Assessment of SLO #1

"At the end of the FW course, students can compose a text to achieve a specific purpose and respond adeptly to an identifiable audience."

**Research Questions**

1. How well can students compose a text that achieves a specific purpose and responds adeptly to an identifiable audience?

2. What are students’ metacognitive skill levels, as exhibited in their reflective essays, in regards to the concepts of purpose and audience?

**Methods to Gather Evidence**

Students in FW sections selected a piece of writing that they believed best demonstrated their achievement of the outcome.

**Methods to Evaluate**

Graduate assistants and faculty members scored the essays using a rubric created by members of the assessment team.

**Program Size & Sampling Technique**

• Random selection
• Final sample=208 students

**Results**

74% of students fell into the “prepared” and “well prepared” categories.

48% of the students appeared to possess metacognitive awareness of audience and purpose.

**Conclusions**

It was felt the FW program needed to provide more explicit instruction to students on audience and purpose. The audience for the majority of the student-selected pieces of writing appeared to be the course instructor. Students struggled in their reflective essays to connect issues of audience and purpose to their own writing.

**Action Plan**

Create and distribute a handout with teaching strategies and writing assignments to help students meet the outcome. Modify the SLO to better reflect writing to several varied audiences and for different purposes. When the revised SLO is assessed, students would be evaluated, in part, on how well they can write to different audiences and for different purposes.

Assessment Method

- Instructors teaching FW sections submitted copies of their students’ research essays.
- Faculty team trained and then applied a rubric to a randomly selected sample of 86 essays.
- Each student text was scored by two people. When the two scores disagreed by 2 points, a third judge was used; outlier scores were discarded; three sequential scores were averaged and doubled for a total score.

Rubric for Scoring Student Learning Outcome #3: Information Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Criteria</th>
<th>1 = Not Meeting</th>
<th>2 = Approaching</th>
<th>3 = Adequate</th>
<th>4 = Exceeding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Makes Use of Source Material</td>
<td>No source material supports claims that need backing.</td>
<td>Some source material supports claims that need backing.</td>
<td>Source material is adequate in terms of relevance.</td>
<td>Source material is obviously relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Relevancy of Sources</td>
<td>Source material, if incorporated, is not relevant.</td>
<td>Source material is somewhat relevant.</td>
<td>Source material is adequate in terms of reliability.</td>
<td>Source material is obviously relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Credibility of Sources</td>
<td>Source material, if incorporated, is not credible.</td>
<td>Source material is somewhat credible.</td>
<td>Source material is adequate in terms of credibility.</td>
<td>Source material is obviously appropriate and credible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Style Integration</td>
<td>A style guide’s rules for referencing outside sources are not followed.</td>
<td>A style guide’s rules for referencing outside sources are inconsistently followed.</td>
<td>A style guide’s rules for referencing outside sources are generally followed.</td>
<td>A style guide’s rules for referencing outside sources are almost always followed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Students</th>
<th>Level of preparation for future writing tasks involving outside sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Well prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Partially prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Not prepared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discoveries**

Overall, the faculty team who scored the texts were disappointed in the quality of the student work in regards to information literacy. With only 6% of the students scoring in the “well prepared” category, there is room for improvement, especially considering that 26% were only partially prepared and 21% were evaluated as “not prepared.”

**Action Plan**

Discuss results with faculty and devise ways to increase student competence in this area.