EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In AY 2013-2014, 1,077 students took ENG 1103. ENG 1103 instructors trained for and piloted a new “digital literacy” outcome so all students taking this required course learn technologies for writing as writing processes. For Outcomes Assessment (OA), the program returned again to the outcome assessed in 2012-2013: the students’ performance of “integrate information and ideas of others.” A comparison to the previous year’s assessment results indicates the following gains:

• a 16-point increase in the percentage of students two readers judge as meeting college-level expectations on the outcome (63% vs. 47%);
• a shift from lower-order (“appropriateness” and “understanding”) to higher-order (“analysis”) reasons for low scores;
• improvement in the teaching and learning of the evaluation and application of sources.

These gains are the result of following through on the recommendations outlined in last year’s report. This report also articulates the following 2014-2015 goals: unifying the program at a time of increasing variation; responding to increased enrollment; and identifying a new outcome for assessment.
Overview of ENG 1103 in AY 2013-2014

Number of students enrolled: 1,077 (1,070 unduplicated)
Average GPA: 3.05

Actions to Improve Teaching and Learning

In addition to regular meetings and brown bag discussions about teaching, the Composition Program saw the developments below:

- All ENG 1103 instructors attended an August 2013 Think BIG! Digital Writing Institute to work on ways of integrating digital literacy into their ENG 1103 courses.
- Instructors needing additional training received it from the Director of Composition.
- The ENG 1103 Outcomes Committee revised the course outcomes to integrate digital literacy.
- The director held two open discussions to generate guidelines for more effective analytical writing assignments.
- The Assessment Committee met three times to assess a stratified random sample of 52 sourced-essay assignments.
- Strategies to accommodate increased fall 2014 enrollment were planned in summer 2014.

Digital Literacy Integrated into ENG 1103

Because the teaching of writing cannot be separated from the technologies that make it possible, the outcomes were revised to accommodate digital literacy. The relevant outcome is that students will:

1. Employ a variety of writing process strategies such as invention, drafting, research, annotation, peer review, revision, and editing, and become proficient in technologies that facilitate them.

Instructors will now plan to explicitly teach two or more digital tools that help students achieve the learning outcomes of the course. While some instructors have more expertise than others, all instructors have been trained to ensure the outcome is taught across all sections of ENG 1103. Examples of tools taught this year include: Google Docs, Diigo, tumblr, iMovie, and Wordpress.
Improved Analytical Writing Assignments

The DC asked for samples of strong student analytical essays and made these samples, with their writing assignments, available to all instructors. Two open meetings were then held to discuss the assignments and student work. The discussants made the following recommendations:

- Reduce word requirement to 1000-1200 words to encourage focus.
- Make purpose and audience explicit to guide students toward relevance, the “so what?” question.
- Analytical approach and object of analysis can vary.

Outcomes Assessment: Improved Teaching of Writing with Sources

OA Procedure

For AY 2013-2014, we returned again to the outcome assessed last year: the students’ performance of “integrate information and ideas of others.” A stratified random sample of fifty-two synthesis essays was gathered and students’ and instructors’ names deleted. An assessment committee of four ENG 1103 instructors scored the essays on the rubric developed last year. (See Appendix for OA materials).

Essays were scored on EASE (Edited American Standard English), Conventions (associated with “integration”), and Integration. Two readers scored each essay and these scores were added to reach a combined score.

What do Combined Scores Mean?

A combined score of 1-6 indicates both readers agreed the essay did not meet college expectations for the outcome;
A combined score of 7-12 indicates one or both readers agreed the essay met college expectations for the outcome;
A combined score of 10-12 indicates both readers agreed that expectations were met, and at least one reader agreed the essay exceeded expectations for the outcome.

The tables below display OA results from AY 2012-2013 and AY 2013-2014.
## Distribution of Assessment Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scores 1-6</th>
<th>Scores 7-12</th>
<th>Scores 10-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013-2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012-2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Difference in OA Scores from AY 2012-2013 to AY 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scores of 1-6</th>
<th>Scores of 7-12</th>
<th>Scores of 10-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventions N</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions %</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>+28%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration N</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration %</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013:
9/51 or 18% were passed by both readers and only 1 exceeded expectations.

### 2014:
16/52 or 31% were passed by both readers and 5 exceeded expectations.

The difference (decrease in low scores; increase in high scores) reflects the program’s implementation of last year’s recommendations following OA. It also reflects the knowledge gained from the OA process itself, as instructors are able to see a “snapshot” of what the program yields, to discuss student work and ways of reading it with each other, and to achieve greater consistency in assignment design.

### Stronger Use of Sources in Writing

The OA process involves not only assigning a 1-6 score but also indicating the criterion that most informed the judgment. (See the OA glossary in Appendix). The shift in reasons given for a score of 1-3 represents a shift from lower-order to higher-order concerns, as “understanding” of the assignment and “appropriateness” of sources became less common and “analysis” emerged as the most common reason for a 1-3 score.
AY 2012-2013 Criterion for Scores 1-3:

Scores 1-3

- analysis
- appropriateness
- audience
- context
- complexity
- conversation
- control
- difficulty
- ethos
- interest
- openness

AY 2013-2014 Criterion for Scores 1-3:
AY 2012-2013 Criteria for Scores 4-6

AY 2013-2014 Criterion for Scores 4-6

Scores 4-6

- analysis
- appropriateness
- audience
- context
- complexity
- conversation
- control
- difficulty
- ethos
- interest
- openness
Conclusions and Objectives for 2014-2015

- Implement guidelines for analytical essay assignment.
- Develop OA rubric for analytical or final essay assignment/conduct OA.
- Provide support for more efficiency in course management, assignment design, classroom planning, and grading to help instructors prepare for high ENG 1103 course loads. FT Instructor Allison Walker has been instrumental here, as she generously agreed to create an optimized ENG 1103 Blackboard shell for all instructors.
- With input from instructors, provide more targeted faculty development opportunities.
- Develop adjunct evaluation procedure.
- Review textbooks for common adoption in 2015-2016. As ENG 1103 is participating widely in learning communities and has dedicated service-learning sections, the program needs to revisit and revise what unifies it. It will be important to articulate that in ways that respect instructor autonomy and support learning.
APPENDIX
HPU Composition Program  
Outcomes Assessment Procedure-January 24, 2014

Instructions: Each essay will be scored for: 1. conventions of American Edited Standard English (EASE); 2. conventions associated with integrating sources; and 3. “integrating the ideas and information of others.” Readers will note the criterion that most informed their judgment for outcome 3.

Open your packet in Google Drive. For each essay, complete a worksheet and then proceed to the next essay in your packet. When the packet has been scored, review your worksheets to finalize scores and the criteria you wish to transfer to the spreadsheet.

When you have completed your spreadsheet, add your initials to the end of the document title and email it to me.

Scores associated with EASE:

6: no noticeable errors  
5: 1-2 errors  
4: noticeable and perhaps consistent errors, but they do not impede meaning  
3: consistent errors that impede meaning  
2: errors impede meaning and damage writer’s ethos  
1: unreadable

Scores associated with Conventions and Integration:

6: exceeds expectations for college writing for this outcome  
5: clearly meets expectations for college writing for this outcome  
4: barely meets expectations for college writing for this outcome  
3: partially/almost meets expectations for college writing for this outcome  
2: clearly does not meet expectations for college writing for this outcome  
1: cannot be evaluated for this outcome
**Worksheet**

**Student ID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventions (EASE)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., spelling, punctuation, fragments, capitalization, verb tense, subject-verb agreement, run-on/fused sentences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventions associated with outcome</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., signal phrases/verbs, framing, citation, attribution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration of information and ideas of others</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criterion:** ____________________________ (from glossary)

**Other:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary

Accuracy: of facts; “I do not think it means what you think it means”; also ethos
Analysis: to designate approach; also response; reaction; reporting; doesn’t go beyond summary
Appropriateness: evaluation; reliability and credibility of sources
Audience: relevance; assumptions; ease of reading
Context: to serve purpose and audience; to create the conversation writer enters
Complexity: of organization, of task, of claims
Conversation: sources speaking to each other; writer engaging ideas of others.
Control: source-driven/purpose-driven; parroting; differentiation; randomness
Difficulty: of writing task
Ethos: of writer
Interest: passion; thinking
Openness: vs. resistance to ideas and evidence; arrives someplace new; change
Potentiality: points to future work; as work-in-progress
Purpose
Reading: depth/surface; ownership; skimming; no summary or paraphrase
Reasoning: analysis-in-action; claim-evidence relationship; warrants; premises
Relevance
Specificity: scope of claims and generalizations; relevance of claims to problem
Understanding: of task; of reading; of assignment
Use: of sources as support or props; rhetorical function of sources; application; BEAM