Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

General Education Core Curriculum: English (Core Competency #1)

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

Prepared by: Thomas Reynolds, Program Coordinator Date: May 20, 2019

Approved by: Greg Handel, Provost Date: June 4, 2019

Northwestern State Mission: Northwestern State University is a responsive, Student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its Students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

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.

As this is a new approach yearly comparison between AY 2017-2018 and AY 2018-2019 are not as useful in understanding AY 2019-2020 and are, therefore, not included in this report.

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

Measure 1.1 (Direct - Skill)

Target: 70% 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:

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

- o Informal Writing #1
- o Informal Writing #2
- o Informal Writing #3

At least 70% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1010 (982)	Portfolio	70%	Fall 2018

Findings: Target met. 754/982 student assignments (77%) scored 2+.

Analysis: In response to the changes to the General Education Core Curriculum, the Writing Program Administrator, with faculty input, revised Student Learning Outcomes and the methodologies through which those outcomes would be measured for the English competence. For this reason, previous years' results are not relevant. Future data will help us better understand the value of our current results. The new measures tie to course goals and objectives, which are based in national standards from the "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" and the *NCTE / IRA Standards for the English Language Arts*.

In AY 2018-2019 the target was met with 77% of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the evaluation, as 754 of the students who submitted portfolios scored 2 or higher on the rubric. Students performed well in this measure in general.

However, looking at specific rubric items suggests that students were less successful at demonstrating competency in two areas across the program: 1010.9: Practice collaboration (234 not acceptable, or 24% scoring 1 on the rubric) and 1010.7: Identify, understand, and discuss textual features and strategies and how they function as agents of effective communication (231 not acceptable, or 24% scoring 1 on the rubric). While 76% of students did score acceptable or higher (2+) in these areas, in an effort to improve the program, faculty will be provided training on incorporating collaboration and rhetorical analysis in ENGL 1010 classes, and the portfolio and rating process will be reviewed to assist them in ways in which to include evidence of collaboration and analysis in their students' portfolios. Furthermore, instructors will be encouraged to review their own results to identify areas of opportunity for improvement based on their students' portfolios. Because the rubric ties specifically to course goals and objectives in measuring this student learning outcome, any low-scoring areas provide instructors specific indication of areas for improvement in their own classrooms.

It is worth noting that the 982 students assessed represented only 77% of course enrollment in Fall 2018 (1268 students enrolled), and it is believed that higher response rates would be beneficial in future semesters to better understand the program.

Because the findings demonstrate that our program met the target for SLO 1 through Measure 1.1, the Department will establish a more rigorous target to maximize the benefit of assessment in AY 2019-2020.

Decision: Findings from AY 2018-2019 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 1 through Measure 1.1, with 77% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric. In the spirit of improvement, faculty will receive additional training in our new assessments so that portfolios and reporting truly represent what happens in classrooms. Based on the analysis of rubric criteria, faculty will also receive training on incorporating collaboration and rhetorical analysis in ENGL 1010.

Because only 77% of students in ENGL 1010 in the fall of 2018 were evaluated, we will the issue of participation in order to understand why some students were not evaluated. This data was not collected in AY 2018-2019, so in AY 2019-2020 the reporting forms will be updated to request information about students who were not evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will revise expectations so that 75% of students will be expected to score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AY 2019-2020.

Measure 1.2 (Indirect – Reflection)

Target: 70% 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 70% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1010 (982)	Portfolio Letter	70%	Fall 2018

Findings: Target met. 754/982 student assignments (77%) scored 2+.

Analysis: In response to the changes to the General Education Core Curriculum, the Writing Program Administrator, with faculty input, revised Student Learning Outcomes and the methodologies through which those outcomes would be measured for the English competence. For this reason, previous years' results are not relevant. Future data will help us better understand the value of our current results. The new measures tie to course goals and objectives, which are based in national standards from the "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" and the *NCTE / IRA Standards for the English Language Arts*.

In AY 2018-2019 the target was met with 77% of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the evaluation, as 754 of the students who submitted portfolios scored 2 or higher on the rubric. Students performed well in this measure in general.

However, looking at specific rubric items suggests that students were less successful at reflecting on one area across the program: 1010.9: Practice collaboration (234 not acceptable, or 24% scoring 1 on the rubric). While 76% of students did score acceptable or higher (2+) in these areas, in an effort to improve the program, faculty will be provided training on incorporating collaboration in ENGL 1010 classes, and the portfolio and rating process will be reviewed to assist them in ways in which to include evidence and discussion of collaboration in their students' portfolios. Furthermore, instructors will be encouraged to review their own results to identify areas of opportunity for improvement based on their students' portfolios. Because the rubric ties specifically to course goals and objectives in measuring this student learning outcome, any low-scoring areas provide instructors specific indication of areas for improvement in their own classrooms.

It is worth noting that the 982 students assessed represented only 77% of course enrollment in Fall 2018 (1268 students enrolled), and it is believed that higher response rates would be beneficial in future semesters to better understand the program.

It is also worth noting, and several faculty did note it, that the results for Measures 1.1 and 1.2 were very similar; in fact, while there was some granular variation, the overall results were identical. This issue will be studied in AY2019-2020 and may lead to further revision of the assessment tool(s).

Because the findings demonstrate that our program met the target for SLO 1 through Measure 1.1, the Department will establish a more rigorous target to maximize the benefit of assessment in AY 2019-2020.

Decision: Findings from AY 2018-2019 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 1 through Measure 1.2, with 77% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric. In the spirit of improvement, faculty will receive additional training in our new assessments so that portfolios and reporting truly represent what happens in classrooms. Based on the analysis of rubric criteria, faculty will also receive training on incorporating collaboration in ENGL 1010.

Because only 77% of students in ENGL 1010 in the fall of 2018 were evaluated, we will the issue of participation in order to understand why some students were not evaluated. This data was not collected in AY 2018-2019, so in AY 2019-2020 the reporting forms will be updated to request information about students who were not evaluated.

Because results were so similar between Measure 1.1 and 1.2, we will study this issue based on AY 2019-2020 results to determine if two measures are needed or if we are measuring the same thing twice. By giving this issue attention, we hope to improve our assessment process to make it both useful and efficient.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will revise expectations so that 75% of students will be expected to score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AY 2019-2020.

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: 70% 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
- o 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 70% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1020 (807)	Portfolio	70%	Spring 2019

Findings: Target met. 692/807 student assignments (86%) scored 2+.

Analysis: In response to the changes to the General Education Core Curriculum, the Writing Program Administrator, with faculty input, revised Student Learning Outcomes and the methodologies through which those outcomes would be measured for the English competence. For this reason, previous years' results are not relevant. Future data will help us better understand the value of our current results. The new measures tie to course goals and objectives, which are based in national standards from the "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" and the NCTE / IRA Standards for the English Language Arts.

In AY 2018-2019 the target was met with 86% of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the evaluation, as 692 of the students who submitted portfolios scored 2 or higher on the rubric. Students performed very well in this measure in general.

Even looking at specific rubric items suggests that students who successfully met the target did well in all areas, while the 115 students (14%) whose work was determined to be not acceptable tended to be not acceptable across the rubric items. In other words, no area can be deemed to be of concern, but unsuccessful students seemed to be unsuccessful in all aspects of the portfolio. To improve the program, faculty will be provided training on the portfolio and rating process to assist them in finding ways to ensure that students include all required information in their portfolios.

Furthermore, instructors will be encouraged to review their own results to identify areas of opportunity for improvement based on their students' portfolios. Because the rubric ties specifically to course goals and objectives in measuring this student learning outcome, any low-scoring areas provide instructors specific indication of areas for improvement in their own classrooms.

Because the findings demonstrate that our program met the target for SLO 2 through Measure 2.1, the Department will establish a more rigorous target to maximize the benefit of assessment in AY 2019-2020.

Decision: Findings from AY 2018-2019 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 2 through Measure 2.1, with 86% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric. In the spirit of improvement, faculty will receive additional training in our new assessments so that portfolios and reporting truly represent what happens in classrooms.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will revise expectations so that 75% of students will be expected to score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AY 2019-2020.

Measure 2.2 (Indirect – Reflection)

Target: 70% 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 (807)	Portfolio Letter	70%	Spring 2019

Findings: Target met. 668/807 student assignments (83%) scored 2+.

Analysis: In response to the changes to the General Education Core Curriculum, the Writing Program Administrator, with faculty input, revised Student Learning Outcomes and the methodologies through which those outcomes would be measured for the English competence. For this reason, previous years' results are not relevant. Future data will help us better understand the value of our current results. The new measures tie to course goals and objectives, which are based in national standards from the "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" and the *NCTE / IRA Standards for the English Language Arts*.

In AY 2018-2019 the target was met with 83% of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the evaluation, as 668 of the students who submitted portfolios scored 2 or higher on the rubric. Students performed well in this measure in general.

Even looking at specific rubric items suggests that students who successfully met the target did well in all areas, while the 139 students (17%) whose work was determined to be not acceptable tended to be not acceptable across the rubric items. In other words, no area can be deemed to be of concern, but unsuccessful students seemed to be unsuccessful in all aspects of the portfolio letter. To improve the program, faculty will be

provided training on the portfolio and rating process to assist them in finding ways to ensure that students address all required information in their portfolio letters.

Furthermore, instructors will be encouraged to review their own results to identify areas of opportunity for improvement based on their students' portfolios. Because the rubric ties specifically to course goals and objectives in measuring this student learning outcome, any low-scoring areas provide instructors specific indication of areas for improvement in their own classrooms.

It is also worth noting, and several faculty did note it, that the results for Measures 2.1 and 2.2 were very similar; while there was a difference for 24/807 students (3%), the vast majority of students scored similarly on the two measurements. This issue will be studied in AY2019-2020 and may lead to further revision of the assessment tool(s).

Because the findings demonstrate that our program met the target for SLO 2 through Measure 2.2, the Department will establish a more rigorous target to maximize the benefit of assessment in AY 2019-2020.

Decision: Findings from AY 2018-2019 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 2 through Measure 2.2, with 83% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric. In the spirit of improvement, faculty will receive additional training in our new assessments so that portfolios and reporting truly represent what happens in classrooms.

Because results were so similar between Measure 2.1 and 2.2, we will study this issue based on AY 2019-2020 results to determine if two measures are needed or if we are measuring the same thing twice. By giving this issue attention, we hope to improve our assessment process to make it both useful and efficient.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will revise expectations so that 75% of students will be expected to score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AY 2019-2020.

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Improvements Based on Analysis of Results

- In response to the changes to the General Education Core Curriculum, the Writing Program Administrator, with faculty input, revised Student Learning Outcomes and the methodologies through which those outcomes would be measured for the English competence.
- The new measures tie to course goals and objectives, which are based in national standards from the "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition" and the NCTE / IRA Standards for the English Language Arts.

Plan of Action Moving Forward

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

- Increased attention in coursework to and practice in "collaboration" in English 1010 and training in the integration of "collaboration" in the coursework and assessment for all instructors of English 1010.
- Increased attention in coursework to and practice in "rhetorical analysis" in English 1010 and training in the integration of "rhetorical analysis" in the coursework and assessment for all instructors of English 1010.
- 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.
- The addition of an item on the assessment reporting forms to allow faculty to report on reasons for students who are not under evaluation.
- Finally, because findings demonstrate that our program met the targets for all SLOs in both AY 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, we will establish more rigorous targets to maximize the benefit of assessment in the future.
- Student achievement of targets for Measures 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 2.2 in AY 2018-2019 demonstrates the success of the program regarding our established SLOs that tie directly to the purpose of Core Competency 1: English.
- Low response rates on the survey instrument for Measures 1.1 and 1.2 (77%) administered in the fall of 2018 illustrates the need for better administration of the portfolio and portfolio letters to ensure student participation. However, increased participation on Measures 2.1 and 2.2 (82%) administered in the spring of 2019 suggests that as the new approach to assessment becomes more familiar participation rates should increase.
- Intentional training of faculty in our new approach to assessment in this area should improve participation and student success as faculty are better prepared to administer, collect, evaluate, and report on assessments.
- Measures 1.1 and, in part, 1.2 suggest that faculty might benefit from specific training on the integration of collaboration and rhetorical analysis in English 1010 in general and specifically as they might be evidenced and addressed in the assessment tools.

Attachment A:

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

Rubric 1.1 – English 1010 Writing Portfolio Rubric

Standards	Artifact(s)	Target 3	Acceptable 2	Not_Acceptabl e 1	Scor e
ENGL 1010.1	Samples of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fail to	
Write texts	formal and informal	the student's ability to	the student's ability 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					

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

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

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

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

To what extent	Target	Acceptable	Not_Acceptable	Score
does the	3	2	1	
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.	
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 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 1010.6 -	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	of, the concept. Appropriate examples are	Examples, when applicable, are not provided.
	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.	
ENGL 1010.9 – Practicing collaboration.	Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on, and	Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalization of,
	personalization of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	personalization of, the concept. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	the concept. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.
ENGL 1010.7 –	Response	Response	Response
Identifying,	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection
understanding,	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or
and discussing	and personalization	and personalization	personalization of, the concept.
textual features	of, the standard.	of, the concept.	Examples, when
and strategies	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.
and how they	provided, as	provided, as	
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)

Rubric 2.1 - English 1020 Process Portfolio Rubric

Standards	Artifact(s)	Target 3	Acceptable 2	Not_Acceptab le 1	Scor e
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		o coody.			
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		Situation.	Situation.		
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.	oontoxt.	
style, and		context.			
<i>y</i> ,	l .				

for a transaction				<u> </u>	
features					
appropriate to					
the writer's					
context.			_		
ENGL 1020.5	Final version of the research	Demonstrate s the student's	Demonstrate s the student's	Fails to demonstrate the student's	
Demonstrate	argumentativ	ability to	ability to	ability to	
knowledge of	e essay	employ the conventions	employ the conventions	employ the conventions of	
the		of Standard	of Standard	Standard	
conventions of		American English with	American English.	American English.	
Standard		minimal		3	
American		error.			
English in					
formal writing.					
ENGL	Final version	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to	
1020.10 -	of the research	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's	
Synthesize	argumentativ	ability to	ability to	ability to	
research	e essay	present their own ideas	present their own ideas	present their 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	

	and respond	and respond	source
	to source	to source	materials.
	materials in	materials.	
	way.		
Final version	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
or the research	s tne student's	s tne student's	demonstrate the student's
argumentativ	ability to	ability to	ability to
e essay	research	research	document research
	materials	materials	materials
	according to	according to	correctly according to
			the conventions of
	of MLA style,	of MLA style,	MLA style,
	including	including	including correct use of
	of	of	quotations,
	quotations,	quotations,	citations, and Works Cited.
	and Works	and Works	Works Cited.
	Cited with	Cited.	
	no error.		
	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fail to
,	the student's use of	the student's use of	demonstrate the student's
materials,	multiple	strategies for	use of
and draft with		, o	strategies for planning,
comments	drafting, and	revising	drafting, and
	revising when	_	revising when composing.
	composing.	,	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
Evidence of	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
peer review activity	s the student's	s the student's	demonstrate the student's
	of the research argumentative essay Planning materials, shaping materials, and draft with comments	Final version of the research argumentativ e essay Planning materials, shaping materials, shaping materials, and draft with comments Planning materials, shaping materials, and draft with comments Evidence of peer review Evidence of peer review Final version a critical and strategic way. Demonstrate student's ability to document research materials correctly according to the conventions of MLA style, including correct use of quotations, citations, and Works Cited with minimal to no error.	Final version of the research argumentative e essay Planning materials, shaping materials, and draft with comments Planning materials, shaping materials, and draft with comments Pevidence of peer review Evidence of peer review Pinal version a critical and strategic way. Demonstrate s the student's ability to ability to ability to ability to document research materials correctly according to the conventions of MLA style, including correct use of quotations, citations, and Works Cited with minimal to no error. Demonstrate the student's use of strategies for planning, drafting, and revising when composing. Demonstrate the student's use of strategies for planning, drafting, and revising when composing. Evidence of peer review Demonstrate to source materials. Demonstrate s the student's ability to ability to document research materials correctly according to the conventions of MLA style, including correct use of quotations, citations, and Works Cited. Demonstrate the student's use of strategies for planning, drafting, and revising when composing.

collaboration		obility to	ability to	obility to work
collaboration		ability to work	ability to work with	ability to work with their
		productively	their	classmates.
		with their	classmates.	0.0001101001
		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 conduct	ability to conduct	ability to conduct
primary and		research and	research and	research and
secondary		collect materials	collect materials	collect materials from
research		from reliable	from primary	primary and
materials.		primary and	and	secondary
		secondary sources.	secondary sources.	sources.
ENGL 1020.8	Reflective	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
– Identify,	letter	s the	s the	demonstrate
understand,		student's ability to	student's ability to	the student's ability to
· ·		recognize	recognize	recognize and
and discuss		and discuss	and discuss	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		
effective		communicat e effectively		
communicatio		and		
n.		efficiently.		
ENGL	Portfolio as a	Demonstrate	Demonstrate	Fails to
1020.12 –	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.

research and	technologies		
writing.			

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

Rubric 2.2 – English 1020 Process Portfolio Rubric (Indirect)

To what extent	Target	Acceptable	Not_Acceptable	Score
does the	3	2	1	
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	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.	
	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.		
ENGL 1020.3 –	Response	Response	Response	
Writing with	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a lack of reflection	
awareness of	reflection on,	reflection on,	on, or	
rhetorical	and	and	personalization of,	
situations	personalization of, the standard.	personalization of, the concept.	the concept. Examples, when	
tailored to specific	Clear, detailed examples are	Appropriate examples are	applicable, are not provided.	
audiences.	provided, as	provided, as	,	
	applicable.	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	and	personalization of,	
genre, format,	personalization of, the standard.	personalization of, the concept.	the concept. Examples, when	
	Clear, detailed	Appropriate	applicable, are not	
structure, style,	examples are	examples are	provided.	
and surface	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.		

features			
appropriate to the			
writer's context.			
ENGL 1020.5 –	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	provided
writing.	applicable.	applicable.	
ENGL 1020.10 –	Response	Response	Response
Synthesizing	demonstrates an in-depth	demonstrates a general	demonstrates a 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	provided
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.

	provided, as	provided, as	
	applicable.	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 of, the standard.	personalization of, the concept.	the concept. Examples, when
	Clear, detailed	Appropriate	applicable, are not
	examples are	examples are	provided.
	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.	
ENGL 1020.9 –	Response	Response	Response
Gathering and	demonstrates an	demonstrates a	demonstrates a
evaluating primary	in-depth reflection on,	general reflection on,	lack of reflection on, or
Cvaluating primary	TOTIGORIOTI OTI,	TOTICOUOTI OTI,	J.1., J.1

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