English – Core Competency #1. To demonstrate writing as a purpose-driven process of communication within specific contexts.

Prepared by: Thomas Reynolds, Program Coordinator   Date: May 18, 2020

Approved by: Greg Handel, Provost   Date: June 22, 2020

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 was a new approach last year, yearly comparisons between AY 2017-2018 and more recent years are not useful and, therefore, are not included in this report. Yearly comparisons between AY 2018-2019 are useful in understanding AY 2019-2020 and, therefore, are 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: 75%** 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 75% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1010 (1040)	Portfolio	75%	Fall 2019

Findings:
AY 2019-2020   920/1040* student assignments (88%) scored 2+.   Target met.
AY 2018-2019   754/982 student assignments (77%) scored 2+. Target met.

Results include 265 dual enrollment students

Analysis:
In AY 2018-2019 the target was met with 77% of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessment. Students performed well in this measure in general; however, looking at specific rubric items suggested that students were less successful at demonstrating competency in two areas across the program: 1010.9: Practice collaboration and 1010.7: Identify, understand, and discuss textual features and strategies and how they function as agents of effective communication. Based on the analysis of the results and in an effort to improve the program, faculty were provided training on incorporating collaboration and rhetorical analysis in ENGL 1010 classes, and the portfolio and rating process was reviewed to assist them in ways in which to include evidence of collaboration and analysis in their students' portfolios. Furthermore, instructors were encouraged to review their own results to identify areas of opportunity for improvement based on their students' portfolios.

As a result, in AC 2019-2020 the target was met with 88.46% (920/1040) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessment, showing an 11% improvement over the previous year. The training seems to have been effective in improving student performance across the portfolio assessment. Furthermore, no individual rubric item stood out as a significant area of concern across the program.

It is worth noting that in AY 2018-2019, the 982 students assessed represented 77% of course enrollment in Fall 2018 (1268 students enrolled), though those numbers only included sections taught by instructors employed directly by NSU. The assessment process and significance were reviewed and emphasized for faculty at the beginning of the fall semester. In AY 2019-2020, all sections taught by faculty directly employed by NSU reported assessment data. As a result, in AY 2019-2020 84% (1012/1207) of students enrolled in sections taught by faculty directly employed by NSU were assessed, demonstrating that the increased

training in the assessment importance, process, and reporting worked to assist faculty in understanding how to collect and report data more effectively. The remaining 15% of student in these sections for whom no assessment data was collected did not complete the course and, therefore, did not complete the assessment.

An important change in the ENGL 1010 assessment took place this year. AY 2019-2020 is the first year during which assessments were collected for dual enrollment sections taught by faculty credentialed through NSU but teaching in local high schools as the locations of instruction. In fall 2019, there were 584 dual enrollment sections, of which 265 were assessed (45%). Of dual enrollment sections taught by non-NSU employees, only 56 of 364 students (15%) were assessed in fall 2019. Including all sections of English 1010 at all sites of instruction, shows that only 67.44% of students enrolled in the course in Fall 2019 were assessed. This is an area of opportunity for future assessment cycles.

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 2020-2021.

Decision:
Findings from AY 2019-2020 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 1 through Measure 1.1, with 88% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric, 11% higher than the previous year's 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.

Because only 67% of students in ENGL 1010 (84% of students in NSU-faculty-taught courses, 45% of students in dual enrollment sections, 15% in dual enrollment sections taught by non-NSU-faculty) in the fall of 2019 were evaluated, we will study the issue of participation at other sites of instruction to ensure that dual enrollment students are assessed as part of the general education curriculum. Training will be offered to instructors at those 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 revise expectations so that 80% of students will be expected to score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AY 2020-2021.

Measure 1.2 (Indirect – Reflection)
Target: 75% 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 75% of students evaluated will score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation.

Course Name (# of students)	Methodology	Target	Term
ENGL 1010 (1040)	Portfolio Letter	75%	Fall 2019

Findings:
AY 2019-2020   900/1040* student assignments (87%) scored 2+   Target met.
AY 2018-2019   754/982 student assignments (77%) scored 2+.Target met.

Results include 265 dual enrollment students

Analysis:
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. Based on the analysis of the results and in an effort to improve the program, faculty were provided training on incorporating collaboration in ENGL 1010 classes, and the portfolio and rating process was reviewed to assist them in ways in which to include evidence and discussion of collaboration in their students' portfolios. Furthermore, instructors were encouraged to review their own results to identify areas of opportunity for improvement based on their students' portfolios.

As a result, in AY 2019-2020 the target was met with 87% of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the evaluation, as 900 of the 1040 students who submitted portfolios scored 2 or higher on the rubric, showing an 10% improvement over the previous year. The training seems to have been effective in improving student performance across the portfolio assessment. Furthermore, no individual rubric item stood out as a significant area of concern across the program.

It is worth noting that in AY 2018-2019, the 982 students assessed represented 77% of course enrollment in Fall 2018 (1268 students enrolled), though those numbers only included sections taught by instructors employed directly by NSU. The assessment process and significance were reviewed and emphasized for faculty at the beginning of the fall semester. In AY 2019-2020, all sections taught by faculty directly employed by NSU reported assessment data. As a result, in AY 2019-2020 84% (1012/1207) of students enrolled in sections taught by faculty directly employed by NSU were assessed, demonstrating that the increased training in the assessment importance, process, and reporting worked to assist faculty in understanding how to collect and report data more effectively. The remaining 15% of student in these sections for whom no assessment data was collected did not complete the course and, therefore, did not complete the assessment.

An important change in the ENGL 1010 assessment took place this year. AY 2019-2020 is the first year during which assessments were collected for dual enrollment sections taught by faculty credentialed through NSU but teaching in local high schools as the locations of instruction. In fall 2019, there were 584 dual enrollment sections, of which 265 were assessed (45%). Of dual enrollment sections taught by non-NSU employees, only 56 of 364 students (15%) were assessed in fall 2019. Including all sections of English 1010 at all sites of instruction, shows that only 67.44% of students enrolled in the course in Fall 2019 were assessed. This is an area of opportunity for future assessment cycles.

In AY 2018-2019, a number of faculty noted 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 was studied in AY2019-2020 and will continue to be studied over this assessment cycle, which may lead to further revision of the assessment tool(s) following the next reporting year.

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 2019-2020 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 1 through Measure 1.2, with 87% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric, 10% higher than the previous year. 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.

Because only 67% of students in ENGL 1010 (84% of students in NSU-faculty-taught courses, 45% of students in dual enrollment sections, 15% in dual enrollment sections taught by non-NSU-faculty) in the fall of 2019 were evaluated, we will study the issue of participation at other sites of instruction to ensure that dual enrollment students are assessed as part of the general

education curriculum. Training will be offered to instructors at those sites as part of the effort to increase collection and reporting of assessment data to ensure instruction is consistent across the program.

Because results continue to be so similar between Measure 1.1 and 1.2, we will study this issue based on AY 2020-2021 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 80% of students will be expected to score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AY 2020-2021.

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: 75% 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:
o Cover Page
o Table of Contents
o Reflective Statement
o Planning Materials (e.g., freewriting, notes, idea maps, etc.)
o Shaping/Organizing Materials (e.g., thesis statements, outlines, etc.)
o Rough Draft with Comments (self-review, tutor review, and/or instructor review)
o Evidence of Collaborative Activity
o Working Bibliography of Research
o 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 (707)	Portfolio	75%	Spring 2020

Findings:
AY 2019-2020   620/707* student assignments (88%) scored 2+.   Target met.
AY 2018-2019   692/807 student assignments (86%) scored 2+.Target met.

Results include 133 dual enrollment students

Analysis:
In AY 2018-2019 the target was met with 86% (692/807) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessment. Students performed well in this measure in general, and, looking at specific rubric items suggested that students who were successful were successful across the rubric while students who were unsuccessful were unsuccessful across the rubric. Based on the analysis of the results and in an effort to improve the program, faculty were provided training on ways in which to encourage more students to complete the portfolio assignment, including samples to share with students who might have been unsuccessful without a model. Furthermore, instructors were encouraged to review their own results to identify areas of opportunity for improvement based on their students' portfolios.

As a result, in AY 2019-2020 the target was met with 88% (620/707) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessment, showing an 2% improvement over the previous year. The training seems to have been effective in improving student performance across the portfolio assessment; however, overall student submissions were down, which is addressed below. Looking at the rubric, ENGL 1020.6: Practice Collaboration was an area of concern across both successful and unsuccessful assignments. Because this was not an issue identified in AY 2018-2019, it is suspected that the move to online instruction in response to the COVID-19 pandemic is largely responsible for this issue. It is likely that collaboration that could happen easily between face-to-face students was more difficult to manage in the online setting, particularly in the quick move to online instruction of students and faculty who were scheduled to meet face-to-face. Still this was identified as an area of opportunity for faculty development.

It is worth noting that in AY 2018-2019, the 982 students assessed represented 77% of course enrollment in Spring 2019 (1268 students enrolled), though those numbers only included sections taught by instructors employed directly by NSU. The assessment process and significance were reviewed and emphasized for faculty at the beginning of the fall semester. In AY 2019-2020, all but one section taught by faculty directly employed by NSU reported assessment data. Despite this increased reporting, in AY 2019-2020 only 72% (688/944) of students

enrolled in sections taught by faculty directly employed by NSU were assessed. The strong reporting across sections indicates that this training was successful, but numbers of students evaluated dropped due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced a larger-than-normal number of students not completing the course on time (opting for grades of Incomplete [I], taking a late Withdrawal [W], or not completing the course at all and earning a failing grade [F]). In other words, the remaining 28% of student in these sections taught by instructors employed directly by NSU for whom no assessment data was collected did not complete the course on time and, therefore, did not complete the assessment within the assessment period.

An important change in the ENGL 1020 assessment took place this year. AY 2019-2020 is the first year during which assessments were collected for dual enrollment sections taught by faculty credentialed through NSU but teaching in local high schools as the locations of instruction. In spring 2020, there were 400 dual enrollment students, of whom 114 were assessed (28.5%). Of dual enrollment sections taught by non-NSU employees, only 19 of 286 students (7%) were assessed in spring 2020. This low number is likely the result of COVID-19 pandemic impact on the completion of K12 schools that were effectively closed by the Governor for the portion of the semester during which the portfolio would have been completed and submitted. Including all sections of English 1020 at all sites of instruction, shows that only 57.5% of students enrolled in the course in Spring 2020 were assessed. This is an area of opportunity for future assessment cycles.

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 2020-2021.

Furthermore, instructors will be provided training in the use of and evidencing of collaboration in the course, particularly in online environments.

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.

Finally, the Writing Program Administrator, working with the Dual Enrollment areas on campus, will work to improve reporting from instructors credentialed through NSU but employed by and working in K12 settings.

Decision:
Findings from AY 2019-2020 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 2 through Measure 2.1, with 88% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric.

Based on the analysis of the results and in the spirit of improvement, instructors will be provided training in the use of and evidencing of collaboration in the course in online environments.

In an effort to improve reporting of assessment of instruction at all NSU sites, 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

Furthermore, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will revise expectations so that 80% of students will be expected to score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AY 2020-2021.

Measure 2.2 (Indirect – Reflection)
Target: 75% 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 (707)	Portfolio Letter	75%	Spring 2020

Findings:
AY 2019-2020   604/707* student assignments (85%) scored 2+.   Target met.
AY 2018-2019   668/807 student assignments (83%) scored 2+. Target met.

Results include 133 dual enrollment students

Analysis:
In AY 2018-2019 the target was met with 83% (668/807) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessment. Students performed well in this measure in general, and, looking at specific rubric items suggested that students who were

successful were successful across the rubric while students who were unsuccessful were unsuccessful across the rubric. Based on the analysis of the results and in an effort to improve the program, faculty were provided training on ways in which to encourage more students to complete the portfolio assignment, including samples to share with students who might have been unsuccessful without a model. Furthermore, instructors were encouraged to review their own results to identify areas of opportunity for improvement based on their students' portfolios.

As a result, in AY 2019-2020 the target was met with 85% (604/707) of students evaluated scoring 2 or higher on the assessment, showing an 2% improvement over the previous year. The training seems to have been effective in improving student performance across the portfolio assessment; however, overall student submissions were down, which is addressed below. Looking at the rubric, ENGL 1020.6: Practice Collaboration was an area of concern across both successful and unsuccessful assignments. Because this was not an issue identified in AY 2018-2019, it is suspected that the move to online instruction in response to the COVID-19 pandemic is largely responsible for this issue. It is likely that collaboration that could happen easily between face-to-face students was more difficult to manage in the online setting, particularly in the quick move to online instruction of students and faculty who were scheduled to meet face-to-face. Still this was identified as an area of opportunity for faculty development.

It is worth noting that in AY 2018-2019, the 982 students assessed represented 77% of course enrollment in Spring 2019 (1268 students enrolled), though those numbers only included sections taught by instructors employed directly by NSU. The assessment process and significance were reviewed and emphasized for faculty at the beginning of the fall semester. In AY 2019-2020, all but one section taught by faculty directly employed by NSU reported assessment data. Despite this increased reporting, in AY 2019-2020 only 72% (688/944) of students enrolled in sections taught by faculty directly employed by NSU were assessed. The strong reporting across sections indicates that this training was successful, but numbers of students evaluated dropped due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced a larger-than-normal number of students not completing the course on time (opting for grades of Incomplete [I], taking a late Withdrawal [W], or not completing the course at all and earning a failing grade [F]). In other words, the remaining 28% of student in these sections taught by instructors employed directly by NSU for whom no assessment data was collected did not complete the course on time and, therefore, did not complete the assessment within the assessment period.

An important change in the ENGL 1020 assessment took place this year. AY 2019-2020 is the first year during which assessments were collected for dual enrollment sections taught by faculty credentialed through NSU but teaching in local high schools as the locations of instruction. In spring 2020, there were 400 dual enrollment students, of whom 114 were assessed (28.5%). Of dual

enrollment sections taught by non-NSU employees, only 19 of 286 students (7%) were assessed in spring 2020. This low number is likely the result of COVID-19 pandemic impact on the completion of K12 schools that were effectively closed by the Governor for the portion of the semester during which the portfolio would have been completed and submitted. Including all sections of English 1020 at all sites of instruction, shows that only 57.5% of students enrolled in the course in Spring 2020 were assessed. This is an area of opportunity for future assessment cycles.

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 2020-2021.

Furthermore, instructors will be provided training in the use of and evidencing of collaboration in the course, particularly in online environments.

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.

Finally, the Writing Program Administrator, working with the Dual Enrollment areas on campus, will work to improve reporting from instructors credentialed through NSU but employed by and working in K12 settings.

It is also worth noting, and a number of faculty did note it, that the results for Measures 2.1 and 2.2 were very similar; while there was a difference for 20/707 students (3%), the vast majority of students scored similarly on the two measurements. This issue will continue to be studied in AY2020-2021 and may lead to further revision of the assessment tool(s) when the current assessment cycle ends.

Decision:
Findings from AY 2019-2020 provide evidence that the English program successfully fulfills SLO 2 through Measure 2.1, with 85% of students scoring 2+ on the rubric.

Based on the analysis of the results and in the spirit of improvement, instructors will be provided training in the use of and evidencing of collaboration in the course in online environments.

In an effort to improve reporting of assessment of instruction at all NSU sites, 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

Because results were so similar between Measure 2.1 and 2.2, we will continue to study this issue based on AY 2020-2021 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.

Finally, based on the analysis of these results, the Department will revise expectations so that 80% of students will be expected to score a 2 (acceptable) or higher on the evaluation in AY 2020-2021.

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

- Student achievement of targets for Measures 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 2.2 in AY 2019-2020 demonstrated the success of the program regarding our established SLOs that tie directly to the purpose of Core Competency 1: English.

- Increased response rates on the survey instrument for Measures 1.1 and 1.2 (84%) administered in the fall of 2019 demonstrated that training in the assessment process provided to faculty in August 2019 led to stronger collection and reporting of date.

- Lower response rates on the survey instrument for Measures 2.1 and 2.2 (72%) administered in the spring 2020 illustrated the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the move to all-online instruction on collection of data—a larger-than-normal number students simply did not complete the assessment even while NSU employed faculty did report data for all but one section.

- Intentional 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.

- Intentional training in the integration of collaboration and rhetorical analysis in English 1010—identified as areas of opportunity through Measures 1.1 and 1.2—in general and specifically as they were evidenced and addressed in the assessment tools had a significant positive impact on Fall 2019 reporting on those measures.

- The first year of intentionally collecting and reporting data from dual enrollment students in courses taught by NSU credentialed instructors who are employed by and teach in K12 settings demonstrated a need to work with dual enrollment areas on campus and K12 schools to improve the collection 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):

- Training in the integration of "collaboration" in the coursework and assessment for all instructors of English 1020, particularly in online settings.

- 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.

- 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.

- Finally, because findings demonstrate that our program met the targets for all SLOs in both AY 2018-2019 and 2019-2020, we will establish more rigorous targets to maximize the benefit of assessment in the future.

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

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

ENGL 1010.9 – Practice **collaboration.**	Sample of student writing that evidences collaboration	Demonstrates the student's ability to work productively with their classmates.	Demonstrates 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 communication.	Reflective letter	Demonstrates the student's ability to recognize and discuss elements in their own writing and writing processes and how they affect their ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.	Demonstrates 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	Demonstrates the student's ability to compose and produce products using electronic technologies.	Demonstrates 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 does the statement address learning about …	Target 3	Acceptable 2	Not_Acceptable 1	Score
ENGL 1010.1 – Writing texts with a variety of **purposes**.	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 1010.4 – Writing in a variety of **rhetorical situations** tailored to a variety of **audiences**.	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 1010.5 – Writing with respect to **expectations** of genre, format, structure, style,	Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on, and personalization of, the standard. Clear, detailed examples are	Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and personalization of, the concept. Appropriate examples are	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalization of, the concept. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.	

and surface features appropriate to the writer's context.	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.		
ENGL 1010.8 – Understanding basic **rhetorical strategies** used in the development of writing.	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 1010.3 – Constructing clear **thesis statements**.	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 1010.6 – Demonstrating knowledge of the conventions of **Standard American English** in formal writing.	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 1010.2 – Understanding and developing flexible strategies	Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on, and personalization	Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and personalization	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or 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 – Identifying, understanding, and discussing **textual features and strategies** and how they function as agents of effective communication.	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 1010.10 – Employing **electronic technologies** that aid in writing.	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.	

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_Acceptable 1	Score
ENGL 1020.1 – Write purpose-driven, evidence-based, **argumentative** texts.	Final version of the research argumentative essay	Demonstrates the student's ability to write an effective researched argumentative essay.	Demonstrates the student's ability to write a researched argumentative essay.	Fails to demonstrate the student's ability to write a researched argumentative essay.	
ENGL 1020.3 – Write with awareness of **rhetorical situations** tailored to specific **audiences**.	Final version of the research argumentative essay	Demonstrates the student's awareness of a specific audience and rhetorical situation.	Demonstrates the student's awareness of general audience and rhetorical situation.	Fails to demonstrate the student's awareness of a audience and rhetorical situation.	
ENGL 1020.4 – Write with respect to **expectations** of genre, format, structure, style, and surface	Final version of the research argumentative essay	Demonstrates the student's ability to recognize and meet the many expectations of their writerly context.	Demonstrates the student's ability to recognize and meet the expectations of their writerly context.	Fails to demonstrate the student's ability to recognize and meet the expectations of their writerly context.	

features appropriate to the writer's context.					
ENGL 1020.5 – Demonstrate knowledge of the conventions of **Standard American English** in formal writing.	Final version of the research argumentative essay	Demonstrates the student's ability to employ the conventions of Standard American English with minimal error.	Demonstrates the student's ability to employ the conventions of Standard American English.	Fails to demonstrate the student's ability to employ the conventions of Standard American English.	
ENGL 1020.10 – Synthesize **research materials** to situate and contextualize their own writing within the existing discourse surrounding their topic.	Final version of the research argumentative essay	Demonstrates the student's ability to present their own ideas within the larger conversation surrounding the topic through effective synthesis of research.	Demonstrates the student's ability to present their own ideas within the larger conversation surrounding the topic through synthesis of research.	Fails to demonstrate the student's ability to present their own ideas within the larger conversation about the topic through synthesis of research.	
ENGL 1020.7 – Read and **respond critically** to a	Final version of the research argumentative essay	Demonstrates the student's ability to read, understand,	Demonstrates the student's ability to read, understand,	Fails to demonstrate the student's ability to read, understand, and respond to	

variety of texts.		and respond to source materials in a critical and strategic way.	and respond to source materials.	source materials.	
ENGL 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.	Final version of the research argumentative essay	Demonstrates the 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.	Demonstrates the student's ability to document research materials correctly according to the conventions of MLA style, including correct use of quotations, citations, and Works Cited.	Fails to demonstrate the student's ability to document research materials correctly according to the conventions of MLA style, including correct use of quotations, citations, and Works Cited.	
ENGL 1020.2 – Understand and develop flexible strategies for writing as an open **process**.	Planning materials, shaping materials, and draft with comments	Demonstrate the student's use of multiple strategies for planning, drafting, and revising when composing.	Demonstrate the student's use of strategies for planning, drafting, and revising when composing.	Fail to demonstrate the student's use of strategies for planning, drafting, and revising when composing.	
ENGL 1020.6 – Practice	Evidence of peer review activity	Demonstrates the student's	Demonstrates the student's	Fails to demonstrate the student's	

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

research and writing.		technologies.			

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 does the statement address learning about …	Target 3	Acceptable 2	Not_Acceptable 1	Score
ENGL 1020.1 – Writing purpose-driven, evidence-based, **argumentative** texts.	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 1020.3 – Writing with awareness of **rhetorical situations** tailored to specific **audiences**.	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 1020.4 – Writing with respect to **expectations** of genre, format, structure, style, and surface	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.	

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

	provided, as applicable.	provided, as applicable.		
ENGL 1020.11 – **Documenting and integrating research materials** in their own writing in a way that clearly designates source materials as separate from, but in relation to, their own arguments.	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 1020.2 – Understanding and develop flexible strategies for writing as an open **process**.	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 1020.6 – 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 1020.9 – Gathering and evaluating primary	Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on,	Response demonstrates a general reflection on,	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or	

and secondary **research** materials.	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 1020.8 – Identifying, understanding, and discussing **textual features and strategies** and how they function as agents of effective communication.	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 1020.12 – Employing **electronic technologies** that aid in research and writing.	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.	