October 8, 2021

Shawn Moore, Ihasha Horn, Michael Barach, Tom Mohundro, Jennifer Grove, Brandi George, Jeremy Pilarski, Suzanne Biedenbach, Cara Minardi Power, Amy Trogan, Jill Hummel, Leonard Owens, Eric Ivey, John Pelot, Thomas Wayne, Jason Calabrese, Sara Dustin, Ellie Bunting, Mark Massaro, David Luther.

Special Guest: Prof. Arenthia Herren

Not present: Jennifer Grove.

I. **Call to Order**:

 1.Dr. Amy Trogan at 9:50 a.m.

II. **Vote to Approve Notes:**

1. Notes approved.

**III.** **Library Update with Professor Arenthia Herren:**

1. Prof. Herren: Discover tool has few issues, and we are working on fixing that. Student services improved. We can Zoom with students, creating a more personable atmosphere. We also have research presentations if you want to schedule those for your classes. New authentication services available.

 2. E-Reserves: Going Well. *Little Seagull* is the most checked out book. Dr. Trogan helped us get more copies.

 A. Dr. Minardi-Power: I just did that. The library needs to keep a copy of your text. No longer doing physical loans.

 3. Prof. Herren: Looking forward to the QEP. English department one of your favorite departments. I will be in 303 if you need anything.

**IV. Writing Certificate Update with Dr. Trogan:**

1: Met with Professor Schierer, Dr. George, Dr. Minardi-Power, and Dr. Biedenbach. I found a course and will think about a new course proposal. Keep the course broad to appeal to a lot of students. We would like to look at different pathways before anything is implemented. Afterwards, we’ll prepare a draft for faculty feedback. We’ll keep you updated.

**IV. Assessment Update with Dr. Minardi Power**

English Assessment Report

Summer 2021

Author: Joseph F. van Gaalen, Ph.D., Asst. VP, IR, Assessment & Effectiveness

# 1INTRODUCTION

Fall 2020 marked a reestablishment of earlier assessment logistical practices (assessment tool) combined with the new model initiated in fall 2019 (collecting data of co-requisite enrolled-ENC 1130 students and their performance in ENC 1101). Four courses will be covered in this assessment plan which marks a transition between ENC 0022 *Writing for College Success* in support of ENC 1101 *Composition I*, to ENC 1130 *Improving College Writing* supporting ENC 1101. The courses are ENC 0022, ENC 1130, ENC 1101, and ENC 1102 (as an indirect measured assessment).

The standard assessment plan highlighted above is designed to evaluate each course and inform faculty on Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) for future assessment plans. Additionally, the plan provides information on achievement levels of concurrent dual enrollment artifacts compared with traditional, as by modality, and by site, where possible.

For additional detail or further analysis not provided in this report, please contact Dr. Joseph F. van Gaalen, Asst. VP, IR, Assessment & Effectiveness, Academic Affairs (jfvangaalen@fsw.edu; x16965).

# 2ENC 1101 & ENC 1130 COMPARISON (VIA 1101 ASSESSMENT)

Using common rubric criterion revised based on assessment results of AY 2016-17 as an assessment method, the FSW English faculty defined two areas of interest for evaluation based on core outcomes for the course. Using two revised common rubric dimensions, the outcomes include:

* SLO 1: Students must incorporate research into their own writing using summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation by composing academic research assignments.
	+ (5) Achieves Excellence: The student integrates and explicates relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research through summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; (4) Exceeds Expectations: The student introduces and explicates relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research through summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; (3) Meets Expectations: The student introduces and uses some relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research through some summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; (2) Needs Improvement: The student identifies, but does little to include, relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research through minimal summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; (1) Does Not Meet Expectations: The student does not include relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research and/or engage in summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation.
* SLO 2: Students must demonstrate the ability to organize, compose, revise, and edit essays with clear thesis statements, coherent, unified paragraphs, and varied sentence structures and length.
	+ (5) Achieves Excellence: The student develops and engages in a through process of drafting and revision to produce a composition with a clear thesis statement, unified paragraphs, and varied sentence structure and length; (4) Exceeds Expectations: The student develops and engages in a satisfactory process of drafting and revision to produce a composition with a clear thesis statement, unified paragraphs, and varied sentence structure and length; (3) Meets Expectations: The student mostly follows a process of drafting and revision to produce a composition with a thesis statement, unified paragraphs, and some varied sentence structure and length; (2) Needs Improvement: The student does minimal drafting and revision to produce a composition that is lacking in a clear thesis statement and/or unified paragraphs, and some varied sentence structure and length; (1) Does Not Meet Expectations: The student does not engage in drafting and revision and does not produce a composition that has a clear thesis statement, unified paragraphs, and/or varied sentence structure and length.

## 2.1LEARNING OUTCOMES, OBJECTIVES, & DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

### 2.1.1Learning Outcomes & Objectives

Each assessment will be used to assess student ability to recognize and produce effective writing. The department established the following goals for the assessments:

* Establish baseline data between 1130 and 1101 on each rubric dimension.
* Establish baseline data by site between 1130 and 1101 on each site or by each modality.

### 2.1.2Learning Outcomes Achievement

ENC 1101 is scored using a rubric with just two dimensions as listed above and herein referred to as SLO 1 and SLO 2. The English department has identified a target statistic for measurement purposes of measuring the percentage of artifacts scoring a 3 or greater. For the Summer 2021 assessment, 92 artifacts were collected for ENC 1101 from 8 course sections. SLO 1 achievement is 73% scoring 3 or greater. SLO 2 achievement is 79% scoring 3 or greater (Table 1).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric Score**  | **SLO 1**  | **SLO 2**  |
| **% Meets Expectations or Higher**  | **73%**  | **79%**  |
| 5  | 23%  | 36%  |
| 4  | 33%  | 15%  |
| 3  | 17%  | 28%  |
| 2  | 14%  | 9%  |
| 1  | 13%  | 12%  |

*Table 1. Percentage of student achievement level by rubric dimension (includes percentage of students scoring in developmental level or higher as per SLO) for ENC 1101.*

### 2.1.3Learning Outcomes Achievement Comparison of 1101 and 1130

Of the 92 artifacts collected from the ENC 1101 assessment, 82 originated from standard students, while 10 originated from co-requisite enrolled students (students enrolled in ENC 1130 while also enrolled in ENC 1101). In SLO 1, artifacts originating from ENC 1101-only students exhibit a 19% lower achievement percentage. In SLO 2, that gap is narrowed to 12% (Table 2). Note that sample size for ENC 1130/1101 students is very low, at n=10.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ENC 1101 only**  | **ENC 1101 & ENC 1130**  |
| **Rubric Score**  | **SLO 1**  | **SLO 2**  | **SLO 1**  | **SLO 2**  |
| **% Meets Expectations or Higher**  | **71%**  | **78%**  | **90%**  | **90%**  |
| 5  | 21%  | 35%  | 40%  | 40%  |
| 4  | 33%  | 13%  | 30%  | 30%  |
| 3  | 17%  | 29%  | 20%  | 20%  |
| 2  | 15%  | 9%  | 10%  | 10%  |
| 1  | 15%  | 13%  | 0%  | 0%  |

*Table 2. Percentage achievement by rubric dimension for ENC 1101-only students and those also enrolled in ENC 1130.*

## 2.2COMPARISONS BY SITE, FORMAT, AND STUDENT TYPE

2.2.1Dual Enrollment to Non-Dual Enrollment Comparison

No dual enrollment sections are offered during the summer, so no comparison can be completed.

### 2.2.2Modality Comparison

Of the artifacts collected from the ENC 1101 assessment, 34 originated from asynchronous online sections, 15 from live online, 0 from flex, 0 from blended, and 43 from traditional. In SLO 1, artifacts originating from asynchronous online exhibit the highest achievement at 79%, followed by traditional at 56%, then live online at 53% (Figure 1). In SLO 2, artifacts originating from asynchronous online exhibit the highest achievement at 76%, followed by live online at 53%, and traditional at 33%. All are significantly different from each other, according to a Fisher’s exact test.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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*Figure 1. Achievement by modality.*

2.2.3Comparison by Site/Campus

Only one site included sections of the course this term, so no comparison by site could be completed.

# 3ENC 1130 COMMON ASSESSMENT

Using common rubric criterion, the FSW English faculty reviews a common area of interest for evaluation based on core outcomes for the course. The outcome is:

 SLO 2: Students must demonstrate the ability to organize, compose, revise, and edit essays with clear thesis statements, coherent, unified paragraphs, and varied sentence structures and length.

o (5) Achieves Excellence: The student integrates and explicates relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research through summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; (4) Exceeds Expectations: The student introduces and explicates relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research through summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; (3) Meets Expectations: The student introduces and uses some relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research through some summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; (2) Needs Improvement: The student identifies, but does little to include, relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research through minimal summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation; (1) Does Not Meet Expectations: The student does not include relevant and credible sources in his or her academic research and/or engage in summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation.

## 3.1.1Learning Outcomes & Objectives

Each assessment will be used to assess student ability to recognize and produce effective writing. The department established the following goals for the assessments:

* Establish baseline data for 1130
* Establish baseline data by site and modality.

## 3.1.2Learning Outcomes Achievement

The English department has identified a target statistic for measurement purposes of measuring the percentage of artifacts scoring a 3 or greater. For the Summer 2021 assessment, 11 artifacts were collected for ENC 1130 from seven course sections. SLO 2 achievement is 82% scoring 3 or greater (Table 3).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rubric Score**  | **SLO 2**  |
| **% Meets Expectations or Higher**  | **82%**  |
| 5  | 45%  |
| 4  | 36%  |
| 3  | 0%  |
| 2  | 18%  |
| 1  | 0%  |

*Table 3. Percentage of student achievement level by rubric dimension (includes percentage of students scoring in developmental level or higher as per SLO) for ENC 1130.*

4ENC 1102

Beginning with the Spring 2019 term, the English Department developed an exit survey to study student perspectives upon completion of the ENC 1102 course. The questions posed in the survey are listed below and results of the survey are shown in Figure 3. Each survey response includes options of “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Neither agree nor disagree,” “Disagree,” and “Strongly disagree.”

* Q1 - I think my ENC 1101 class (Composition I) prepared me well for ENC 1102.
* Q2 - I feel prepared to apply my knowledge of writing and research to other academic and nonacademic situations in the future.
* Q3 - What I learned in ENC 1101 and 1102 will help me to write successfully in my major and in my profession.
* Q4 - I am comfortable conducting and documenting primary and secondary research.
* Q5 - After taking ENC 1101 and 1102, I am more comfortable with reading, writing, and researching in the media of the 21st century (digital, web-based, etc.).
* Q6 - I think the feedback I received on my written assignments was comprehensive and constructive. In other words, the feedback enabled me to take my writing skills to the next level.
* Q7 - I am comfortable reading and writing about, as well as discussing in class, complex and difficult issues, even if I disagree strongly with others.
* Q8 - I can encounter a view by someone with whom I disagree, but still take seriously and try to understand their perspective.
* Q9 - I understand how I can apply skills in argumentation and rhetoric to my other academic courses, in the workplace, and in my personal life.
* Q10 - I feel comfortable defining my position (argument/perspective) and supporting it in writing.
* Q11 - I understand how research, writing, and argumentation are necessary for problemsolving in college, the workplace, and the world.
* Q12 - Diversity of values and empathy with others are important for my success as a reader, writer, and researcher.
* Q13 - I am comfortable acknowledging different approaches or theories, and even changing my own mind when learning new information.
* Q14 - ENC 1101 and 1102 have expanded what I listen to, watch, and/or read by exposing me to new ideas and texts.
* Q15 - I am comfortable evaluating and sorting through information, including deciding if something or someone is credible or not.

No assessment for ENC 1102 is completed during the summer term.

# 5CONCLUSIONS

FSW’s English Department assessment plan includes four courses: ENC 0022, ENC 1130, ENC 1101, and ENC 1102 (as an indirect measured assessment). Fall 2020 marked a reestablishment of earlier assessment logistical practices (assessment tool) combined with the new model initiated in fall 2019 (collecting data of co-requisite enrolled-ENC 1130 students and their performance in ENC 1101).

## 5.1ENC 1101 & ENC 1130

A drilldown of ENC 1101 & ENC 1130 results are as follows:

1. ENC 1101 is scored using a rubric with just two dimensions as listed above and herein referred to as SLO 1 and SLO 2. The English department has identified a target statistic for measurement purposes of measuring the percentage of artifacts scoring a 3 or greater. For the Summer 2021 assessment, 92 artifacts were collected for ENC 1101 from 8 course sections. SLO 1 achievement is 73% scoring 3 or greater. SLO 2 achievement is 79% scoring 3 or greater.
2. Of the 92 artifacts collected from the ENC 1101 assessment, 82 originated from standard students, while 10 originated from co-requisite enrolled students (students enrolled in ENC 1130 while also enrolled in ENC 1101). In SLO 1, artifacts originating from ENC 1101-only students exhibit a 19% lower achievement percentage. In SLO 2, that gap is narrowed to 12%. Note that sample size for ENC 1130/1101 students is very low, at n=10.
3. No dual enrollment sections are offered during the summer, so no comparison can be completed.
4. Of the artifacts collected from the ENC 1101 assessment, 34 originated from asynchronous online sections, 15 from live online, 0 from flex, 0 from blended, and 43 from traditional. In SLO 1, artifacts originating from asynchronous online exhibit the highest achievement at 79%, followed by traditional at 56%, then live online at 53% (Figure 1). In SLO 2, artifacts originating from asynchronous online exhibit the highest achievement at 76%, followed by live online at 53%, and traditional at 33%. All are significantly different from each other, according to a Fisher’s exact test.
5. Only one site included sections of the course this term, so no comparison by site could be completed.

## 5.2ENC 1130

A drilldown of ENC 1130 results are as follows:

1. The English department has identified a target statistic for measurement purposes of measuring the percentage of artifacts scoring a 3 or greater. For the Summer 2021 assessment, 11 artifacts were collected for ENC 1130 from seven course sections. SLO 2 achievement is 82% scoring 3 or greater.

## 5.3ENC 1102

A drilldown of ENC 1102 results are as follows:

1. No assessment completed during summer terms.
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**Learning Assessment Coordinator Announcements for October 2021 Departmental Meetings**

* **Remind faculty to familiarize themselves with the FSW QEP as prep for SACSCOC visit:** encourage faculty to review and understand the QEP; let them know they might be asked about it in the unlikely event that they are interviewed by SACSCOC.
* **Plug *DataVersed*:** remind faculty about the monthly newsletter which has good info about the committee’s work as well as announcements on PD events and accessible overviews of assessment data.
* **October Assessment events/PD Fridays:**Team AASPIRE and Elijah Pritchett will host a pair of assessment PD events in October. Both events will look ahead to spring 2022’s work, with one session focusing on “Investigate,” the other on “Think.” Though all are welcome, the October PD sessions will be of special interest for anyone who has been selected to submit an assignment for gen ed assessment this fall, and for anyone interested in training to teach the upcoming QEP capstone course. Times for these PD sessions are:

**Friday, 10-29-2021**

*Assessing “Investigate”: Preparing for General Education Assessment in AY 21/22 -*1:00 PM-1:45 PM

*Assessing “Think”: Preparing for General Education Assessment in AY 21/22* -2:00 PM-2:45 PM

English Department Assessment:

Summer 2021 Assessment report

Questions, problems, comments? Are there opportunities here for inquiry we should follow up on? Approve so ASPIRE can publish report

Literature 2000 assessment spring 2022

I sent out calendar reminders for this semester’s assessment

Enc 1101 SLOs: continue discussion/revise

Vote in November?

1. **Conversations:**

 **1. Dr. Minardi-Power:** Looking for someone to do GEN ED assessment for the Spring. $250.00 stipend. Please drop me an email if interested. Please look at summer assessment report so TEAM ASPIRE can publish it. Percentages look good (70–79%).

 **2. SLO**: Fix the outcomes. Put them in the active voice. Take advantage of the comments on the discussion board and find an official to express them. Include measurability.

 A. Prof. Owens: That would be helpful. Referring to my comment, students must demonstrate STEM.

**V. Selection Committee**: (Dr. Hummel, Dr. Biedenbach, Prof. Horn, Prof. Ivey, Dr. Trogan)

 1. Timeline: Internal posting. A couple of weeks before external.

**VI. Dual Enrollment: (Prof. Jeremy Pilarski).**

 1. Created survey focusing on PD, scheduling, and portfolios). 22 questions. Sent to Dr. Minardi- Power.

 2. Spring semester means concurrent faculty portfolios. We will be doing recordings. Change some of the questions on the observation form. Some are a bit redundant. Will work Dr.Trogan.

 3. All syllabi submitted.

 4. Will post an announcement about surveys.

 5. Workshops will be embedded in course. Will be on 8 different topics. Face to face. Use Google form to file a request.

**VII. Writing Center**: (**Prof. Lenny Owens)**

 1. Will cover the book Peripheral Visions of the Writing Center. Continue to establish a strong connection with the center. Great work by Laurie and Katie. Some of the IA’s will do workshops. Workshops will be embedded in course. Will be on 8 different topics. Face to face. Use Google form to file a request. Videos on MLA also embedded. To encourage participation, make Writing Center visit part of the student’s grade. Thinking about putting together a blog.

**VIII. Faculty Updates:**

1. **Dr. George**: *Illuminations* is open for submissions. Link available on how to submit. Having a launch party October 29. Open mic. Theme is home.

 2. Aimee Nezhukumatathil and Ross Gay will be reading from their collaborative chapbook, “Lace & Pyrite: A Letter from Two Gardens,” on Monday, 11/15, from 7- 8:15pm. There will be a craft talk and Q&A as well.

 2. **Prof. Horn:**

1. Field Trip to Food Forest. Working with Collier County Rooftops Environmental Adventurers. Working with Captiva to explore the backwaters. Nov. 12. Oct. 28 will be hosting tree trunk decorations. Next meetings will be October 11 and 25.

 3**. Dr. Ortolani:**

 1. Community of Practice in English. Teaching Session on Teaching Flex Courses. October 15th. Dr. Akiko Yoshida’s event will be on October 14.

 4. Prof. Owens and Laura Tichy Smith: Florida College English Association. Presenting on Saturday. Prof. Owens and two new faculty members will be doing *New Kids on the Block*, a presentation on teaching tips and how to succeed as an FSW professor.

**IX. Old and New Business:**

 **1. Dr. Trogan:** Let Wendi know if you using a non-adopted text by Oct. 15. Date is firm. Get information early.

 2. **Shells (1101 and 1102):** Wonderful upgrades. Shout-out to Brandon Simpson. He helped me crate a 10-page document to update those modules. Will have meeting with Dr. Jester about OERS. Will work on keeping the links updated. Summer work on these shells will be available along with compensation.

 3. **Prof. Owens:** Dr. Jester just received a large grant to develop OER text.

 4. **Prof. Herren**: Not sure how the OER Institute will work. Received $100,000 to get it running, and I am kind-of co-hosting it. English gets the highest enrollment, and I want there to be a library partner.

 Dr. Trogan: Dr. Teed discussed new things at the GEN ED Advisory Committee. Writing intensive requirements look to be the same.

 Prof. Horn: Shoutout to Dr. Hodges and Prof. Bishop for making the poetry coffee house a success.

 Meeting adjourned 11:00

*\*Notes: Professor Jeremy Pilarski*