

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in General Education Summary Report

Use this form to provide a summary report on campus-based assessment of student learning outcomes in General Education

GER (name and #): GER 10 Academic Year: 2016-2017

Submitted by: Kirk Jones, GER 10

Improvements Made as a Result of Previous Assessment

Recommendations from GER Assessment Subcommittee made in previous assessment report (please copy and paste below):

We didn't have a subcommittee to generate such recommendations during the last cycle.

1. What program improvements in curriculum and/or teaching were made as a result of the previous assessment of General Education? If no program improvements were made, please provide a rationale for why recommendations made in previous assessment report were not implemented.

Here was our planned course of action during the last cycle:

1. *First and foremost, the high percentage of non-respondents – particularly in the context of objective #3 (revision) – suggests that we need to provide greater incentives for student revisions.*

Status: *we still need to work on this.*

2. *Additionally, the fact that many of the non-respondents dropped the courses, withdrew, or failed, points to a larger issue with student retention. This is by no means a phenomenon unique to GER 10 course offerings. Discussions with the retention committee began at the end of the Spring 2014 semester. They will continue as we move into the next academic year.*

Status: *We have changed our 097/101 (developmental) setup to increase retention based upon G2S data and the placement report compiled by Kirk Jones and Emily Hamilton-Honey.*

3. *Currently, this assessment methodology reflects only student performance, and does not necessarily demonstrate our ability to teach students to meet the objectives. For that reason, and several other reasons, we are currently trying to implement testing for incoming students. Testing incoming students will provide a baseline from which we can determine how much students improve in our introductory writing courses. It will also allow us to place students effectively, thereby improving retention.*

Status: *Due to the expense, this endeavor has temporarily been dropped. The placement report compiled by Kirk Jones and Emily Hamilton-Honey did address this issue and push for some degree of test-in options, however.*

4. *In the process of reviewing our introductory writing courses, we have also determined that we need to make the SUNY mandates as transparent as possible in our course outlines. We will be revisiting our course outlines during the Fall 2014 semester.*

Status: *The GER 10 objectives have become our course objectives now. We have five GER mandates. This has made things easier for incoming faculty.*

Deviations from Approved Methodology

2. Were there any significant deviations from the GER assessment plan that was approved by the Academic Assessment Committee? If so, please comment on why these changes were necessary and how these changes may have affected the reported results, if at all.

We used Task Stream to collect the results this time. I did not ask professors to utilize the report forms. Rather, the faculty reported their findings in statistic form, as per the Task Stream guidelines.

Major Findings of this Assessment

3. Please include the numerical data from last cycle's report and the current cycle's report below. What are the major findings for the assessment of all GER SLOs assessed? Please include a comprehensive narrative or discussion outlining these findings and a complete interpretation of these results in addition to completing the table.

Previous Year's Result

GER 10: Findings Summary 2013-2014* **

	Does not meet standards	Approaching standards	Meets standards	Exceeds standards	Non-respondent
Objective #1 (1 st criteria)	12	26	35	15	42
Objective #1 (2 nd criteria)	8	40	27	14	41
Objective #2	10	31	29	17	43
Objective #3	17	13	21	12	67
Objective #4	3	26	37	9	55
Objective #5	10	15	23	26	56

Total # of enrolled students _130_

	Does not meet standards	Approaching standards	Meets standards	Exceeds standards	Non-respondent
Objective #1 (1 st criteria)	14%	30%	40%	16%	32% of 130 total enrolled students were non-respondent
Objective #1 (2 nd criteria)	9%	45%	30%	16%	32% of 130 were non-respondent
Objective #2	11%	36%	33%	20%	33% of 130 were non-respondent
Objective #3	27%	21%	33%	19%	52% of 130 were non-respondent
Objective #4	4%	35%	49%	12%	42% of 130 were non-respondent
Objective #5	14%	20%	31%	35%	43% of 130 were non-respondent

* - Percentages calculated using total # of enrolled students minus the total number of non-respondents for each objective

** - Percentages rounded up to remove decimals

Current Year's (2016-2017) Assessment Results

SLO	# Sections Assessed	% Exceeding Standards	% Meeting Standards	% Not Meeting Standards
Course Objective #1 Produce coherent texts within common college-level written forms.	20	80%	5%	15%
Course Objective #2 Demonstrate the ability to revise and improve college-level texts.	20	65%	10%	25%
Course Objective #3 Research a topic, develop an argument, and organize supporting details	20	95%		5%
Course Objective #4 Develop proficiency in oral discourse	20	95%	5%	
Course Objective #5 Evaluate an oral presentation according to established criteria	20	100%		

Assessment Results Narrative and Interpretation (i.e., What conclusions can be drawn from the numbers above, including a comparative analysis with last year's data?)

As you can see, we struggled the most with objectives #1 and objectives #2. While we still met our minimum targets, we have found the results to be unsatisfactory for us personally. More on our plan of action below.

Our work with objectives #3 and #5 have improved considerably since the last cycle.

The percentage of students exceeding standards suggests we may need to raise our targets in future semesters.

Recommendations for Improvement in Student Learning

4. Based on the assessment results, what changes to curriculum and/or teaching should be made to improve student learning?

Raw Recommendations from Faculty Below:

Course Objective #1

Recommendations : *For the G2S students, additional review of grammar issues are needed. For the final essay, an additional revision that focuses on grammar will be included.*

Reflections/Notes : *Of the 13 students who did not meet the objective, 7 of them were from the Gateway to Success program, where students struggle with grammar issues.*

Recommendations : Carefully maintain my spot on the teeter-totter of pedagogy.

Recommendations : Students are struggling most with documentation. I added paraphrasing activities in class and a day in the lab for documentation. Next semester I plan to spend an additional day in the class for paraphrasing and an additional day in the lab. I will also be moving some of the content I introduced later in the semester closer to the beginning of the semester.

Recommendations : Students struggled with incorporating research into essays. Next year I aim to spend an additional two classes practicing and workshopping with secondary sources with students.

Recommendations : Students struggled with documentation and integration of research especially. I'd like to incorporate a shorter, research-based paper prior to the final paper. I'd also consider scaffolding the research draft, breaking it into a round of review on content and round of review focused solely on citation.

Reflections/Notes : I currently incorporate a lecture on citation and plagiarism, an in-class activity, an annotated bibliography, and a quiz in Blackboard. When students had to apply that documentation knowledge to the final, however, the work they'd done in preparation did not seem to translate to their papers.

In the future, I think students need more individualized citation help at the research draft stage. When we conferenced on drafts, students were still struggling to clarify their arguments, so feedback focused more heavily on content and development than citation.

Reflections/Notes : I should have offered them more time to revise their papers so that more of them could have earned higher grades on their revisions (which were to replace their original grades).

Course Objective #2

Recommendations : In order to place greater emphasis on the revising stage of the writing process, the draft grade will carry more weight towards the final course grade. In addition, part of class time will be devoted to the instructor checking over the progress of the revisions to ensure that serious revisions are made.

Reflections/Notes : The base writing skills in many classes was actually higher than in previous semesters, leading to less progress in revision. The exception was in the G2S program, where five students made few changes between the draft and the final copy.

Recommendations : . Find a way to keep students from checking out during the semester.

Recommendations : I plan to ask students to revise earlier in the semester instead of only checking for revisions at the end of the semester.

Recommendations : Stress that conferences are mandatory and follow up on conference scheduling in person (rather than via email).

Reflections/Notes : Despite the fact that conference were mandatory, this is the first semester that some students did not even sign up for a conference time.

Recommendations : Rigorous requirements to attend class during peer review workshop.
Reflections/Notes : For each essay, students revised their essays three times after doing peer review on one another's papers and after meeting with the instructor. I require peer review in order to get a grade for this paper. Some students did not do peer review and thus did not receive a grade on the assignment.

Course Objective #3

Recommendations : One to two additional assignments focusing on citations will be utilized to better prepare students for citations on the final essays.

Recommendations : Further scaffolding of the research draft, with additional rounds of review and feedback (in addition to the feedback provided on topic development and the research proposal).

Recommendations : Maintain balance as if I am doing the Yoga pose Warrior Three with Sally and her brother's fishbowl on my flattened back, while the Cat in the Hat looks for trouble to make elsewhere.

Recommendations : I plan to ask for a more detailed document with their supporting argument so I have an artifact in the future.

Course Objective #4

Recommendations : This is genuinely one of the strong points for many of our students, even those who struggle with writing.

Recommendations : I will make presentations due before last day of classes or final exam day so that there will be time for absent students to make up presentation.

Recommendations : In order to make students more comfortable in class, and thus more likely to feel comfortable giving a presentation, more group oriented assignments, including a group presentation, will be required before students have to give a solo presentation.

In addition, more weight will be given to the final presentation grade in order to dissuade students from refusing to do it.

Course Objective #5

No recommendations.

Consolidated Recommendations Below:

- One spring semester course release for faculty to compile a anti-plagiarism suite of resources for the Provost's Page.
- Studio for lecture recording (especially for online courses)
- One department meeting where we get the chance to discuss the lessons we use to remedy the issues with objectives 1 and 2.
- More support for the writing center
- Include library's anti-plagiarism module on BB or refer to the module for each ENGL 101 section.
- More lab time requests during scheduling (one day a week in the lab if possible)

4a. Based on the assessment results, what other resources, if any, are needed to improve student learning? Please check all that apply and include a rationale below (academic support services, equipment, software, etc.) are needed

Academic support services
(tutoring, accommodative
services, etc.)

Classroom
equipment needed

Software needed

Other (please specify below)

Closing the Loop

5. What mechanisms are in place for documenting and sharing assessment results, closing the loop processes, and intended changes resulting from these assessment results? (i.e., presentations, school meetings, etc.)

We engage in the Dean's symposium, which was held this year on January 19, 2017. Faculty meet in breakout sessions by discipline or program and discuss findings and how they'll change things. We highlighted the overarching recommendations, which are mentioned above in question #3. We plan to make changes in the Fall of 2017.

6. What closing the loop activities, such as ongoing professional development activities for faculty and staff, will be implemented as a result of these assessment results?

We will meet as a department to discuss our findings and plans for implementing remedies in future semesters.

7. What changes to the assessment process should be made for the following cycle? If methodology revisions are needed, please submit a proposal to GER Assessment Subcommittee.

1. *We may raise targets.*
2. *We plan to use the report forms so both # and % of students are reflected.*
3. *Additionally, we plan to add the following criteria to our assessment:*
4. *# and % of students who engage in academic dishonesty*
5. *# and % of students who are dismissed from the course due to attendance and/or stop attending*
6. *We plan to include which mode the course is taught in (online, F2F, distance learning, hybrid)*