Middle Tennessee State University

General Education Assessment Report 2010

Submitted to the Tennessee Board of Regents
October 14, 2010

Assessment of General Education Learning Outcomes

Academic Year 2009-2010

Subject Area: Critical Thinking

1. Identify the Performance-Funding test of general education used by your institution.

   California Critical Thinking Skills Test

2. If you used sampling as permitted by THEC, describe the method used.

   Sampling was not used.

3. Present the institutional mean scores or sub-scores on the Performance Funding instrument that your institution reviewed to assess students' comprehension and evaluation of arguments. If comparable scores for a peer group are available, also present them.

   MTSU = 17.3
   National = 16.8

4. Summarize your impressions of the results yielded by the THEC test regarding critical thinking. Based upon your interpretations of the data, what conclusions emerge about student attainment of critical thinking skills?

   For the third consecutive year, MTSU students' critical thinking skills exceeded those of students taking the same test at universities across the country. Our students also scored in the mid-range or above on all sub-score categories: analysis, deduction, evaluation, induction, and inference. These test scores indicate that MTSU students are being taught appropriate and useful critical thinking skills in their classes.

5. Do you plan any strategies to correct deficiencies or opportunities for improvement that emerged with respect to critical thinking? If so, describe them below.

   MTSU faculty are making a focused effort to include classroom activities to improve students' critical thinking skills at all levels. Critical thinking skills are emphasized in each degree program. In addition, critical thinking is addressed in each of the following university-wide programs:
   a. The development of critical thinking skills is an area of emphasis in the University Seminar course (UNIV 1010). UNIV 1010 textbooks contain a critical thinking component in each chapter.
   b. Tutoring in the University Writing Center emphasizes the development of critical thinking skills in the writing process.

c. The University Library Research Coach service (which offers students in-depth, one-on-one sessions with a librarian) emphasizes critical thinking in finding and selecting the best books, articles, and database resources for projects, papers, and presentations.

Assessment of General Education Learning Outcomes

Academic Year 2009-2010

Subject Area: Mathematics

1. Identify the course(s) used in the assessment. Include the prefix, number, and title of each course.

   MATH 1710—College Algebra and MATH 1710K—College Algebra

2. Indicate the number of students who were assessed. Was sampling used? If yes, briefly describe the method of selecting student work and the percentage of students whose work was assessed.

   All 2489 students taking the final examination in fall 2009 and spring 2010 were assessed.

3. Do the procedures described in Items 1 and 2 represent any significant change from the pilot assessment? If so, describe the changes and rationale.

   The pilot assessment plan called for each learning outcome to be associated with only two questions on the examination. In order to increase the usefulness and reliability of the assessment, we have modified it so that each learning outcome is associated with a larger number of questions—40 questions for the first learning outcome and 16 questions for each of the other learning outcomes.

   It was felt that the distinction between Learning Outcomes 2 (real-life problems) and 3 (meaningful connections) was too subtle to measure with a single examination. Thus the same set of 16 questions was used to assess these two learning outcomes.

   A correct response rate of at least 85% was deemed to be superior; a correct response rate between 60% and 84% was deemed to be satisfactory; a correct response rate of less than 60% was deemed to be unsatisfactory.

   Results of both fall and spring semesters were included in this year's analysis.

Mathematics Learning Outcome to be Assessed	**Test Used**	**Test Item Numbers**
Learning Outcome 1: Students are able to use mathematics to solve problems and determine if results are reasonable.	Math 1710 Common Final	Questions 1-40
Learning Outcome 2: Students are able to use mathematics to model real-world behaviors and apply mathematical concepts to the solution of real life problems.	Math 1710 Common Final	Questions 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,13,14,16,18,22,39

Learning Outcome 3: Students are able to make meaningful connections between mathematics and other disciplines.	Math 1710 Common Final	Questions 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,13,14,16,18,22,39
Learning Outcome 4: Students are able to use technology for mathematical reasoning and problem solving.	Math 1710 Common Final	Questions 2,3,5,8,9,13,14,18,20,22,24,29,31,32,34,38
Learning Outcome 5: Students are able to apply mathematical and/or basic statistical reasoning to analyze data and graphs.	Math 1710 Common Final	Questions 2,3,4,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,21,27,28,30,40

4. Per the evaluation rubric utilized at your institution, adapt the table below to record the results of the assessments of each learning outcome in the subject area discussed in the report. Below is an example of a table for mathematics. <u>Revise the table to reflect the descriptors used at your institution.</u> If you rephrased a TBR goal statement, type your institution's version below the corresponding TBR goal and within the same cell. If you addressed additional outcomes not included in the TBR list, create rows for them at the bottom of the table.

Mathematics Outcome to be Assessed	**Superior** Number and Percent	**Satisfactory** Number and Percent	**Unsatisfactory** Number and Percent
Learning Outcome 1: Students are able to use mathematics to solve problems and determine if results are reasonable.	**13% (313 of 2489 students) were correct on at least 85% of the questions**	**62% (1541 of 2489 students) were correct on at least between 60% and 84% of the questions**	**26% (635 of 2489 students) were correct on fewer than 60% of the questions**
Learning Outcome 2: Students are able to use mathematics to model real-world behaviors and apply mathematical concepts to the solution of real life problems.	**10% (246 of 2489 students) were correct on at least 85% of the questions**	**53% (1328 of 2489 students) were correct on at least between 60% and 84% of the questions**	**37% (915 of 2489 students) were correct on fewer than 60% of the questions**
Learning Outcome 3: Students are able to make meaningful connections between mathematics and other disciplines.	**10% (246 of 2489 students) were correct on at least 85% of the questions**	**53% (1328 of 2489 students) were correct on at least between 60% and 84% of the questions**	**37% (915 of 2489 students) were correct on fewer than 60% of the questions**

Learning Outcome 4: Students are able to use technology for mathematical reasoning and problem solving	**10% (239 of 2489 students) were correct on at least 85% of the questions**	**55% (1361 of 2489 students) were correct on at least between 60% and 84% of the questions**	**36% (889 of 2489 students) were correct on fewer than 60% of the questions**
Learning Outcome 5: Students are able to apply mathematical and/or basic statistical reasoning to analyze data and graphs.	**19% (460 of 2489 students) were correct on at least 85% of the questions**	**57% (1419 of 2489 students) were correct on at least between 60% and 84% of the questions**	**25% (610 of 2489 students) were correct on fewer than 60% of the questions**

5. Summarize your impressions of the results reported in item 4. Based upon your interpretation of the data, what conclusions emerge about student attainment of the learning outcomes?

   The results on Learning Outcome 1 are pleasing. Seventy-five percent of students are able to use mathematics to solve problems and determine if results are reasonable.

   The results on Learning Outcomes 2 and 3 are not surprising. Students continue to experience difficulty with application problems and in making connections between disciplines. Applications of mathematics are challenging in at least two ways—the context of the problem as well as the mathematics which models the problem.

   The result of Learning Outcome 4 is unexpected. Although today's students arrive on campus with a wide variety of experience and expertise with technology, over one-third of the College Algebra students cannot successfully use technology to solve problems.

   Learning Outcome 5 is in line with Learning Outcome 1. Approximately 75% of students were able to use mathematics to solve problems and to use statistical reasoning to interpret data and graphs.

   These results are acceptable, but certainly they can be improved.

6. Do you plan to implement strategies to correct any deficiencies that emerged from the data obtained? If yes, please explain.

   In order to identify actions and strategies to improve student achievement, these results will be considered by the Department of Mathematical Sciences' Math Council, Service Course Committee, and Coordinator of the Mathematics Tutoring Lab, as well as by the Department of University Studies.

   Further analysis of individual test items will help to identify specific areas in which to focus efforts to improve instruction.

7. Have you implemented any plans to correct deficiencies based upon data obtained from the pilot assessment in 2008-09? If yes, please explain.

   Results of the 2008-2009 assessment were presented to and discussed by the faculties of the Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Academic Enrichment Department (now the University Studies Department).

   Realizing that the correct response rate on a single pair of questions cannot provide a reliable indicator of student knowledge and achievement, we have improved the usefulness of our assessment tool, obtained a more functional assessment of student learning, and made significant progress toward the establishment of a baseline from which to measure future progress.

   Students who need assistance attaining the mathematics learning outcomes are referred to the campus Math Lab for individualized tutoring.

Assessment of General Education Learning Outcomes

Academic Year 2009-2010

Subject Area: Oral Communication

1. Identify the course(s) used in the assessment. Include the prefix, number, and title of each course.

The course Fundamentals of Communication, COMM 2200, was used in the assessment of Oral Communication. To evaluate student performance in constructing and delivering an oral presentation, Informative Speech Outlines and Persuasive Speech Oral Presentations were assessed.

2. **Indicate the number of students who were assessed. Was sampling used? If yes, briefly describe the method of selecting student work and the percentage of students whose work was assessed.**

The COMM 2200 procedure consisted of random stratified samples of representative populations of the COMM 2200 sections offered in Spring, 2010. The total enrollment in COMM 2200 for Spring, 2010 was 1758. Data was collected from 221 students (110 Presentation Outlines and 111 Oral Presentations).

From the randomly selected sections of COMM 2200, Informative Speech Presentation Outlines and Oral Persuasive Speech Presentations were randomly selected for evaluation. The outlines consisted of blind copies requested from the instructors. Selected student Oral Presentations were video-taped. No identifying elements were used for individual students or instructors. Outlines, demographics instructions, videotapes and sections were identified by assigned numbers for the study. Assigned number listings were secured in a locked drawer in the principal investigator's office.

All random selections were generated using Research Randomizer (Urbaniak and Plous, 2008) from the Social Psychology Network.

Four faculty members in Communication Studies participated in a Pre-Assessment Workshop and developed a speech rubric (for assessment of the Persuasive Speech Presentations) and an outline rubric (to evaluate the Informative Speech Outlines). Resources for development of each rubric were collected from a variety of sources, including the National Communication Association and recent workshops.

Training for faculty members included four hours per evaluator to assess persuasive speeches, and four hours per evaluator to assess outlines. Evaluation of speeches and outlines required three evaluators (as stipulated by the National Communication Association and professionals in the field). For the 2010 assessment, three new faculty members were trained to be evaluators (two for speech evaluations and one for outline evaluations). This is in keeping with the original proposal to add several new evaluators each assessment cycle.

3. Do the procedures described in Items 1 and 2, represent any significant change from the pilot assessment? If so, describe the changes and rationale.

The number of participants was increased from the number used in the pilot study to insure a valid representative sample (10 percent of the total enrollment) as well as provide a baseline for future assessment.

4. Per the evaluation rubric utilized at your institution, adapt the table below to record the results of the assessments of each learning outcome in the subject area discussed in the report. Below is an example of a table for oral communication. Revise the table to reflect the descriptors used at your institution. If you rephrased a TBR goal statement, type your institution's version below the corresponding TBR goal and within the same cell. If you addressed additional outcomes not included in the TBR list, create rows for them at the bottom of the table.

TABLES

Oral Communication TBR Competencies to be Assessed *NOTE: Since we assess persuasive oral presentations AND informative speech outlines, more than one table may be included for each TBR Outcome.*	**Superior** Number and Percent	**Satisfactory** Number and Percent	**Unsatisfactory** Number and Percent
TBR Outcome I **Students are able to distill a primary purpose into a single, compelling statement.** *[Table A: Revised on our rubric for the persuasive oral presentation to: Students are able to communicate the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for a persuasive presentation, the audience & occasion---students communicate within the opening few sentences of the speech a thesis/specific purpose that is clear, concise, is appropriate and one that the audience members should clearly understand.]*	(1); 9%	(61); 55%	(49); 44.1%
[Table B: Revised on our rubric for the informative speech outline to: Student outlines contain a purpose statement that is appropriate for an informative speech, is clear and concise, and contains no deficiencies in expression.]	*(13); 11.8%*	*(46); 41.8%*	*(51); 46.4%*
TBR Outcome II. **Students are able to order major points in a reasonable and convincing manner based on that purpose.** *[Table C: Revised on our rubric for the persuasive oral presentation to: Students use persuasive appeals (ethos, logos pathos) appropriate to the purpose, topic, audience, & occasion---the speaker displays an ability to appropriately and effectively utilize all three types of persuasive appeals in the presentation and the speech is clearly persuasive throughout.]*	(0); 0%	(78); 70.3%	(33); 29.7%

TBR Outcome III. **Organizational Patterns. Students are able to develop their ideas using appropriate rhetorical patterns (e.g., narration, example, comparison/contrast, classification, cause/effect, definition).** *[Table D: Revised on our rubric for the persuasive oral presentation to: Students use an organizational pattern appropriate to the persuasive presentation---students present an introduction that clearly engages the audience in an appropriate and creative manner; the body of the speech reflects clarity in organization, and the conclusion reflects clearly and accurately the content of the speech and leaves the audience with a compelling message or call to action.]*	(0); 0	(40); 36%	(71); 64%
[Table E: Revised on our rubric for the informative speech outline to: Student outlines contain 2 to 5 main points; each point is clear and concise and consistently follows an organizational pattern (topical, chronological, etc.) that is appropriate for the topic and audience; all main points are fully developed.]	*(8); 7.3%*	*(47); 42.7%*	*(55); 50.0%*
TBR Outcome IV. **Students are able to employ correct diction, syntax, usage, grammar, and mechanics**. *[Table F: Revised on our rubric for the oral persuasive speech to: The speaker uses language that is reasonably clear, vivid and appropriate and is free of inappropriate jargon, slang, and is nonsexist, nonracist, etc.]*	(0); 0%	(104); 93.7%	(7); 6.3%
[Table G: Revised on our rubric for the informative speech outline to: Student outlines contain clear language that is concise and appropriate to the audience, the topic and the occasion; may contain elements of style (the use of metaphors, parallelisms, etc.), and is void of language that is sexist, racist, etc.]	*(0); 0%*	*(95); 86.4%*	*(15); 13.6%*
[Table H: Revised on our rubric for the informative speech outline to: Student outlines contain no major errors in spelling, syntax and/or grammar.]	*(12); 10.9%*	*(81); 73.6%*	*(17); 15.5%*

TBR Outcome V. **Students are able to manage and coordinate basic information gathered from multiple sources.** *[Table i: Revised on our rubric for the* <u>*informative speech outline*</u> *to: A bibliography or works cited page is present and contains a minimum of 6 sources; sources are cited using an accepted citation style with no major errors or omissions.]*	(20); 18.2%	(24); 21.8%	(66); 60.0%

5. Summarize your impressions of the results reported in item 4. Based upon your interpretation of the data, what conclusions emerge about student attainment of the learning outcomes?

With regard to the five TBR Learning Outcomes, performance was moderately strong on **Outcome I** (Clear Articulation of a Purpose Statement / Tables A, B) with over 50% of students scoring at the satisfactory level or higher. Performance was strong with 70% of the students scoring at the satisfactory or higher level for **Outcome II** (the Ordering of Main Points in a reasonable and convincing manner / Table C.) Performance was also strong for **Outcome IV** (Diction, syntax, usage, grammar, mechanics) with more than 80% of the students scoring at the satisfactory level or higher (Tables F, G, H). Performance was weak on two learning outcomes. For **Outcome III** (use of appropriate rhetorical patterns) 52% of students scored at the unsatisfactory level (Tables D and E); and on **Outcome V** (the gathering and use of multiple sources) 60% of students scored at the unsatisfactory level (Table i).

6. D**o you plan to implement strategies to correct any deficiencies that emerged from the data obtained? If yes, please explain.**

For the Spring 2010 assessment, outlines were collected from all students enrolled in twelve different sections while five to seven speeches were recorded in forty different sections of Comm 2200. In order to provide a more accurate assessment, we intend to collect outlines from the same number of sections (forty) as we record speeches (forty). The final list of outlines and speeches to be assessed will continue to be selected using the Research Randomizer (Urbaniak and Plous, 2008) from the Social Psychology Network.

7. Have you implemented any plans to correct deficiencies based upon data obtained from the pilot assessment in 2008-09?

Work on improving student outcomes has already begun. At the beginning of the 2010 Fall semester all but one of the Comm 2200 instructors participated in a two-hour workshop during which time the results of the assessment were discussed with particular attention to the two outcomes where performance was weak. Another training workshop is scheduled before the beginning of classes in Spring 2011. The coordinator has also started a dialogue with the MTSU library staff regarding the use of multiple sources for the kinds of topics students deal with in Comm 2200. The results of this initiative should be in place by the beginning of the Spring semester. Further data analysis will also be conducted to determine what other factors may be impeding student performance.

Improvement efforts continue to be hampered, however, by the continuing increase in class sizes. According to *The National Communication Association's Standards for Undergraduate Communication Programs* "... all performance courses (e.g., public speaking) should not have more than a 25:1 student /faculty ratio." [1] Currently Comm 2200 sections are being capped at a 28:1 student/faculty ratio. We would strongly recommend that class sizes for Comm 2200 be returned to the 25:1 ratio as recommended by the NCA.

[1] <http://www.natcom.org/Default.aspx?id=1128&libID=1149>

Assessment of General Education Learning Outcomes

Academic Year 2009-2010

Subject Area: Writing

1. Identify the course(s) used in the assessment. Include the prefix, number, and title of each course.

English 1020: Research and Argumentative Writing

2. Indicate the number of students who were assessed. Was sampling used? If yes, briefly describe the method of selecting student work and the percentage of students whose work was assessed.

All 1020 instructors were asked to submit one copy of the most researched essay each student turned in for grading. There were 2,438 students enrolled in English 1020 in spring 2010, and a pool of 1,951 essays was collected. The essays of 481 students enrolled in English 1020 were not collected due to two main issues: instructor non-compliance (e.g., not turning in any essays, turning in essays that were written on or graded, or turning in essays after the deadline) and student non-compliance (e.g., not turning in an essay to the instructor). A computer-generated randomizer (www.random.org/lists) was used to decrease the original pool of 1,951 essays to a pool of 250 essays that were double blinded by clerical staff, using cover-up tape. The assessment organizer then double checked that the pool of 250 essays matched the data generated by the clerical staff. The computer-generated randomizer was used on these 250 essays, and the first 100 essays from the final randomized pool were chosen as the final sample. Thus, out of the original 1,951 essays, 5.13% of the total essays were chosen for the final sample.

3. Do the procedures described in Items 1 and 2 represent any significant change from the pilot assessment? If so, describe the changes and rationale.

In the pre-pilot (2007-2008) and pilot (2008-2009) studies, the assessment organizer discarded any essay that did not include a Works Cited. Based on a request from the Assessment Subcommittee of the MTSU General Education Committee, in this year's study, the assessment organizer did not discard any essays that were missing a Works Cited. Eighty-seven essays of the 1,951 turned in did not include a Works Cited, even though instructors were asked to turn in a set of essays that resulted from assignments calling for the most student research in English 1020. Thus, 4.46% of the essays in the 1,951 sampling did not include a Works Cited. And, in the final pool of 100 essays, seven essays (7%) did not include a Works Cited.

4. Per the evaluation rubric utilized at your institution, adapt the table below to record the results of the assessments of each learning outcome in the subject area discussed in the report. Below is an example of a table for writing. Revise the table to reflect the descriptors used at your institution. If you rephrased a TBR goal statement, type your institution's version below the corresponding TBR goal and within the same cell. If you addressed additional outcomes not included in the TBR list, create rows for them at the bottom of the table.

Writing Outcome to be Assessed	**Superior** Number and Percent	**Satisfactory** Number and Percent	**Unsatisfactory** Number and Percent
Students are able to distill a primary purpose into a single, compelling statement. [revised on our rubric to: The student writer is able to distill a **primary argumen**t into a single, compelling statement.]	22/200=**11%**	109/200=54.5**%**	69/200=**34.5%**
Students are able to order major points in a reasonable and convincing manner based on that purpose. [revised on our rubric to: The student writer is able to order major points in a reasonable and convincing manner based on **primary argument**.]	30/200=**15%**	86/200=**43%**	84/200=**42%**
Students are able to develop their ideas using appropriate rhetorical patterns (e.g., narration, example, comparison/contrast, classification, cause/effect, definition).	25/200=**12.5%**	115/200=**57.5%**	60/200=**30%**
Students are able to employ correct diction, syntax, usage, grammar, and mechanics.	19/200=**9.5%**	100/200=**50%**	81/200=**40.5%**
Students are able to manage and coordinate basic information gathered from multiple sources. [revised on our rubric to: The student writer is able to manage and coordinate basic information gathered from multiple **secondary** sources.]	9/200=**4.5%**	83/200=**41.5%**	108/200=**54%**
[added criterion for our rubric: **The student writer gives a clear purpose and audience**.]	38/200=**19.0%**	118/200=**59%**	44/200=**22%**
[added criterion for our rubric: **The student writer has written a minimum of 1,000 words or four typed pages at 250 words per page (please estimate)].**	4/200=**2%**	130/200=**65%**	66/200=**33%**

5. Summarize your impressions of the results reported in item 4. Based upon your interpretation of the data, what conclusions emerge about student attainment of the learning outcomes?

- Forty-four to seventy-eight percent of student writers in the pool achieve adequate or more than adequate levels for all criteria.
- Based on adequate or more than adequate achievement by student writers in the pool, three criteria are notably higher than others:
  i. Student writers are able to develop their ideas using appropriate rhetorical patterns (e.g., narration, example, comparison/contrast, classification, cause/effect, definition).
  ii. The student writer gives a clear purpose and audience.
  iii. Student writers have written a minimum of 1,000 words or four typed pages at 250 words per page.
- Based on less than adequate achievement by student writers in the pool, three criteria need more attention than others:
  i. Student writers are able to manage and coordinate basic information gathered from multiple secondary sources.
  ii. The student writer is able to order major points in a reasonable and convincing manner based on primary argument.
  iii. Students are able to employ correct diction, syntax, usage, grammar, and mechanics.

6. Do you plan to implement strategies to correct any deficiencies that emerged from the data obtained? If yes, please explain.

The English Department plans to

- disseminate results of the 2009-10 assessment study. We will
  - provide copies of the results to Dr. Tom Strawman, Department Chair; Dr. Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director; Dr. Julie Myatt, English Coordinator of Graduate Teaching Assistants; and Dr. Wes Houp, Director of the University Writing Center.
  - discuss results at GTA orientation, fall and spring Lower Division curriculum meetings, and general faculty meeting at the beginning of the academic year.
  - mention specifically at orientations, curriculum meetings, and general faculty meetings the need for instructor compliance in providing all 1020 essays for the assessment study each spring semester.
- focus on student management and coordination of basic information. We will
  - have Dr. Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director, and Dr. Julie Myatt, English Coordinator of Graduate Teaching Assistants, continue to invite Dr. Jason Vance and others from James E. Walker Library to GTA/adjunct/FTT orientations to discuss available library assistance, including Research Coach, SearchPath, and Embed a Librarian options.
  - have the English Lower Division Committee continue the requirement for all English 1020 instructors to take their classes to the library for at least one class

period for a librarian-led introduction to using the library effectively for research in 1020.

- investigate the role departmental grade inflation may play in less than adequate scores. We will
    - have Dr. Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director, and the English 1020 Syllabus Review Committee continue to review 1020 syllabi (for GTAs, adjuncts, and instructors) for how instructors represented and fulfilled the Course Objectives for English 1020. The results will be given to each instructor with a request to revise any deficiencies by the next time the instructor teaches 1020. The committee will also confirm that each 1020 instructor uses appropriate texts that focus on the specific course objectives for 1020.
    - have Dr. Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director, and Dr. Julie Myatt, Coordinator of Teaching Assistants, organize grade norming sessions for GTAs/adjuncts/instructors in fall 2010 and spring 2011.
- restructure the English 1020 course into a research and argumentative course that focuses on Writing Across the Curriculum, rather than on one that focuses on literary analysis, to stimulate more student interest in research and argumentation. We will
    - have Dr. Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director, lead the way in this restructuring, and she and Dr. Allison Smith, the assessment organizer, will be presenting text choices to the Lower Division committee in fall 2010. At the spring 2011 Lower Division curriculum meeting, publisher representatives and textbook authors will present their books and supplementals to 1020 instructors. The Lower Division Committee will also provide sample syllabi focusing on Writing Across the Curriculum. All 1020 instructors will choose new books and prepare new syllabi for this focus, and the Writing Across the Curriculum aspect of 1020 will be implemented in fall 2011.
- emphasize the 1020 course objectives for new hires and returning GTAs, adjuncts, and instructors. We will
    - guide all new GTAs, adjuncts, and instructors to the New Hire Resources webpage, located on the For English Faculty website, that includes the course objectives, sample syllabi, general information for contingent faculty, and specific assistance with grading, developing effective assignments, and judging written work in GE courses. Course objectives, syllabi, assignments, and grading are all reviewed in the annual evaluation of each GTA, adjunct, and instructor in the department.
- emphasize the need for freshman writing courses to follow the guidelines of the National Council of Teachers of English with regard to class size. Dr. Tom Strawman and Dr. Laura Dubek will
    - make a request to upper administration that the current class size of 25 students per freshman writing class fall into NCTE guidelines: "No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class. Ideally, classes should be limited to 15. Students cannot learn to write without writing. In sections larger than 20, teachers cannot possibly give student writing the immediate and individual response necessary for growth and improvement."

7. Have you implemented any plans to correct deficiencies based upon data obtained from the pilot assessment in 2008-09?

The English Department has already

- disseminated results of the 2008-09 assessment study. Dr. Allison Smith, the assessment organizer, has
    - provided copies of the results to Dr. Tom Strawman, Department Chair; Dr. Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director; Dr. Julie Myatt, English Coordinator of Graduate Teaching Assistants; and Dr. Wes Houp, Director of the University Writing Center.
    - discussed results at GTA orientation, fall adjunct/FTT orientation, spring Lower Division curriculum meeting, and general faculty meeting at the beginning of the academic year.
- focused on student management and coordination of basic information. Dr Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director, has
    - invited Dr. Jason Vance from James E. Walker Library to adjunct/FTT orientations to discuss available library assistance, including Research Coach, SearchPath, and Embed a Librarian options. Dr. Julie Myatt, Coordinator of GTAs, has also invited Dr. Vance to GTA orientation meetings.
    - implemented the requirement for all English 1020 instructors to take their classes to the library for at least one class period for a librarian-led research introduction.
- investigated the role departmental grade inflation may play in less than adequate scores. Dr. Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director, and the English Lower Division Committee have
    - formed an English 1020 Syllabus Review Committee in spring 2010, and the committee members meticulously noted how each 1020 syllabus (for GTAs, adjuncts, and instructors) represented and fulfilled the Course Objectives for English 1020. The results were given to each instructor with a request to revise any deficiencies by the next time the instructor taught 1020.
    - organized grade norming sessions for adjuncts/instructors in fall 2009 and spring 2010. Dr. Julie Myatt, Coordinator of GTAs, has also organized grade norming sessions for the GTAs.
- emphasized the 1020 course objectives for new hires and returning GTAs, adjuncts, and instructors. Dr. Laura Dubek, English Lower Division Director, has
    - created a New Hire Resources webpage, located on the For English Faculty website, that includes the course objectives, sample syllabi, general information for contingent faculty, and specific assistance with grading, developing effective assignments, and judging written work in GE courses. Course objectives, syllabi, assignments, and grading are all reviewed in the annual evaluation of each GTA, adjunct, and instructor in the department.