EDISON STATE COLLEGE
ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS REPORTING FORM

Name of Course: General Education Assessment of Written Communication

Name of Program Leader (s): Professor Marty Ambrose

Date: May 20, 2010

Report Completed by: Professor Marty Ambrose

LEARNING OUTCOME(S): Written Communication (General Education Assessment for the Institutional Portfolio)

ASSESSMENT PLAN:

1. At the beginning of the 2009 fall session, the Department of Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness (IRPE) completed a random, district-wide selection of courses to participate in the General Education Assessment of Written Communication. They then notified each faculty member that his or her course was selected and for which general education outcome.

2. Faculty then filled out a form that was sent to IRPE indicating the description of the assignment, the date the assignment was due, and the target submission date of the artifacts to IRPE. Faculty were also instructed to send the artifacts electronically before any grading process took place.

3. IRPE prepared the artifacts for scoring by randomly selecting 100 artifacts from students who have achieved at least 30 hours.

4. A team of English faculty (Prof. Elaine Shaeffer, Prof. Pam Mangene, Prof. Marty Ambrose, and Prof. Peggy Romeo) trained in the holistic scoring of essays were paid to score the artifacts at the beginning of Spring, 2010. The team scored the essays according to the General Education Rubric in Written Communication. The scored artifacts were then returned to IRPE for analysis of the data.

Edison State College
Data Analysis for Communication Assessment
Fall 2009 Performance
77 students were matched to Banner data on ID

Hours Earned	N	%	Average Score	Comments
<45	25	32.5%	3.10	Students with less than 45 hours had an average score higher than those with more than 45 hours. The average score increased with hours attained but not to the level of those with less than 45 hours.
45-60	16	20.8%	2.50	
61-75	15	19.5%	2.50	
76-90	12	15.6%	2.60	
91+	9	11.7%	2.90	
	77	100.0%		

GPA	N	%	Average Score	Comments
<2.00	1	1.3%	2.00	The average score based on GPA was better for students who achieved a "B" or higher average.
2.01-2.50	4	5.2%	2.10	
2.51-3.00	15	19.5%	2.30	
3.01-3.50	32	41.6%	2.90	
3.51-4.00	25	32.5%	3.10	
	77	100.1%		

Degree Program	N	%	Average Score	Comments
AA Degree	27	35.1%	2.70	The average score for students enrolled in the AS program was higher than those in an AA or BS program.
AS Degrees	17	22.1%	2.90	
BAS/BS Degrees	31	40.3%	2.70	
Non-Degree	2	2.6%	3.50	
	77	100.1%		

141 artifacts were collected, of these 64 (45%) were not graded.

Edison State College
Average Scores Above and Below 2.0

Communication Assessment
Fall 2009 Performance

Above Cut:		
	57	74.0%
Below 2.0:		
	20	26.0%
Total:		
	77	100.0%

Edison State College

Reliabilities of Paired Scorers for Communication Assessment

Fall 2009 Performance

Scorers	Reliability		Number
A & B			
	0.64	*(Reliable)*	*38*
C & D			
	0.56	*(Reliable)*	*28*
E & B			
	0.54	*(Reliable)*	*11*
Number Analyzed for Reliability			*77*

➢ The scoring session revealed that the Written Communication rubric worked very well for almost all types of writing assignments across the disciplines. The team found, however, that the research paper artifacts were still not very successful in revealing relevant data because the scoring team found a high degree of plagiarism in many of the artifacts.

➢ Over 70% of the students scored above a "2" on the Written Communication rubric; however, one scoring team was deemed "not reliable" in its inter-rater reliability.

USE OF ASSESSMENT FINDINGS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING:

The scoring team had the following recommendations for general education assessment in Written Communication:

➢ The English faculty held Written Communication workshops in the TLC.
➢ The research paper was discouraged as a Written Communication artifact.
➢ Student artifacts were suggested to be at least one fully-developed paragraph that meets the criteria of the Written Communication rubric (preferably at least one typed page).

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

➢ During the syllabus review process, faculty were given suggestions on what assignments should be listed as meeting the Written Communication general education competency to improve.
➢ The online and upper-level artifacts should be stratified for more effective analysis.

DESCRIBE HOW DATA AND RECOMMENDATIONS WILL BE SHARED WITH FACULTY:

This data will be shared with the SAC committee; the chairs and associate deans will then disseminate to faculty at departmental meetings. The data will also be posted on the Edison State College Assessment Website.

EDISON STATE COLLEGE
ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS REPORTING FORM

Name of Course: Pilot General Education Assessment of Written Communication

Name of Program Leader (s):   Professor Marty Ambrose

Date: July 13, 2011

Report Completed by: Mary Myers, Dean, Edison Online

Results for: Edison Online

LEARNING OUTCOME(S): Written Communication (General Education Assessment for the Institutional Portfolio)

ASSESSMENT PLAN:

1. At the beginning of the 2009 fall session, the Department of Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness (IRPE) completed a random, district-wide selection of courses to participate in the Pilot General Education Assessment of Written Communication. They then notified each faculty member that his or her course was selected and for which general education outcome.

2. Faculty then filled out a form that was sent to IRPE indicating the description of the assignment, the date the assignment was due, and the target submission date of the artifacts to IRPE. Faculty were also instructed to send the artifacts electronically before any grading process took place.

3. IRPE prepared the artifacts for scoring by randomly selecting 50 artifacts from students who have achieved at least 30 hours. Of this sample, 18 were available for analysis from Edison Online.

4. A team of English faculty (Prof. Ellie Bunting, Prof. Pam Mangene, Prof. Marty Ambrose, and Prof. Judy Van Gaalen) trained in the holistic scoring of essays were paid to score the artifacts at the end of the summer session. The team scored the essays according to the General Education Rubric in Written Communication. The scored artifacts were then returned to IRPE for analysis of the data.

DATA ANALYSIS:

Edison State College
Data Analysis for Communication Assessment
Fall 2009 Performance
Edison Online
18 students were matched to Banner data on ID

Hours **Earned**	N	%	Average Score	Comments
45-60	7	38.9%	3.36	The average score decreased as
61-75	4	22.2%	2.88	students completed more hours.
76-90	0	0.0%		
91 +	4	16.7%	2.88	
	18	100.0%	2.50	

GPA	N	%	Average Score	Comments
<2.00	1	5.6%	2.0	The average score based on GPA was
2.01-2.50	2	11.1%	2.80	not significant but students maintaining a
2.51-3.00	3	16.7%	3.00	"B" average or higher performed better.
3.01-3.50	6	33.3%	3.10	
3.51-4.00	6	33.3%	3.20	
	18	100%		

Degree Program	N	%	Average Score	Comments
AA Degree	4	22.2%	2.60	The average score for students enrolled
AS Degrees	2	11.1%	3.50	in the AS programs was higher than
BAS/BS Degrees	10	55.6%	3.00	those in an AA program. Non-degree
Non-Degree	2	11.1%	3.50	seeking students also scored as high as
	18	100%		those in the AS program.

Edison State College
Average Scores Above and Below 2.0
Communication Assessment
Fall 2009 Performance

Edison Online

Above Cut:	14	77.8%
Below 2.0:	4	22.2%
Total:	18	100.0%

Edison State College
Reliabilities of Paired Scorers for Communication Assessment
Fall 2009 Performance
Edison Online

Scorers	Reliability		Number
A&B	**0.22**	*(Not Reliable)*	6
C&D	***0.84***	*(Reliable)*	7
E & B	***0.66***	*(Reliable)*	6
Number Analyzed for Reliability			***19***

> The scoring session revealed that the Written Communication rubric worked very well for almost all types of writing assignments across the disciplines. The team found, however, that the research paper artifact was not very successful in revealing relevant data because the scoring team found a high degree of plagiarism in many of the artifacts.

> Over 70% of the students scored above a "2" on the Written Communication rubric; however, one scoring team was deemed "not reliable" in its inter-rater reliability.

USE OF ASSESSMENT FINDINGS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING:
The scoring team had the following recommendations for general education assessment in Written Communication:

> English faculty will conduct workshops/norming sessions on writing assignments for faculty in other disciplines.
> The multidisciplinary scoring team should have more norming sessions to improve inter-rater reliability.
> Student artifacts should be typed in correct MLA or APA format or clearly handwritten (typed is preferable).
> Student artifacts should be at least one fully-developed paragraph that meets the criteria of the Written Communication rubric (preferably at least one typed page).

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

> A larger number of artifacts from upper-level courses need to be randomly chosen by IRPE for the next scoring of Written Communication.
> Written Communication artifacts should not be more than 5-8 pages.
> Feedback will be provided by IRPE for faculty who wish to adjust their assignments.

DESCRIBE HOW DATA AND RECOMMENDATIONS WILL BE SHARED WITH FACULTY:

This data will be shared with the SAC committee; the chairs and associate deans will then disseminate to faculty at departmental meetings. The data will also be posted on the Edison State College Assessment Website.