designates		quotations, citations,	quotations, citations,	citations, and Works Cited.
source		and Works	and Works	WOIKS Cileu.
materials as		Cited with	Cited.	
separate from,		minimal to no error.		
but in relation				
to, their own				
arguments.				
ENGL 1020.2	Planning	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fail to
 Understand 	materials, shaping	the student's use of	the student's use of	demonstrate the student's
and develop	materials,	multiple	strategies for	use of
flexible	and draft with	strategies for planning,	planning, drafting, and	strategies for planning,
strategies for	comments	drafting, and	revising	drafting, and
writing as an		revising when	when composing.	revising when composing.
open		composing.		
process.				
ENGL 1020.6	Evidence of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
- Practice	peer review activity	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's

collaboration		ability to	ability to	ability to work
		work	work with	with their
•		productively	their	classmates.
		with their	classmates.	
		classmates.		
ENGL 1020.9	Source	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
– Gather and	materials	s the	s the	demonstrate
		student's	student's	the student's
evaluate		ability to	ability to	ability to
primary and		conduct research and	conduct research and	conduct research and
secondary		collect	collect	collect
research		materials from reliable	materials from primary	materials from primary and
materials.		primary and	and	secondary
		secondary	secondary	sources.
		sources.	sources.	
ENGL 1020.8	Reflective	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
– Identify,	letter	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's
understand,		ability to	ability to	ability to
and discuss		recognize and discuss	recognize and discuss	recognize and discuss
textual		elements in	elements in	elements in
features and		their own	their own	their own
		writing and	writing and	writing and
strategies		writing	writing	writing
and how they		processes and how	processes.	processes.
function as		they affect		
agents of		their ability to		
effective		communicat		
communicatio		e effectively and		
n.		efficiently.		
ENGL	Portfolio as a	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
1020.12 –	whole	s the	s the	demonstrate
		student's	student's	the student's
Employ		ability to compose	ability to produce	ability to compose or
electronic		and produce	products	produce
technologies		products using	using electronic	products using electronic
that aid in		electronic	technologies	technologies.
L	1		1	II

research and	technologies		
writing.			

Attachment D: General Education Core Curriculum: English (Core Competency #1) Assessment Rubric for Indirect Assessment (SLO 2.2)

To what extent	Target 3	Acceptable 2	Not_Acceptable	Score
does the	•	_	•	
statement				
address learning				
about …				
ENGL 1020.1 –	Response	Response	Response	
Writing purpose-	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection	
driven, evidence-	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
based,	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.	
argumentative	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when	
texts.	Clear, detailed examples are provided, as	Appropriate examples are provided, as	applicable, are not provided.	
	applicable.	applicable.	Deserves	
ENGL 1020.3 –	Response demonstrates an	Response demonstrates a	Response demonstrates a	
Writing with	in-depth	general	lack of reflection	
awareness of	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
rhetorical	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.	
situations	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when	
tailored to specific	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.	
audiences.	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.		
ENGL 1020.4 –	Response	Response	Response	
Writing with	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection	
respect to	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
expectations of	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.	
genre, format,	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when	
structure, style,	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.	

provided, as

applicable.

provided, as

applicable.

and surface

Rubric 2.2 – English 1020 Process Portfolio Rubric (Indirect)

features				
appropriate to the				
writer's context.				
ENGL 1020.5 –	Response	Response	Response	
Demonstrating	demonstrates an	demonstrates a	demonstrates a	
	in-depth	general	lack of reflection	
knowledge of the	reflection on, and	reflection on, and	on, or personalization of,	
conventions of	personalization	personalization	the concept.	
Standard	of, the standard. Clear, detailed	of, the concept. Appropriate	Examples, when applicable, are not	
American	examples are	examples are	provided.	
English in formal	provided, as	provided, as		
writing.	applicable.	applicable.		
	_	_		
ENGL 1020.10 –	Response demonstrates an	Response demonstrates a	Response demonstrates a	
Synthesizing	in-depth	general	lack of reflection	
research	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
materials to	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.	
situate and	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when	
contextualize their	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.	
own writing within	provided, as	provided, as		
the existing	applicable.	applicable.		
discourse				
surrounding their				
topic.				
ENGL 1020.7 –	Response	Response	Response	
Reading and	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection	
responding	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
critically to a	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.	
variety of texts.	of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are	of, the concept. Appropriate examples are	Examples, when applicable, are not provided.	

	and the second	and the second second	1
	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.	
ENGL 1020.11 –	Response	Response	Response
Documenting	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
and integrating	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
research	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.
materials in their	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when
own writing in a	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.
way that clearly	provided, as	provided, as	
designates source	applicable.	applicable.	
materials as			
separate from, but			
in relation to, their			
own arguments.			
ENGL 1020.2 –	Response	Response	Response
Understanding	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
and develop	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
flexible strategies	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.
for writing as an	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when
open process .	Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	applicable, are not provided.
ENGL 1020.6 -	Response	Response	Response
Practicing	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
collaboration.	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
	and	and	personalization of,
	personalization	personalization	the concept.
	of, the standard. Clear, detailed	of, the concept. Appropriate	Examples, when applicable, are not
	examples are	examples are	provided.
	provided, as	provided, as	
	applicable.	applicable.	Deenener
ENGL 1020.9 –	Response demonstrates an	Response demonstrates a	Response demonstrates a
Gathering and	in-depth	general	lack of reflection
evaluating primary	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or

and secondary research materials. ENGL 1020.8 – Identifying, understanding, and discussing textual features and strategies and how they function as agents of effective communication.	and personalization of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable. Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on, and personalization of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	and personalization of, the concept. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable. Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and personalization of, the concept. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	personalization of, the concept. Examples, when applicable, are not provided. Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalization of, the concept. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.	
ENGL 1020.12 – Employing	Response demonstrates an in-depth	Response demonstrates a general	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection	
electronic	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
technologies that	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.	
aid in research	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when	
and writing.	Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	applicable, are not provided.	