ENGL 150 Recertification proposal (2011-2012) example

Course description

(ACE 1) ENGL 150. Writing: Rhetoric as Inquiry (3 cr) ENGL 150 is open to Freshman and Sophomores only.
Study and practice of writing using such rhetorical concepts as purpose, audience, genre, cultural context, and style to develop strategies for writing, thinking, and research.

Original Certification Proposal

Outcome(s)

SLO1: Write texts, in various forms, with an identified purpose, that respond to specific audience needs, incorporate research or existing knowledge, and use applicable documentation and appropriate conventions of format and structure.

1. Describe opportunities students should have to learn the outcome. How is the learning objective embedded in the course?

   Write texts, in various forms, with an identified purpose, that respond to particular audience needs: All sections of English 150 require students to generate at least three (3) inquiry-based writing projects in appropriate forms for identifiable purposes and audiences (culminating in at least 25 pages of polished prose). In addition to original projects, students will generate course-based reflective writing for peers and the instructor as well as analyses of others’ texts for academic audiences. ...incorporate research or existing knowledge: All sections of English 150 require students to conduct primary and secondary research appropriate to their topic and goals for writing and to synthesize and integrate the ideas of others into their own writing (though paraphrase, summary, analysis, and evaluation) ...and use application documentation and appropriate conventions of form and structure: All sections of English 150 require students to identify and follow relevant stylistic conventions with regard to citation and formatting as they research and compose their writing projects. Students are guided to complete this work in supportive learning environments that feature attention to the rhetorical concepts of purpose, audience, situation, and form; respectful, serious engagement of human diversity and examination of individual and cultural assumptions, biases, and values; frequent in-class and out-of-class writing; a range of in-class activities that help students reflect on their own writing and learning; strategies for generating ideas, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading; readings, discussions, and writing assignments that support writing development; and substantive peer and teacher response to writing.

2. Describe student work that will be used to assess student achievement of the outcome and explain how the students demonstrate the knowledge and skills specified by the outcome.
Student achievement of the outcome will be assessed via student work products. All sections of 150 require students to produce at least three (3) sustained, finished arguments (the equivalent of 25 typed, double-spaced pages) in addition to short, informal writing assignments. Most, but not all, teachers of 150 collect a portfolio of student writing.

3. As part of the ACE certification process, the department/unit agrees to collect and assess a reasonable sample of students' work and provide reflections on students' achievement of the Learning Outcomes for its respective ACE-certified courses. Please comment on your plans to develop a process to collect and evaluate student work over time for the purpose of assessing student success for this ACE outcome.

We will collect a reasonable, random sample of student portfolios including three final writing products from each student, available reflective material, and corresponding assignments. We will score the portfolios 1) holistically and 2) analytically according to teaching and learning questions that emerge as part of each assessment iteration using a faculty-developed ACE-1 rubric. We will feed our findings back into our existing teacher development sites: TA workshop, colloquia, composition theory and practice seminar.

Reinforcements

What Outcome(s) or skill(s) will be reinforced in this course?

Oral Communication
All sections of this course require students to participate in class discussions about readings and in peer response groups.

Critical Thinking
All sections of this course require students to examine multiple positions, stances, assumptions, beliefs, and biases as they research and formulate their writing projects.

Recertification Proposal

1. Please indicate the semesters the course has been taught as an ACE certified course.

   Fall 2009 (1098), Spring 2010 (1101), Summer 2010 (1105), Fall 2010 (1108), Spring 2011 (1111), Summer 2011 (1115), Fall 2011 (1118), Spring 2012 (1121), Summer 2012 (1125)

2. What have assessment data revealed about how the course helps students achieve the designated Student Learning Outcome(s)? (You might be able to complete this textbox by copying information found in the Summary & Conclusion sections from your Department/Program ACE Assessment Report.)

   We used a faculty-developed four-point rubric (high proficiency; proficiency; some proficiency; no/little proficiency) to assess student achievement of Outcome 1 across our courses.

   Mean scores:
holistic audience conventions
ENGL 150(18) 2.639 (+/- .637) 2.417 (+/- .691) 2.889 (+/- .739)
ENGL 151 (21) 2.929 (+/- .657) 2.786 (+/- .624) 3.048 (+/- .757)

The data indicate that most of our students are performing near a proficient level.

From the assignments and range of student work we reviewed, we know our students are writing for a range of purposes and audiences; they are drafting, receiving feedback, revising, and reflecting on their work; and they are being required to document sources using appropriate conventions.

3. How have those assessment data been used to help the course meet the certified Student Learning Outcome(s)? (You might be able to complete this textbox by copying information found in the Summary & Conclusion sections from your Department/Program ACE Assessment Report.)

In order to improve our students’ awareness of audience, we would like to spend more time working on this issue (including writing for audiences beyond the classroom as well as thinking more complexly about imagined audiences) with our teachers in our existing teacher development sites: TA workshop, graduate seminar on teaching, teaching colloquia, etc. We also plan to offer a workshop on teaching students to engage sources that are most effective for their given audience and purpose. We will implement these modifications in the year ahead.

4. If your assessment plan does not include collection of student work from all sections each time the course is taught, indicate how your department ensures that all sections are taught in accordance with the ACE plan.

The composition coordinator, along with the graduate chair and vice chair, review the syllabi, course evaluations and teacher reflections of all of our TAs and lecturers (who teach the majority of our ACE-1 courses). We read for alignment of course goals and assignments with the ACE outcome and programmatic aims and scopes.

5. If the response in the original proposal for ACE certification indicated that the assessment process was still being developed, the UCC/ACE subcommittee expects an explanation of the process. (May be referenced in the Methods section of the Department ACE Assessment Report.)

We randomly collected three anonymized student portfolios from 20 sections of first-year writing during both fall and spring semesters. From this group, we randomly selected 40 portfolios to score, ensuring we had a representative sample (a mix of new and returning teachers, no ELL courses, etc.). Because our 100-level courses reach the greatest number of students, we chose to focus on these classes for this assessment iteration. The portfolios included three final writing products from each student; the corresponding assignments; the students’ learning letters or reflective writing, if available.
**Please note that all of our collected samples are on a Blackboard page. We are happy to provide any interested reviewers access to the samples.**

A team of 10 reviewers, largely consisting of instructors who teach these courses, read and rated the portfolios (each portfolio was read by 2 reviewers) against the rubric we developed for Outcome 1. We scored the portfolios both holistically and analytically, focusing on two outcome terms: conventions and audience.

Additionally, the composition coordinator, along with the graduate chair and vice chair, review the syllabi, course evaluations and teacher reflections of all of our TAs and lecturers (who teach the majority of our ACE-1 courses). We read for alignment of course goals and assignments with the ACE outcome and programmatic aims and scopes.

**Results & Planning**

**Summary of Assessment Results**

• Summarize the assignments and/or tests used to assess student achievement of the outcome.
• Describe the degree or extent that samples of student work demonstrate achievement of the outcome.

We used a faculty-developed four-point rubric (high proficiency; proficiency; some proficiency; no/little proficiency) to assess student achievement of Outcome 1 across our courses.

Mean scores:

holistic audience conventions
ENGL 150(18) 2.639 (+/- .637) 2.417 (+/- .691) 2.889 (+/- .739)
ENGL 151 (21) 2.929 (+/- .657) 2.786 (+/- .624) 3.048 (+/- .757)

The data indicate that most of our students are performing near a proficient level.

***

Our review of syllabi and course evaluations demonstrated good alignment, for the most part, between our ACE outcome, programmatic aims and scopes, and syllabi and assignments. However, our composition coordinator noted that it may be beneficial for there to be more shared experiences for students in English 254: Writing and Community.