

Discipline Assessment Analysis Form

Directions: For each course SLO undergoing assessment, collect the Transfer/Basic Skills Assessment forms for Individual Course Sections.

Convene a department meeting (and/or communicate with department members) to summarize and discuss the SLO assessment results/analyses for all sections

DEPARTMENT	
Meeting Date (if applicable) And/or Alternative Means of Communication	
Number of Faculty/Staff Participating (# fulltime, # adjunct, and total)	
Number of Faculty Sharing Assessment Results Number of Course Sections Assessed	
Course SLO or Degree SLO Measured --Identify Course(s) and Degree--	
ASSESSMENT TOOLS Describe assessment tool/ assignments faculty/staff used to measure the SLO.	

ASSESSMENT RESULTS
(Summarize the overall results of your department, including performance data if applicable.)

In what areas was student performance outstanding?

In what areas should student performance be improved?

Describe unaddressed student needs or issues that the assessment revealed.

DRAFT

<p>NEXT STEP(S) TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING</p> <p>How will your department address the needs and issues that were revealed by your assessment?</p> <p>What are your collective plans and strategies for improving student learning?</p> <p>Check all that apply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Seek out or design faculty development activities on teaching and assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Consult teaching and learning experts about teaching and assessment methods <input type="checkbox"/> Encourage faculty to share activities that foster improved student learning <input type="checkbox"/> Write collaborative grants to fund departmental projects to improve teaching <input type="checkbox"/> Purchase articles/books on teaching/assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Create bibliography of resource material <input type="checkbox"/> Visit classrooms to provide feedback (mentoring) <input type="checkbox"/> Share rubrics and assessment results among all discipline faculty <input type="checkbox"/> Analyze/revise course curriculum and/or SLOs <input type="checkbox"/> Analyze department curriculum to strengthen the coherence of the program or the progression of skills from course to course <input type="checkbox"/> Nothing; assessments indicate no improvements necessary <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): <p>Additional Explanation:</p>
<p>Priorities to Improve Student Learning</p> <p>List the TOP 3 TO 6 actions/changes faculty judge will <u>most</u> improve student learning.</p>	
<p>IMPLEMENTATION</p> <p>Describe the departmental plans to implement these priorities.</p>	

<p>TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION</p> <p>Provide a timeline for implementation of your top priorities.</p>	
<p>REASSESSMENT</p> <p>When do you plan to reassess this SLO?</p>	

DIRECTIONS FOR USING COURSE/SECTION AND COURSE/DISCIPLINE ASSESSMENT FORMS

These forms have been designed to be as simple as possible and to facilitate collegial discussion between discipline experts with the shared goal of improving teaching and learning. We need to keep in mind that assessment ultimately should not be driven by data, forms, and reporting, but rather by instructors coming together to talk about curriculum, teaching, and learning and to engage in thoughtful, meaningful planning.

1. Within each discipline, faculty will agree on a procedure for choosing which course SLO/SLOs or degree SLO will be assessed in a given semester, aiming to make steady progress to assess all the course and degree SLOs within a reasonable time. In some cases, faculty may decide (collectively) to assess more than one SLO in a semester, and in other cases, they may decide to run the same assessment for more than one semester to collect more data. When two or more courses in a discipline share the same or very similar SLOs, faculty may arrange to pool data on multiple courses. In short, designing the best assessment method is up to the discipline experts, ideally as a collaborative project. Please keep in mind, too, that assessment information should be collected from sections offered at *all* sites where a course is taught.
2. Once a SLO is targeted, discipline faculty will decide on an assessment tool and criteria that will be (or already is) common to all sections of the course. For example, Psychology 1 instructors may agree that all will include some of the same questions on the midterm, or Speech instructors may use the same rubric for the argumentative speech assignment that is given in all sections of Public Speaking. Note that, while some rubrics or scoring criteria may be relatively complex, others may be very simple: Above Average, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory. Discussion among discipline faculty will help to make sure that the standards for assessment are uniform enough to be useful.
3. After the assessment has been administered and evaluated, each instructor involved will fill out the **Assessment Analysis For Course Section** form, summarizing the results in his or her section(s). These forms should be submitted to the Department Chair (or another faculty member whom the department has designated to receive them). **It is essential that all faculty members trust that the information collected on the Course Section form will be kept within the department and will *not* be used to evaluate individual faculty or to impact future hiring decisions. This information should be used *only* to help discipline experts plan and improve—collectively and collegially—instruction, curriculum, and student learning.** Course Section assessment forms should be filed carefully and shredded after the data has been compiled.
4. After the **Assessment Analysis For Course Section** forms have been submitted, discipline faculty will convene a department meeting (and/or communicate with department members via technology) to summarize and discuss the SLO assessment results/analyses for *all* sections. If the assessment has involved many sections, the Department Chair (or another faculty member designated by the department) should try to compile some of the information before the meeting, so the discussion will not be hindered by paper shuffling. All full-time faculty teaching the course (or courses) must be included in this discussion, and ideally associate faculty should also participate. The results of the discussion and planning process will be recorded on the **Discipline Assessment Analysis Form**. This form—and more importantly, the plans and goals it documents—should be shared throughout the discipline/department and will play a key role in Program Review.

Assessment Analysis For Course Section

Department	ENGLISH
COURSE	ENGL 150
Course Student Learning Outcomes measured	Recognize the rudiments and variations of argument structure in a text they have read, distinguishing between major ideas and supporting evidence.
AA/AS Degree Outcome measured	N/A
ASSESSMENT TOOL/ ASSIGNMENT Describe briefly and/or attach a copy of the assignment, if possible	Midterm Reading Test: Students answer short essay questions analyzing an argumentative essay (Dyson, "Cyberspace: If You Don't Love It, Leave It") Question 5 asks students to identify major supporting ideas and explain the rhetorical strategy behind their organization; Question 6 asks them to identify at least two kinds of specific evidence, to point out examples, and to discuss their effectiveness.
Rubric or Criteria for Evaluation Describe briefly and/or attach a copy of rubric	Simple three-part rubric: 1=Unsatisfactory (Undeveloped/incomplete; confused; shows poor understanding of concept) 2=Adequate(Adequately reasoned and developed; shows OK understanding of concepts) 3=Very good/Excellent (Well-reasoned, and well-developed; shows strong understanding of concepts)
ASSESSMENT RESULTS In general, describe how students performed on the assignment. (Include performance data if applicable)	Question 5 (Supporting Ideas): Score/Number of Students 1=8 students 2=9 students 3=5 students Question 6 (Specific Evidence): 1=4 students 2= 8 students 3=10 students Students demonstrated a fairly good grasp of how specific evidence works in an argument. Most were able to identify different types of evidence, providing examples of each and evaluating their effectiveness. Those answers with Unsatisfactory scores were generally due to carelessness or poor development rather than confusion—that is, the students did not read the test carefully and so did not address all parts of the question.

<p>In what areas was student performance outstanding?</p> <p>In what areas should student performance be improved?</p> <p>Describe any unaddressed student needs or issues that the assessment revealed.</p>	<p>The assessment showed students are struggling more with identifying major supporting ideas. More than a third of the students just summarized portions of the essay, jumbling up evidence and major supporting claims. A number stumbled when asked to analyze the rhetorical choices underlying the organization of supporting ideas.</p> <p>In their reading, at least, most really seem to grasp what specific evidence is and how it impacts an argument.</p> <p>Students need to gain more proficiency in identifying supporting ideas—that level of abstraction seems to represent a big challenge.</p> <p>Weak critical thinking skills when dealing with abstract concepts.</p>
<p>NEXT STEP(S) TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING</p> <p>How will you address the needs and issues that were revealed by your assessment?</p> <p>What are your plans and strategies for improving student learning?</p> <p>Check all that apply</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revise course content and/or assignments</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revise activities leading up to and/or supporting assignment/activities</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase guidance for students as they work on assignments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Revise the amount of writing/oral/visual/clinical or similar work</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> State goals or objectives of assignment/activity more explicitly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> State criteria for grading more explicitly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Employ different/revised teaching methods (Explain below)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase/improve in-class discussions and activities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase/improve student collaboration and/or peer review</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Provide more frequent and/or more effective feedback on student progress</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Encourage more interaction with students outside of class</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Seek out collegial feedback on assignments/activities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Collect more data</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Nothing; assessment indicates no improvement necessary</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): Consult with colleagues about researching best practices in teaching critical thinking/reading to students in developmental courses.</p> <p>Additional Explanation:</p>

Discipline Assessment Analysis Form

Directions: For each course SLO undergoing assessment, collect the Assessment Analysis For Course Sections forms.

Convene a department meeting (and/or communicate with department members) to summarize and discuss the SLO assessment results/analyses for all sections. This form records the results of that discussion and planning process.

DEPARTMENT	ENGLISH
Meeting Date (if applicable) And/or Alternative Means of Communication	<p>August 21, 2009</p> <p>Colleagues at Del Norte participated via phone (having received all relevant data through intercampus mail and email). Some associate faculty did not attend the meeting, but their input was requested via email.</p>
Number of Faculty/Staff Participating (# fulltime, # adjunct, and total)	<p>5 FT 3 AF Total: 9</p>
Number of Faculty Sharing Assessment Results	6 faculty
Number of Course Sections Assessed	9 sections
Course SLO or Degree SLO Measured --Identify Course or Degree--	ENGL IB: Write well-organized and logical argumentative critical essays in response to issues raised by literary works.
ASSESSMENT TOOLS Describe assessment tool/ assignments faculty/staff used to measure the SLO.	<p>Assignment: Critical essay on a work(s) of literature</p> <p>Specific assignments varied, but all required a minimum 3-4 page formal essay advancing an interpretative argument about a work (or works) of literature. The essays assessed were final drafts, having gone through at least one cycle of revision.</p>
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (Summarize the overall results of your department, including performance data if applicable.)	<p>Overall, student essays demonstrated an adequate mastery of composing a well-organized, thesis-driven essay. There was considerable variation, however, in their performance in the following areas: writing a meaningful argumentative thesis about literature and supporting their critical claim with appropriate evidence from the text and interpretative commentary. Although about a third of the student essays had relatively strong thesis statements and support, the rest struggled with one or both of these challenges.</p>

<p>In what areas was student performance outstanding?</p> <p>In what areas should student performance be improved?</p> <p>Describe unaddressed student needs or issues that the assessment revealed.</p>	<p>For the most part, students showed they have mastered writing papers that conform to a basic essay structure. Some students (about a third) demonstrated good to excellent critical writing skills in their strong thesis statements and credible performance developing their argument with evidence and commentary.</p> <p>Students need learn how to apply argumentative essay strategies (that they learned in earlier composition courses) to literary analysis.</p> <p>Critical thinking as it applies to literature Incorporating quotations for close textual analysis</p>
<p>NEXT STEP(S) TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING</p> <p>How will your department address the needs and issues that were revealed by your assessment?</p> <p>What are your collective plans and strategies for improving student learning?</p> <p>Check all that apply.</p>	<p>X Seek out or design faculty development activities on teaching and assessment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Consult teaching and learning experts about teaching and assessment methods</p> <p>X Encourage faculty to share activities that foster improved student learning</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Write collaborative grants to fund departmental projects to improve teaching</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Purchase articles/books on teaching/assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Create bibliography of resource material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Visit classrooms to provide feedback (mentoring)</p> <p>X Share rubrics and assessment results among all discipline faculty</p> <p>X Analyze/revise course curriculum and/or SLOs</p> <p>X Analyze department curriculum to strengthen the coherence of the program or the progression of skills from course to course</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Nothing; assessments indicate no improvements necessary</p> <p>X Other (please describe): Encourage greater co-enrollment in ENGL 52 to give students access to expert tutoring</p> <p>Additional Explanation:</p>
<p>Priorities to Improve Student Learning</p> <p>List the TOP 3 TO 6 actions/changes faculty judge will <u>most</u> improve student learning.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage more co-enrollment in ENGL 52 for tutoring—specifically for dialogue with English faculty that can model critical analysis strategies. 2. Organize ENGL 1B faculty development activities: collaboration on a shared departmental rubric; sharing techniques for teaching literary analysis. 3. Structure class discussions to focus explicitly on the process of articulating an argumentative claim about literature and backing it up with specific evidence and commentary; and replace some open-ended class discussions with group activities.

<p>IMPLEMENTATION</p> <p>Describe the departmental plans to implement these priorities.</p>	<p>Starting this semester (SP 10), all 1B instructors will promote ENGL 52 during the first week of classes (bring handouts) and again around week 3/4 when students are thinking about the first essay assignment.</p> <p>1B instructors will convene at least three meetings each semester: two to work on clarifying shared standards (rubrics) and one to discuss teaching techniques, in-class activities, and assignments. Meetings will be augmented with email communication.</p> <p>1B instructors will replace some of their open-ended discussions with more focused, structured discussions and/or group activities. (Record problems and successes to share with colleagues.)</p>
<p>TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION</p> <p>Provide a timeline for implementation of your top priorities.</p>	<p>Spring 2010-Fall 2011. Before the end of Spring 2010, discuss the results of our plans/changes and revise if necessary. At this time, we will decide how we will implement our priorities into the next academic year.</p>
<p>REASSESSMENT</p> <p>When do you plan to reassess this SLO?</p>	<p>Spring 2011</p>