



**Wheeling University
Annual Assessment Report
Primary Educational Goals/Core Curriculum
2021-2022**

Table of Contents

Primary Educational Goal (PEG) Assessment Summary Report for AY 2021-2022

Assessment Summary3
Action Plan.....3
Mission PEG.....5
Critical Thinking Fall 2021.....6
Critical Thinking Spring 2022.....9
Ethical Reasoning Fall 2021.....13
Ethical Reasoning Spring 2022.....19
Oral Communication Fall 2021.....23
Oral Communication Spring 2022..... 26
Written Communication Fall 2021.....30
Written Communication Spring 2022.....34

**Wheeling University
Primary Educational Goals Assessment Summary
2021-2022 Academic Year**

Assessment Summary

During the 2021-2022 academic year, the assessment committee and university faculty worked to cultivate a culture of assessment across campus. Assessment Days have been designated at the end of each semester for training, scoring, and reporting for assessment reports while also connecting these actions to curricular improvements and efforts for retention.

The Primary Educational Goals (PEGs) include critical thinking, ethical reasoning, oral communication, and written communication. These serve as foundational tenets for the university's undergraduate core curriculum. The focus of this PEG report is on the undergraduate core; however, PEGs are assessed throughout undergraduate and graduate programs. This report describes data specific to the core PEGS and makes recommendations for continuous improvement.

During spring 2022, a new PEG was proposed for implementation beginning in fall 2022. Details regarding the Mission PEG can be found later in this report. At the conclusion of the 2021-2022 academic year, a faculty-wide PEG discussion was held at the Assessment Day Retreat. A summary of the recommendations is found in the tables below:

Primary Educational Goals Action Plan for AY 2022-2023

Critical Thinking

Topic	Goal	Action	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundational knowledge needs covered/reviewed in science courses • Differences in majors needs addressed in science courses (EXSC vs ENGR in physics, for example) 	Identify students who need additional support in critical thinking and improve their critical thinking scores by the end of the semester	Use data from AY 2021-2023 to identify classes were students need additional attention; work with Teaching and Learning Task Force to implement lessons and strategies to facilitate stronger critical thinking	Implement in fall 2022

Ethical Reasoning

Topic	Goal	Action	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case studies used in nursing and DPT • Observation and confidentiality for education majors • Human subjects training for all psychology majors 	Assess more than just core	Add ethical reasoning where applicable to majors curriculum maps	Some revisions have happened in spring 2022; additional to follow in fall 2022

Oral Communication

Topic	Goal	Action	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students need time to warm up • Math students practice problems as a group • Business students practice eye contact and informal group presentations before graded presentations • Exercise science students mix groups throughout the semester • English students engage in regular practice 	Provide more intentional learning support for students in oral communication	Provide Teaching and Learning Task Force Professional Development sessions on how faculty can create learning opportunities for current students	Provide faculty training in AY 2022-2023

Written Communication

Topic	Goal	Action	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English students complete drafts to gain feedback Psychology students block assignments into sections (infancy/adolescence/adulthood for example) to seem less intimidating than a larger paper (drafts and practice) 	Improve student scores on the written communication rubric	Provide intentional opportunities for practice and feedback (drafts)	Fall 2022

Mission Primary Educational Goal: New for Fall 2022

In addition to the four PEGs currently used, a new Mission PEG was proposed for implementation beginning in AY 2022-2023. As Wheeling University embraces the shift from a Jesuit-sponsored to Diocesan-sponsored institution both in terms of identity and assessment, it is important to incorporate a part of our mission into academic performance. The WU Mission PEG embodies the ideals of *Cura Personalis*, care for the whole person, and provides the university with a means for intentional integration and assessment of mission beginning with Freshman Year Seminar and concluding with a capstone experience in the senior year. Students will use the ePortfolio system in BlackBoard to create a personal vision statement as it relates to their own goals throughout and beyond their academic journey; describe mission as it relates to their selected academic program and detail how their personal goals and program goals align with the institutional mission; and complete academic and co-curricular mission alignment activities to demonstrate students' embodiment of life, leadership, and service with and among others.

The Mission Rubric can be found below:

WHEELING UNIVERSITY MISSION PEG: CURA PERSONALIS - DRAFT

To be implemented in Fall 2022 in First Year Experience and an assigned activity in one low level (100-200) and one higher level/capstone (300-400) course in all majors carried out and graded in Blackboard student ePortfolio.

	Exemplary 25 pts	Proficient 20 pts	Needs Development 15 pts	Emerging 10 pts	Not evident 0 pts
Personal Vision Statement 25 pts	Exemplary Mission statement uses clear, concise sentences: 4 sentences minimum. While stating at least two or three core values and, one goal student would like to accomplish academically and one goal to accomplish in terms of professional progress	Proficient Mission statement is one clear, concise statement outlining at least one value and one thing student would like to accomplish.	Needs Development Mission statement is vague. Does not provide a clear vision for what student wants to accomplish or what student values.	Emerging Mission statement is: two or more sentences OR lacks a desired value or accomplishment.	Not evident No mission statement sentence included.
Degree Program Learning Mission Statement Description 25 pts	Exemplary Describes the key words of the degree program learning mission statement sentence with descriptive adjectives. Tells what the student will do to achieve Degree Program mission in alignment with his/her learning mission and why this is important to the student. Is easy to understand and free of spelling/grammar errors.	Proficient Mission statement is one clear, concise statement outlining at least one value and one thing student would like to accomplish.	Needs Development Mission statement is vague. Does not provide a clear vision for what student wants to accomplish or what student values.	Emerging Mission statement is: two or more sentences OR lacks a desired value or accomplishment.	Not evident No mission statement sentence included.
Mission Statement Description 25 pts	Exemplary Describes the key words of the mission statement sentence with descriptive adjectives. Tells what the student will do to achieve WU mission in alignment with his/her mission and why this is important to the student. Is easy to understand and free of spelling/grammar errors.	Proficient Describes each of the key words of the mission statement sentence in detail. Tells what the student will do to achieve WU mission and his/her mission and why this is important to the student. Spelling/grammar does not detract from reader's understanding.	Needs Development Describes one of the key words of the mission statement sentence. Does not tell why the student values these things. Spelling/grammar detracts from reader's understanding.	Emerging Describes a few of the key words of the mission statement sentence in detail. Tells what the student will do to achieve his/her mission OR why this is important to the student. Spelling/grammar occasionally detracts from reader's understanding.	Not evident No mission statement sentence paragraph included.
Mission Alignment Activity 25 pts	Exemplary Vibrant, creative, with direct impact/results. Student put exceptional effort into completing assignment.	Proficient Shows direct impact/results. It appears student spent adequate time completing assignment.	Needs Development It appears the student spent little time completing the assignment.	Emerging Very little care or effort put into creating the assignment.	Not evident Unfinished assignment.
ePortfolio Assessment 25 pts	Exemplary Vibrant, creative, with direct impact/results. Student put exceptional effort into completing assignment.	Proficient Shows direct impact/results. It appears student spent adequate time completing assignment.	Needs Development It appears the student spent little time completing the assignment.	Emerging Very little care or effort put into creating the assignment.	Not evident Unfinished assignment.

Critical Thinking Primary Educational Goal: Fall 2021**Section A: Introduction/Background**

Program: PEG core

Semester/Academic Year: Fall 2021

Course Numbers: During the fall 2021, course data were captured by a variety of courses and sections from many programs (BIOL-140, BIOL-150, HIST-214, PHIL-115, PSYC-110 SOCI-121, THEO-115, etc.).

Number of sections assessed: 13

Program Goal - Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Section B: Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

1. Explanation of Issues
2. Evidence
3. Influence of context and assumptions
4. Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)
5. Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)

Section C: Assessment Method

How did you measure each of the learning outcomes associated with your course?

The assessment of each of the outcomes was based on the Value-Added rubric of "Critical Thinking". The grading rubric criteria were mapped with the Value Critical Thinking rubric to assess different levels of achievement, for example benchmark (level 1), milestones (level 2 and 3), and capstone (level 4).

List the measures (e.g., course material, assignments, tests, etc.) you used to assess the student learnings.

The assignments included research papers, discussions, library research papers, and problem-solving questionnaires.

Section D: Results/Findings

The critical thinking PEG is embedded in a variety of undergraduate core courses. During fall 2021, the following courses were assessed and a breakdown of the mean scores on a 4-point scale per rubric categories is as follows:

Course	Explanation of Issues	Evidence	Influence	Student's Position	Conclusion	Total
PEG average	M=.529	M=.516	M= .496	M=.494	M=.471	M= 2.507
CHEM-151: n=5	M=.250	M=.250	M=.200	M=.250	M=.200	M=1.15
MATH-151: n=7	M=.250	M=.357	M=.214	M=.286	M=.214	M=1.32
MATH-191: n=12	M=.938	M=.813	M=.750	M=.770	M=.688	M=3.958
MATH-192: n=7	M=.179	M=.179	M=.179	M=.143	M=.179	M=.857

PHIL-115: n=3	M=.667	M=.583	M= .416	M=.583	M=.667	M=2.917
PHYS-107; n=5	M=1.000	M=.900	M=.800	M=.900	M=.800	M=4.400
PHYS-141: n=9	M=.833	M=.806	M=.806	M=.722	M=.694	M=3.86
PHYS-241: n=12	M=.250	M=.250	M=.200	M=.250	M=.200	M=1.150
PSYC-110: N=23	M=.239	M=.239	M=.239	M=.239	M=.187	M=1.14
SOCI-121: n=47	M=.516	M=.516	M=.516	M=.516	M=.527	M=2.59
THEO-115: n=8	M=.406	M=.438	M=.500	M=.469	M=.438	M=2.25

The grading rubric criteria were mapped with the VALUE Critical Thinking Rubric to assess different levels of achievement, with benchmark levels represented as “1”; milestones as “2” and “3”; and capstone “4”. As the core courses represent lower level (100 and 200), the PEG average is an expected milestone (M=2.507). It should be noted that one course, PHYS-107, is scoring much higher; this instructor’s rubric calibration will be revisited.

What is the greatest strength of the program?

The core curriculum critical thinking PEG is incorporated into a broad range of courses. Data reflects students are making considerations that reflect thoughtful consideration of course activities.

What criteria were achieved?

The data reflects our graduates are satisfying the critical thinking component of the CORE PEG curriculum. This data becomes even more valuable when comparing student progress through upper levels of their programs of study.

Any comparisons with the previous term’s results? Are students improving?

The current data provides a snapshot of the undergraduate core curriculum experience.

A challenge in data interpretation emerged from multiple rubric names being used for the critical thinking PEG. Data files were merged. The university assessment committee is working to streamline this process for future semesters.

Because this data set disaggregates core data from upper-level program data, we cannot make a fair semester-to-semester comparison. Rather, we can acknowledge that students in the core are meeting performance expectations, and as described in program reports, make progressions that reflect improved critical thinking in their upper level, major specific courses.

While the university has made great strides in its assessment cycle, we still need to address some shortcomings regarding rubric implementation, connection to student learning, and how that can serve as an impetus for instructional improvements.

Critical Thinking Primary Educational Goal: Spring 2022

Section A: Introduction/Background

Program: PEG core

Semester/Academic Year: Spring 2022

Course Numbers: During the Spring 2022 semester, course data were captured by a variety of courses and sections from many programs (BIOL-130, BIOL-150, CRJU-120, GEOG-121, HIST-115, HIST-212, PSYC-110, PSYC-115, SOCI-121)

Number of sections assessed: 12

Program Goal - Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. The purpose of critical thinking as part of the Wheeling University core curriculum is to develop students as thoughtful persons who are able to apply this information in their course activities as well as to the world around them.

Section B: Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

1. Explanation of Issues
2. Evidence
3. Influence of context and assumptions
4. Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)
5. Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)

Section C: Assessment Method

How did you measure each of the learning outcomes associated with your course?

The assessment of each of the outcomes was based on the Value-Added rubric of "Critical Thinking". The grading rubric criteria were mapped with the Value Critical Thinking rubric to assess different levels of achievement, for example benchmark (level 1), milestones (level 2 and 3), and capstone (level 4).

List the measures (e.g., course material, assignments, tests, etc.) you used to assess the student learnings.

The assignments included research papers, discussions, library research papers, and problem-solving questionnaires.

Section D: Results/Findings

The critical thinking PEG is embedded in a variety of undergraduate core courses. During fall 2021, the following courses were assessed and a breakdown of the mean scores on a 4-point scale per rubric categories is as follows:

Course	Explanation of Issues	Evidence	Influence	Student's Position	Conclusion	Total
PEG average	M=.692	M=.663	M=.695	M=.688	M=.682	M= 3.42
BIOL-130; n=15	M=.333	M=.333	M=.316	M=.333	M=.333	M=1.65

BIOL-150; n=15	M=1.00	M=1.00	M=1.00	M=1.00	M=1.00	M=5.00
CRJU-120; n=33	M=.590	M=.553	M=.560	M=.553	M=.583	M=2.85
GEOG-121; n=28	M=.642	M=.625	M=.563	M=.598	M=.580	M=3.01
HIST-115; n=32	M=.726	M=.664	M=.781	M=.734	M=.734	M=3.64
HIST-212; n=17	M=.515	M=.470	M=.544	M=.500	M=.500	M=2.53
PSYC-110; n=40	M=.737	M=.724	M=.730	M=.711	M=.705	M=3.60
PSYC-115; n=22	M=.761	M=.761	M=.761	M=.772	M=.761	M=3.81
SOCI-121; n=45	M=.756	M=.716	M=.755	M=.777	M=.739	M=3.73

The grading rubric criteria were mapped with the VALUE Critical Thinking Rubric to assess different levels of achievement, with benchmark levels represented as “1”; milestones as “2” and “3”; and capstone “4”. As the core courses represent lower level (100 and 200), the PEG average is at milestone (M=3.42) and higher than the fall 2021 ratings.

What is the greatest strength of the program?

The core curriculum critical thinking PEG is incorporated into a broad range of courses. Data reflects students are making considerations that reflect thoughtful consideration of course activities.

What criteria were achieved?

The data reflects our graduates are satisfying the critical thinking component of the CORE PEG curriculum. This data becomes even more valuable when comparing student progress through upper levels of their programs of study.

Any comparisons with the previous term’s results? Are students improving?

The current data provides a snapshot of the undergraduate core curriculum experience.

The critical thinking score for spring 2022 semester (3.42) is higher than that of fall 2021 (2.507). A true comparison would be if the same courses were evaluated each term; however, core curriculum critical thinking courses differ by semester, both in terms of subject and number of sections. For better data analysis, interpretation, and recommendations, it will be important to regularly train faculty on rubric use, assess assignments with consistency, and continue to work to improve teaching and learning throughout the critical thinking core curriculum.

As noted in the fall 2021 report, the assessment committee and those involved in preparing the PEG reports have disaggregated core data from upper-level program data, which is reported out in the WU program report. Challenges remain with data sets in part because of the reliance on part-time faculty who may need calibration to the rubric and because course offerings differ by term. We can acknowledge that students in the core are meeting performance expectations and are making progressions that reflect improved critical thinking in their upper level, major specific courses.

A discussion of all full-time faculty at the WU Assessment Day Retreat acknowledged the changing demographic of our student population. Specific suggestions regarding teaching and learning and information regarding benchmarking appear earlier in this document.

Ethical Reasoning Primary Educational Goal: Fall 2021

Section A: Introduction/Background

Program _PEG (CORE): Ethical Reasoning

Semester/Academic Year: Fall/2021-2022

Course Numbers: PHIL 305

Number of sections assessed: 3

Program Goal: Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Section B: Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

1. Ethical Self-Awareness
2. Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts
3. Ethical Issue Recognition
4. Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts
5. Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts

Section C: Assessment Method

How did you measure each of the learning outcomes associated with your course?

The Ethical Reasoning Value-Added rubric was used to measure and overall value of student performance in courses designed to include "Ethical Reasoning" content.

List the measures (e.g., course material, assignments, tests, etc.) you used to assess the student learnings.

Written assignments were used to evaluate ethical reasoning for each student.

Section D: Results/Findings

PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric

2021-12-14 - 2022-03-07




Courses Included							
Learning Activity	Course	Instructors	Enrollment	Evaluations	Percent	# Pass	% Pass
PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric	2021FA Ethics (2021FA-PHIL-305-80)	Ciocco, Gary; Makris, Paula	29	29	100	28	96.55
PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric	2021FA Ethics (2021FA-PHIL-305-81)	Gilham, Jarred; Panagiotou, John	9	8	88.89	7	87.5
PEG Ethical Reasoning	2021FA Ethics (2021FA-PHIL-305-01)	Whelton, Beverly	31	28	90.32	28	100

Summary Statistics					
Scored Evaluations	65	# Pass	63	Mean Score	4.31
Rows	5	% Pass	96.92	Median Score	4.5
Possible Item Scores	325	Highest Score	5	Std Dev	0.65
Actual Item Scores	325	Lowest Score	2.5	KR(20) / Cronbach Alpha	0.87

PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric

2021-12-14 - 2022-03-07

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution

<p>1</p>	<p>Ethical Self-Awareness</p>	<p>0.92</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 45 (69.2%) Capstone - 4 ■ 18 (27.7%) Milestone - 3 ■ 2 (3.1%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
<p>2</p>	<p>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</p>	<p>0.85</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 32 (49.2%) Capstone - 4 ■ 27 (41.5%) Milestone - 3 ■ 6 (9.2%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
<p>3</p>	<p>Ethical Issue Recognition</p>	<p>0.87</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 36 (55.4%) Capstone - 4 ■ 24 (36.9%) Milestone - 3 ■ 4 (6.2%) Milestone - 2 ■ 1 (1.5%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	

4	Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 30 (46.2%) Capstone - 4 ■ 31 (47.7%) Milestone - 3 ■ 4 (6.2%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
5	Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 29 (44.6%) Capstone - 4 ■ 29 (44.6%) Milestone - 3 ■ 6 (9.2%) Milestone - 2 ■ 1 (1.5%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	

Data Interpretation:

What is the greatest strength of the program?

Although all areas were at or above designated performance goals, data indicate that the greatest strength was “Ethical Self-Awareness,” which makes sense, as the development of ethical self-awareness is building block that can help students to achieve the other rubric criteria. (See below for a breakdown of the rubric criteria.)

Row Analysis						
Position	Row	Average	Std Dev	Point Biserial	Cronbach Del	
1	Ethical Self-Awareness	0.92	0.13	0.68	0.85	
2	Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.85	0.16	0.67	0.85	

Row Analysis					
Position	Row	Average	Std Dev	Point Biserial	Cronbach Del
3	Ethical Issue Recognition	0.87	0.17	0.71	0.84
4	Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.85	0.15	0.72	0.84
5	Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.83	0.18	0.73	0.84

What criteria were achieved?

Summary of Student Performance on the PEGS:

On average, students achieved the following on the Ethical Reasoning Rubric:

- For Ethical Self-Awareness, 69.2% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4” (or “Excellent”) level;
- For Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, 49.2% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4” level;
- For Ethical Issue Recognition, 55.4% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4” level;
- For Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, 46.2% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4” level;
- For Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, 44.6% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4 level.
- For all five rubric categories, there were no students at or below the “Substandard” “Poor”) level, and there was only one student at the “Benchmark-1” level and 18 students at the “Milestone -2” level. All other students performed at either the “Milestone -3” level or the “Capstone – 4” level.

Section E: Future Actions/Program Improvement Plan

What steps/actions need to be implemented for the program improvement?

Last year’s Core PEG report did not focus exclusively on data from core courses. Instead, it pulled data from all courses that were using PEG rubrics, regardless of whether these courses were in the core. Therefore, the data from the 2020-21 report cannot provide insight into the core-specific curriculum of the University. The first step to improving the collection and analysis of data in the core is to identify and collect only data for core courses, as we have done for this report. Because we only have one semester’s worth of data to analyze, the results are limited, but focused, at this point. Making program or curricular changes based on such limited data would be premature. Therefore, the most important immediate step is to continue to collect data properly for core courses to be analyzed and used for future program improvement.

Are those actions program-related or curriculum related?

Program-related

What areas in the student learning need to be improved?

The lowest-scoring area on the rubric for Fall 2021 was Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: 44.6% of students achieved the “Capstone – 4” level; 44.6% of students achieved the “Milestone -2” level; 9.2% of students achieved the “Milestone -1” level; and 1 student achieved at the “Benchmark -1” level. The next lowest-scoring area on the rubric for Fall 2021 was Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: 46.2% of students achieved the “Capstone – 4” level; 47.7% of students achieved the “Milestone -2” level; and 6.2% of students achieved the “Milestone -1” level (no students achieved below the “Milestone-1” level). It is to be expected that achievement levels in these areas of student learning are lower, since the other rubric criteria focus on the lowest level of Bloom’s taxonomy (understanding), and these rubric criteria focus on the more challenging levels (application and evaluation. Nonetheless, faculty teaching the program will need to include additional assignments and review in their courses in order to help students improve achievement on these two criteria.

What changes need to make to refine the assessment process?

As noted above, the most important immediate step is to continue to collect data properly for core courses to be analyzed and used for future program improvement.

Date of implementation.

Fall 2022

Ethical Reasoning Primary Educational Goal: Spring 2022

Section A: Introduction/Background

Program _PEG (CORE): Ethical Reasoning _____

Semester/Academic Year: Spring 2022

Course Numbers: PHIL 305 and THEO 305

Number of sections assessed: 4

Program Goal: Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students’ ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Section B: Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

1. Ethical Self-Awareness
2. Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts
3. Ethical Issue Recognition
4. Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts
5. Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts

Section C: Assessment Method

How did you measure each of the learning outcomes associated with your course?

The Ethical Reasoning Value-Added rubric was used to measure and overall value of student performance in courses designed to include “Ethical Reasoning” content.

List the measures (e.g., course material, assignments, tests, etc.) you used to assess the student learnings.

Written assignments were used to evaluate ethical reasoning for each student

Section D: Results/Findings




PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric



2022-Spring Semester

Courses Included							
Learning Activity	Course	Instructors	Enrollment	Evaluations	Percent	# Pass	% Pass
PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric	2022SP Ethics (2022SP-PHIL-305-80)	Ciocco, Gary; Makris, Paula	26	25	96.15	24	96
PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric	2022SP Ethics (2022SP-PHIL-305-01)	Whelton, Beverly; Makris, Paula	18	18	100	17	94.44
PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric	2022SP Ethics (2022SP-PHIL-305-02)	Whelton, Beverly; Makris, Paula	21	21	100	17	80.95

Courses Included							
Learning Activity	Course	Instructors	Enrollment	Evaluations	Percent	# Pass	% Pass
PEG - Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric	2022SP Theological Ethics (2022SP-THEO-305-80)	Gilham, Jarred; Panagiotou, John; Makris, Paula	5	3	60	2	66.67

Summary Statistics					
Scored Evaluations	67	# Pass	60	Mean Score	4.08
Rows	5	% Pass	89.55	Median Score	4.5
Possible Item Scores	335	Highest Score	5	Std Dev	1.12
Actual Item Scores	334	Lowest Score	0	KR(20) / Cronbach Alpha	0.96

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
1	Ethical Self-Awareness	0.83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 36 (53.7%) Capstone - 4 ■ 24 (35.8%) Milestone - 3 ■ 3 (4.5%) Milestone - 2 ■ 1 (1.5%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 3 (4.5%) Substandard - 0 	
2	Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 27 (40.3%) Capstone - 4 ■ 32 (47.8%) Milestone - 3 ■ 4 (6%) Milestone - 2 ■ 1 (1.5%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 3 (4.5%) Substandard - 0 	
3	Ethical Issue Recognition	0.86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 41 (62.1%) Capstone - 4 ■ 19 (28.8%) Milestone - 3 	

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
			3 (4.5%) Milestone - 2 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 3 (4.5%) Substandard - 0	
4	Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.84	38 (56.7%) Capstone - 4 22 (32.8%) Milestone - 3 2 (3%) Milestone - 2 2 (3%) Benchmark - 1 3 (4.5%) Substandard - 0	
5	Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.77	24 (35.8%) Capstone - 4 34 (50.7%) Milestone - 3 3 (4.5%) Milestone - 2 3 (4.5%) Benchmark - 1 3 (4.5%) Substandard - 0	

Data Interpretation:

What is the greatest strength of the program?

Although all areas were at or above designated performance goals, data indicate that the greatest strength was “Ethical Issue Recognition,” which was followed closely by Ethical Self-Awareness. Both of these criteria are on the lower level of Bloom’s taxonomy makes sense. The criterion on which students performed the least successfully was Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, which is on the highest level of Bloom’s taxonomy. (See below for a breakdown of the rubric criteria.)

Row Analysis					
Position	Row	Average	Std Dev	Point Biserial	Cronbach Del
1	Ethical Self-Awareness	0.83	0.24	0.85	0.96

Row Analysis					
Position	Row	Average	Std Dev	Point Biserial	Cronbach Del
2	Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.79	0.24	0.8	0.96
3	Ethical Issue Recognition	0.86	0.23	0.87	0.9
4	Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.84	0.25	0.89	0.95
5	Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	0.77	0.25	0.88	0.95

What criteria were achieved?

Summary of Student Performance on the PEGS:

On average, students achieved the following averages on the Ethical Reasoning Rubric:

- For Ethical Self-Awareness, 83%;
- For Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, 79%;
- For Ethical Issue Recognition, 86%;
- For Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, 84%;
- For Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, 77%.
- For all five rubric categories, 3 students performed below the “Substandard” “Poor”) level. However, it appears that these students did not actually perform this low—they simply did not submit the assignment and the instructor score all rubric categories with a 0 to reflect the missing work.

In comparison with Fall 2021, these averages are all slightly lower, though in some cases (Recognition and Application), the difference is only one percentage point. The most significant difference is in the criterion of Ethical Self-Awareness, which was the highest scoring category in Fall 21: 92% average as compared to 83% average.

Section E: Future Actions/Program Improvement Plan

What steps/actions need to be implemented for the program improvement?

Although we are making strides in the effective collection of data, program faculty continue to have difficulty remembering how to fill out the rubrics properly at the end of the semester. The most important immediate step is to continue to collect data properly for core courses to be analyzed and used for future program improvement.

Are those actions program-related or curriculum related?

Program-related

What areas in the student learning need to be improved?

As was true in Fall 21, the lowest-scoring area on the rubric for Spring 2022 was Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. In general, it is to be expected that students will find evaluation to be more challenging than understanding or application, since evaluation is a higher-level skill. The other area of concern (due to the decline in achievement as noted above) is Ethical Self-Awareness. Faculty teaching the program should continue to include additional assignments and review in their courses in order to help students improve achievement on these two criteria.

What changes need be made to refine the assessment process?

As was true for Fall 21, the most important step is to continue to collect data properly for core courses to be analyzed and used for future program improvement.

Date of implementation.

Fall 2022

Oral Communication Primary Educational Goal: Fall 2021

Section A: Introduction/Background

Program: Oral Communication Core

Semester/Academic Year: Fall 2021

Course Numbers: 2021FA Prin. of Professional Speaking (2021FA-COMM-115-01 to 04)

Number of sections assessed: 2

Program Goal: The learner will be able to use oral communication as a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Section B: Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

COMM 115 Principle of Professional Speaking: As a liberal arts core course, COMM 115 includes one Student Learning Outcome [SLO] that is aligned with Program Outcomes and Primary Educational Goals for the University:

The student can communicate effectively through the development and delivery of formal oral presentations to both general and discipline-specific audiences.

Section C: Assessment Method

How did you measure each of the learning outcomes associated with your course?

The learning outcomes were measured by use of rubrics for each of the SLOs as follows (rubric criteria are included in Section D Results/Findings):

COMM 115 Principle of Professional Speaking: *Oral Communication Value Rubric:*
Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors. (Evaluating on Bloom's Taxonomy Scale)




List the measures (e.g., course material, assignments, tests, etc.) you used to assess the student learnings.



COMM 115 used a public speech to assess the following SLO: The student can communicate effectively through the development and delivery of formal oral presentations to both general and discipline-specific audiences. (Applying on Bloom's Taxonomy Scale)

Section D: Results/Findings

Results of Oral Communication data:

All reported sections used the Oral Communication Rubric to assess the respective SLOs: The student can communicate effectively through the development and delivery of formal oral presentations to both general and discipline-specific audiences

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
1	Organization	0.56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 (8.3%) Capstone - 4 7 (29.2%) Milestone - 3 10 (41.7%) Milestone - 2 5 (20.8%) Benchmark - 1 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
2	Language	0.54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 (0%) Capstone - 4 7 (29.2%) Milestone - 3 14 (58.3%) Milestone - 2 3 (12.5%) Benchmark - 1 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
3	Delivery	0.59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 (0%) Capstone - 4 10 (41.7%) Milestone - 3 13 (54.2%) Milestone - 2 1 (4.2%) Benchmark - 1 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
4	Supporting Material	0.53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 (0%) Capstone - 4 9 (37.5%) Milestone - 3 9 (37.5%) Milestone - 2 6 (25%) Benchmark - 1 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
5	Central Message	0.59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 (4.2%) Capstone - 4 9 (37.5%) Milestone - 3 12 (50%) Milestone - 2 2 (8.3%) Benchmark - 1 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	

Data Interpretation:

Any comparisons with the previous term's results? Are students improving?

Fall 2021 is the second semester that we have collected data for the English program using the new curriculum map and the above rubrics, as well as using Blackboard to capture the data.

What is the greatest strength of the program?

In general, however, the Fall 2021 data from the both the Oral Communication Rubric suggest that students approximately 50% of students were able to achieve the milestone 2 level of skill. 20% or less achieved the benchmark level 1, while the 30% achieved the Milestone 3 skill level. The central message and the delivery were the strongest level of achievement for students

What criteria were achieved?

On average, students achieved the following on the Oral Communication Rubric: For Organization, 41.7 % of students achieved the "Milestone-2 level; for language, 58.3 % of students achieved the Milestone -2 level; for Delivery, 54.2% achieved the Milestone -2 level; for supporting material, 37.5% achieved the milestone 2 level; for Central message, 50% achieved the Milestone -2 level. For a core curriculum course for Freshmen students, these results highlight a solid foundation for which to build future success.

Section E: Future Actions/Program Improvement Plan

What steps/actions need to be implemented for the program improvement? Are those actions program-related or curriculum related?

Faculty need to ensure that assessment connects directly to oral communication and that the measurement of the task is appropriate for the course and core reporting.

What areas in the student learning need to be improved?

As noted above, the limited data makes it difficult to identify areas for improvement accurately.

What changes are needed to refine the assessment process?

Schedule a group grading activity for program faculty to norm data collection on assessment rubrics.

Date of implementation: Spring 2022

Oral Communication Primary Educational Goal: Spring 2022

Section A: Introduction/Background

Program: English-Oral Communication
Semester/Academic Year: Spring 2022

Course Numbers: 2022SP Principles of Public Speaking (2022SP-COMM-115 01-03)

Number of sections assessed: 3

Program Goal: The student can communicate effectively through the development and delivery of formal oral presentations to both general and discipline-specific audiences.

Section B: Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

COMM 115 Principle of Professional Speaking: As a liberal arts core course, COMM 115 includes one Student Learning Outcome [SLO] that is aligned with Program Outcomes and Primary Educational Goals for the University:

The student can communicate effectively through the development and delivery of formal oral presentations to both general and discipline-specific audiences.

Section C: Assessment Method

How did you measure each of the learning outcomes associated with your course?

The Oral Communication Value-Added rubric was used to measure and overall value of student performance in courses designed to include “Ethical Reasoning” content.

COMM 115 Principle of Professional Speaking:

Oral Communication Value Rubric: Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

List the measures (e.g., course material, assignments, tests, etc.) you used to assess the student learnings.

COMM 115 used a public speech to assess the following SLO: The student can communicate effectively through the development and delivery of formal oral presentations to both general and discipline-specific audiences.

Results:

PEG - Oral Communication Value Rubric

2022-05-09 - 2022-05-11

Courses Included							
Learning Activity	Course	Instructors	Enrollment	Evaluations	Percent	# Passes	% Pass
PEG - Oral Communication Value Rubric	2022SP Prin. of Professional Speaking (2022SP-COMM-115-02)	Slick, Joseph; Maxwell, William	19	19	100	17	89.47
PEG - Oral Communication Value Rubric	2022SP Prin. of Professional Speaking (2022SP-COMM-115-01)	Slick, Joseph; Seamon, Marc	17	12	70.59	10	83.33
PEG - Oral Communication Value Rubric	2022SP Prin. of Professional Speaking (2022SP-COMM-115-04)	Slick, Joseph	16	15	93.75	15	100

Courses Included							
Learning Activity	Course	Instructors	Enrollment	Evaluations	Percent	# Passes	% Pass
PEG - Oral Communication Value Rubric	2022SP Prin. of Professional Speaking (2022SP-COMM-115-80)	Slick, Joseph	19	18	94.74	16	88.89

Summary Statistics					
Scored Evaluations	64	# Pass	58	Mean Score	3.73
Rows	5	% Pass	90.63	Median Score	3.75
Possible Item Scores	320	Highest Score	5	Std Dev	0.95
Actual Item Scores	320	Lowest Score	0	KR(20) / Cronbach Alpha	0.95

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
1	Organization	0.73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 (23.4%) Capstone - 4 34 (53.1%) Milestone - 3 12 (18.8%) Milestone - 2 1 (1.6%) Benchmark - 1 2 (3.1%) Substandard - 0 	
2	Language	0.75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 (23.4%) Capstone - 4 37 (57.8%) Milestone - 3 10 (15.6%) Milestone - 2 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 2 (3.1%) Substandard - 0 	
3	Delivery	0.77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 (31.3%) Capstone - 4 32 (50%) Milestone - 3 10 (15.6%) Milestone - 2 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 2 (3.1%) Substandard - 0 	
4	Supporting Material	0.73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 (18.8%) Capstone - 4 39 (60.9%) Milestone - 3 10 (15.6%) Milestone - 2 1 (1.6%) Benchmark - 1 2 (3.1%) Substandard - 0 	

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
5	Central Message	0.76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 17 (26.6%) Capstone - 4 ■ 36 (56.3%) Milestone - 3 ■ 9 (14.1%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 2 (3.1%) Substandard - 0 	

Section D: Results/Findings

Data Interpretation:

What is the greatest strength of the program?

Although all areas were at designated performance goals, data indicate that the greatest strength Delivery. The greatest strength is the delivery of formal oral presentations to both general and discipline-specific audiences. In particular, students were more effective in the components of vocal delivery and body presence to effectively deliver their speeches. The criteria on which students performed the least successfully was Organization and Supporting material (as they were the same average).

What criteria were achieved?

Summary of Student Performance on the PEGS:

On average, students achieved the following averages on the Oral Rubric:

- For Organization, 73%;
- For Language, 75%;
- For Delivery, 77%;
- For Supporting Material, 73%;
- For Central Message, 76%.

In comparison with Fall 2021, these averages are all higher. The most significant difference is in the criterion of Language, which was the second to lowest scoring category in Fall 21: 54% average as compared to Spring 22 75% average.

Section E: Future Actions/Program Improvement Plan

What steps/actions need to be implemented for the program improvement?

Although we are making strides in the effective collection of data, program faculty continue to have difficulty remembering how to fill out the rubrics properly at the end of the semester. The most important immediate step is to continue to collect data properly for core courses to be analyzed and used for future program improvement.

Are those actions program-related or curriculum related? Program-related

What areas in the student learning need to be improved?

Although all averages were higher in Spring 22 than Fall 21, faculty teaching the program should continue to include additional assignments and review in their courses to help students improve achievement on these two criteria.

What changes need be made to refine the assessment process?

As was true for Fall 21, the most important step is to continue to collect data properly for core courses to be analyzed and used for future program improvement.

Date of implementation.

Fall 2022

Written Communication Primary Educational Goal: Fall 2021

Section A: Introduction/Background

Program: English-Written Communication

Semester/Academic Year: Fall 2021 Course Numbers: 2021FA Process of Composition (2021FA-ENGL-110 01 to 04)

Number of sections assessed: 3

Program Goal: The central goal for the Written Communication core courses remains the same: preparing students for writing/researching for all majors.

Section B: Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

ENGL 110 Process of Composition: As a liberal arts core course, ENGL 110 includes one Student Learning Outcome [SLO] that is aligned with Program Outcomes and Primary Educational Goals for the University:

All ENGL 110 sections used the Written Communication Rubric to assess the following SLO:

- Construct sophisticated written argument that demonstrates the use of effective diction, sentence variety, logical organization, coherent transitions, and standard grammar, punctuation, and MLA format in several writing assignments (*Applying on Bloom's Taxonomy Scale*)

Section C: Assessment Method

How did you measure each of the learning outcomes associated with your course?

The learning outcomes were measured by use of rubrics for each of the SLOs as follows (rubric criteria are included in Section D Results/Findings):

Written Communication Value Rubric: Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts,

data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.




List the measures (e.g., course material, assignments, tests, etc.) you used to assess the student learnings.




ENGL 110 used a research paper to assess the following SLOs: Synthesize the ideas and arguments of other writers in order to support or refute key points in the writing of a researched essay (*Bloom's Taxonomy: Evaluating*) and Summarize and paraphrase ideas and arguments that other writers have constructed (*Bloom's Taxonomy: Understanding*)

All three course used the Written Communication Rubric to assess the following SLO:

- Construct sophisticated written argument that demonstrates the use of effective diction, sentence variety, logical organization, coherent transitions, and standard grammar, punctuation, and MLA format in several writing assignments (*Applying on Bloom's Taxonomy Scale*)

Here are the combined Written Communication Rubric results for all three classes:

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
1	Context of and Purpose for Writing	0.88	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 4 (50%) Capstone - 4 ■ 4 (50%) Milestone - 3 ■ 0 (0%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
2	Content Development	0.91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 5 (62.5%) Capstone - 4 ■ 3 (37.5%) Milestone - 3 ■ 0 (0%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
3	Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	0.84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 4 (50%) Capstone - 4 ■ 3 (37.5%) Milestone - 3 ■ 1 (12.5%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 	

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
4	Sources and Evidence	0.97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 7 (87.5%) Capstone - 4 ■ 1 (12.5%) Milestone - 3 ■ 0 (0%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
5	Control of Syntax and Mechanics	0.91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 5 (62.5%) Capstone - 4 ■ 3 (37.5%) Milestone - 3 ■ 0 (0%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	
5	Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	0.88	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1 (50%) Capstone - 4 ■ 1 (50%) Milestone - 3 ■ 0 (0%) Milestone - 2 ■ 0 (0%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 0 (0%) Substandard - 0 	

Data Interpretation:

Any comparisons with the previous term's results? Are students improving?

In the past year's assessment, the 14% substandard were noted, while this year's statistics show a zero level of substandard, which highlights student improvements.

What is the greatest strength of the program?

Because we only have one semester's worth of data to analyze, the results are extremely limited at this point; therefore, extrapolating strengths or weaknesses of the program from the data is unfortunately also of limited value.. However, students are hitting projected benchmarks by the end of the semester.

What criteria were achieved?

On average, students achieved the following on the Written Communication Rubric: For Context of and Purpose for Writing, 50% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4” (or “Excellent”) level; for Content Development, 62.5% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4” level; for Genre and Disciplinary Conventions, 50% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4” level; for Sources and Evidence, 87.5% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4” level; for Control of Syntax and Mechanics, 62.5% of students achieved the “Capstone - 4 level. For all five rubric categories, there were no students at or below the “Benchmark-1” (or “Poor”) level, while there was only one student at the “Milestone -2” (or “Sufficient”) level. All other students performed at either the “Milestone -3” (or “Good”) level or the “Capstone – 4” level.

Section E: Future Actions/Program Improvement Plan
--

What steps/actions need to be implemented for the program improvement? Are those actions program-related or curriculum related?

Because the skill level of incoming students may vary from cohort to cohort, the biggest challenge is to maintain the benchmark results reported in this report

What areas in the student learning need to be improved?

As noted above, the limited data makes it difficult to identify areas for improvement accurately. However, the results identify that the results show an achievement of Milestone 3, ranging from 12% to 50%, and an achievement of Capstone-4, ranging from 50% to 87%. Because writing is enhanced over time and practice, the results provide a solid foundation for further practice. In this respect, the results in this writing core course can be deemed to be good to superior, which highlights that these students have reached expected benchmark results.

What changes are needed to refine the assessment process?

1. Schedule a group grading activity for program faculty in order to norm data collection on assessment rubrics.
2. Ensure that program faculty collect data accurately and effectively

Date of implementation.

1. May 2021: Schedule group grading activity
2. May 2021: Provide an overview of data collection process to program faculty.

Written Communication Primary Educational Goal: Spring 2022

Section A: Introduction/Background

Program: English-Written Communication

Semester/Academic Year: Spring 2022 Course Numbers: 2022SP Process of Composition (2022SP-ENGL-110 01 to 04 and ENGL-110 80) and Course Numbers: 2022SP Explorations in

Literature (2022SP-ENGL-250W-01); 2022SP Shakespeare (2022SP-ENGL-275W-01); 2022SP Literary Nonfiction Workshop (2022SP-ENGL-282W-80 to 81

Number of sections assessed: 8

Program Goal: The Core Curriculum's (ENG 110 01-04) Primary Educational Goals: 1. The student can communicate effectively through the development and expression of ideas in writing using a variety of genres and styles.

Then, ENGL 250W, ENGL 275W and ENGL 282W: As intensive writing courses, ENGL 250W, 275W and 282W include one Student Learning Outcome [SLO] that is aligned with Program Outcomes and Primary Educational Goals for the University 1. Construct sophisticated written argument that demonstrates the use of effective diction, sentence variety, logical organization, coherent transitions, and standard grammar, punctuation, and MLA format in several writing assignments

Section B: Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

ENGL 110 Process of Composition: As a liberal arts core course, ENGL 110 includes one Student Learning Outcome [SLO] that is aligned with Program Outcomes and Primary Educational Goals for the University:

All ENGL 110 sections used the Written Communication Rubric to assess the following SLO:

- Construct sophisticated written argument that demonstrates the use of effective diction, sentence variety, logical organization, coherent transitions, and standard grammar, punctuation, and MLA format in several writing assignments (*Applying on Bloom's Taxonomy Scale*)

As intensive writing courses, ENGL 250W, 275W and 282W include one Student Learning Outcome [SLO] that is aligned with Program Outcomes and Primary Educational Goals for the University:

ENGL 250W, 275W and 282W used the Written Communication Rubric to assess the following SLO:

- Construct sophisticated written argument that demonstrates the use of effective diction, sentence variety, logical organization, coherent transitions, and standard grammar, punctuation, and MLA format in several writing assignments (*Applying on Bloom's Taxonomy Scale*)

Section C: Assessment Method

How did you measure each of the learning outcomes associated with your course?

The learning outcomes were measured by use of rubrics for each of the SLOs as follows (rubric criteria are included in Section D Results/Findings):

ENGL 110 and ENGL 250W, 275W and 282W Written Communication:

Written Communication Value Rubric: Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

List the measures (e.g., course material, assignments, tests, etc.) you used to assess the student learnings.

ENGL 110 used a research paper to assess the following SLOs:

- Synthesize the ideas and arguments of other writers in order to support or refute key points in the writing of a researched essay and summarize and paraphrase ideas and arguments that other writers have constructed.

All seven courses ENG 110 01-04, ENGL 250W, ENGL 275W and ENGL 282W used the Written Communication Rubric to assess the following SLO:

- Construct sophisticated written argument that demonstrates the use of effective diction, sentence variety, logical organization, coherent transitions, and standard grammar, punctuation, and MLA format in several writing assignments (*Applying on Bloom's Taxonomy Scale*)

Results:

PEG - Written Communication Value Rubric

2022-05-03 - 2022-05-11

Courses Included							
Learning Activity	Course	Instructors	Enrollment	Evaluations	Percent	# Passes	% Pass
PEG - Written Communication Value Rubric	2022SP Process of Composition (2022SP-ENGL-110-01)	Slick, Joseph	16	16	100	12	75

Courses Included							
Learning Activity	Course	Instructors	Enrollment	Evaluations	Percent	# Passes	% Pass
PEG Written Communication	2022SP Process of Composition (2022SP-ENGL-110-02)	Slick, Joseph; Maxwell, William	19	18	94.74	15	83.33
PEG Written Communication	2022SP Process of Composition (2022SP-ENGL-110-03)	Slick, Joseph; Maxwell, William	20	20	100	16	80
PEG Written Communication	2022SP Process of Composition (2022SP-ENGL-110-80)	Slick, Joseph; Glowzinski, Lee Ann; Glowzinski, Lee Ann	19	17	89.47	9	52.94

Summary Statistics					
Scored Evaluations	71	# Pass	52	Mean Score	3.36
Rows	5	% Pass	73.24	Median Score	3.75
Possible Item Scores	355	Highest Score	5	Std Dev	1.22
Actual Item Scores	355	Lowest Score	0	KR(20) / Cronbach Alpha	0.96

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
1	Context of and Purpose for Writing	0.71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 22 (31%) Capstone - 4 ■ 26 (36.6%) Milestone - 3 ■ 16 (22.5%) Milestone - 2 ■ 3 (4.2%) Benchmark - 1 ■ 4 (5.6%) Substandard - 0 	

Details				
No	Row	Average	Levels Of Achievement	Distribution
2	Content Development	0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 (25.4%) Capstone 31 (43.7%) Milestone 15 (21.1%) Milestone 3 (4.2%) Benchmark 4 (5.6%) Substandard 	
3	Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	0.67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14 (19.7%) Capstone 31 (43.7%) Milestone 18 (25.4%) Milestone 4 (5.6%) Benchmark 4 (5.6%) Substandard 	
4	Sources and Evidence	0.68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 (21.1%) Capstone 33 (46.5%) Milestone 15 (21.1%) Milestone 4 (5.6%) Benchmark 4 (5.6%) Substandard 	
5	Control of Syntax and Mechanics	0.61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 (12.7%) Capstone 31 (43.7%) Milestone 19 (26.8%) Milestone 7 (9.9%) Benchmark 5 (7%) Substandard 	

Data Interpretation:

Any comparisons with the previous term's results? Are students improving?

Students are not improving, as per the averages of Spring 22. Spring 2022 is the second semester that we have collected data for the English program using the new curriculum map and the above rubrics, as well as using Blackboard to capture the data. Also, additional courses (i.e. ENGL-W) were included in this analysis, so additional semesters of data collection are needed for adequate comparison.

What is the greatest strength?

Although all areas were at designated performance goals, data indicate that the greatest strength was of student writers in composing essays in understanding the rhetorical purpose in meeting the needs of the audience.

What criteria were achieved?

Summary of Student Performance on the PEGS:

On average, students achieved the following averages on the Written Communication Rubric:

- Context of and Purpose for Writing, 71%
- Content Development, 70%
- Genre and Disciplinary Conventions, 67%
- Sources and Evidence, 68%
- Control of Syntax and Mechanics, 61%

In comparison with Fall 2021, these averages are all lower. The most significant difference is in the criterion of Control of Syntax and Mechanics, with a Fall 2021 average of 91% compared to a Spring 2022 of 61%.

Section E: Future Actions/Program Improvement Plan

What steps/actions need to be implemented for the program improvement? Are those actions program-related or curriculum related?

Although we are making strides in the effective collection of data, program faculty continue to have difficulty remembering how to fill out the rubrics properly at the end of the semester. The most important immediate step is to continue to collect data properly for core courses to be analyzed and used for future program improvement.

Are those actions program-related or curriculum related?

Program-related

What areas in the student learning need to be improved?

Spring 2022 showed all categories scoring lower than Fall 21. To address these results, faculty teaching the program should continue to include additional assignments and review in their courses in order to help students improve achievement on these criteria.

What changes are needed to refine the assessment process?

As was true for Fall 21, the most important step is to continue to collect data properly for core courses to be analyzed and used for future program improvement.

Date of implementation.

Fall 2022