



# English Program Review

2016

Presented by the English Faculty

4/1/2016

Department of English, Languages, and Communication  
Mohave Community College

Program Review  
Spring 2016

Statement of Collaboration:

The program faculty, college staff, students, and community members listed below collaborated in an open and forthright dialogue to prepare this Periodic Program Review. Statements included herein accurately reflect the conclusions and opinions of this group.

Participants in the review:

Department Faculty: Kata Alvidrez, John Hansen (Co-Chair), John Kitts (Chair), James Lyddane, Tim Montbriand, Dan Pund, J. Peter Roth

Non-discipline Faculty: Cesar Fuentes

Associate Faculty: Loretta Messer

Student/Alumni: Andrew Corrieri

Academic Support Staff: Dean Fred Gilbert

Date Submitted to the Dean of Instruction: April 1, 2016

Authorization

Signature of Dean

---

## Table of Contents

Mission and Goals.....	3
Program Data and Trend Analysis.....	4
SWOT Analysis.....	11
Assessment of Student Learning.....	14
Evaluation of Progress Toward Previous Goals.....	20
Short Term Program Goals .....	22
Long Term Program Goals .....	23
Appendix A: Total MCC Student Enrollment by Ethnicity.....	23
Appendix B: COM/ENG/TRE Demographics.....	22
Appendix C: COM/ENG Revenue.....	24
Appendix D: ENG 101 & ENG 102 Grades by Modality.....	25
Appendix E: ENG 101 Outcome for TRE 089 Students.....	31
Appendix F: Notification of Assessment, 2012-13 & 2014-15.....	32
Appendix G: Common Assessment 2012-13 & 2014-15.....	34
Appendix H: Grading Rubric 2012-13 & 2014-15.....	35
Appendix I: Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2012-13.....	36
Appendix J: Assignment Sheet ENG 101 Class.....	38
Appendix K: Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2014-15.....	39
Appendix L: Fall 2015 English Department Assessment.....	42
Appendix M: Thesis Quiz.....	43
Appendix N: Notification to all ENG 101 Instructors.....	45
Appendix O: Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2015.....	46

## 1. Mission and Goals

Mohave Community College Mission Statement:

*The mission of Mohave Community College is to be a learning-centered college, serving all constituencies, inspiring excellence through innovative learning methodologies and empowering students to succeed.*

English Department Mission Statement:

*The English Department of Mohave Community College believes that educated citizens should use language effectively and appreciate the diversity and complexity of their culture. The department endeavors to prepare students to achieve a wide range of challenging academic, personal, and professional goals by teaching them to read attentively and critically and communicate complex ideas persuasively and creatively. As English students deepen their understanding of diverse literary works and enhance their writing skills, they develop social and cultural awareness, academic curiosity, and a heightened love of language that cultivates productive, fulfilling lives.*

Degrees and Responsibilities

The English Department offers an AA in English including courses in composition, literature studies, and creative and professional writing.

Beyond the eleven courses offered in English studies (including TRE089, our developmental course), the department currently oversees three courses in communication, two in Spanish, and four in American Sign Language.

English Department Program Goals:

1. To generate critical thinking skills through the study of literature and writing.
2. To investigate the major writers, periods, and genres of American, British, and World Literatures.
3. To analyze how language and literature shape culture and identity.
4. To classify the aesthetic elements of literary works, and to construct written arguments that interpret, analyze, and compare literary works utilizing these aesthetic elements.
5. To produce works of critical and creative writing expressed coherently in clear, artful prose.

6. To create researched arguments using appropriate reference tools, methods, and documentation.

## 2. Program Data and Trend Analysis

Since our last departmental program review in 2011, our enrollment numbers have declined along with the overall college enrollment figures. This decline is due in part to our county's recovery from recession and curtailment in population growth as well as our college's tighter management of federal financial aid. Our total class hours for the college fell 4.75% from 2012 to 2013 and 13% from 2012 to 2014, and the number of ENG/COM class hours mirrored this decline, falling 4% from 2012 to 2013 and 16% from 2012 to 2014. This decrease was generally proportional in all age groups, though steeper in our 40-49-year-old-students (down 39%) and 50-59-year-old-students (down 58%) in this three-year period. However, our department is seeing an increase in our youngest students, age 11 to 17, who participate in dual enrollment classes. From 2012 to 2014 we've experienced an 11% increase in English dual enrollment students. Ethnicity figures have also fallen proportionally except for Hispanic students taking communication classes. While the 16% decline in Hispanic students enrolling in English classes is identical to the overall MCC decline in our Hispanic student population (down 16%), for communication classes this decline is 44% (from thirty-two Hispanic students in 2012 to only fourteen in 2014). The department is currently working with IR to explain this statistical anomaly in order to plan corrective measures. (See Appendix A, "Total MCC Enrollment by Reported Ethnicity" and Appendix B, "COM/ENG/TRE Demographics.")

While revenue likewise fell during these years, the departmental net, due in part to low operating costs, was a positive \$10,154 (as an academic field, English is a cheap date: 100% of English expenditures are presently personnel costs). Currently our department has seven resident faculty, the same amount as reported in the 2011 Program Review. But while the number remains the same, in response to goals, recommendations, and needs articulated in the 2011 document and various assessments and Cycle of Learning reports in the intervening years, the seven resident faculty members are currently teaching more of the core English courses in the major and more of the TRE 089 developmental courses to positive effect. (See Appendix C: "COM/ENG Revenue.")

In order to teach the core sophomore literature courses (and the other courses that make up the English AA degree), the resident faculty have been offering these exclusively online for the last few years given it has become difficult for these 200-level courses to achieve the nine-student minimum enrollment

normally required for a class to “make” on-ground on the individual southern campuses. The demand for online offerings in English appears to be stabilizing. ENG 101 students may prefer the on-ground modality. In 2012, 65.1% enrolled in a physical class on one of the four MCC campuses compared to 34.9% who signed up for an on-line section (not including dual enrollment classes). Two years later showed little difference with 63.75% enrolling on-ground and 36.25% opting for online in 2014. This trend might be explained, though, by more onground courses appearing in the catalogue than on-line courses. However, for the more advanced ENG 102 classes, the split between on-ground and online demand is virtually equal and again with no significant change in the three-year time frame. In 2012 students enrolled on-ground 52% to 48%, and by 2014 the gap had narrowed to 51% and 49%, only a 1% increase in the three-year period. So at least in these two major academic core offerings required of all transfer majors, more students are still taking ENG 101 and ENG 102 on-ground than online. (See Appendix D: “ENG 101 & ENG 102 Grades by Modality”).

The department credits recent success in improved passing rates and assessment scores to developing a more uniform TRE 089 curriculum with OER resources and the push to have more resident faculty teaching sections of TRE 089 and ENG 101. The failure rate for TRE 089 moved from 36.31% in 2012 to 25.63% in 2014. In 2012, 122 students failed compared to 51 in 2014. Though some of this decline can be explained by enrollment for TRE 089 being sharply down as well, the increasing percentage of students passing 089 in a single attempt is also encouraging: 155 of 175, or 88.57%. The department is also pleased that the failure rate for those taking ENG 101 after passing TRE 089 moved from an unacceptable 59.52% for those who took 089 in 2012 to a less egregious 26.83% for those who took 089 in 2014, a positive increase of 32.69%. The success rates (here defined as scoring an A, B, or C) also generally prove higher when a course is taught by resident faculty. In 2014, for instance, for ENG 101 students who had taken TRE 089, the associate faculty success rate was 37.5% compared to a resident faculty success rate of 79%. In aggregate, for the three-year period 2012-2014, the associate faculty success rate was 39% (61% failure/dropout) compared to the resident faculty success rate of 62%, or, conversely, the associate faculty failure/dropout rate was 61% compared to the resident faculty failure/dropout rate of 38% (these statistics are *only* for those ENG 101 students who first took TRE 089; other data reveal that completion rates between resident and associate faculty are statistically less significant) Another possible variable is that the college seems to cycle as to when the more successful students take classes. Currently we’re having greater success in day classes than evening classes, and since most of our associate faculty members teach at night, this may explain the disparity in the numbers. (See Appendix E: “ENG 101 Outcomes by TRE 089 Students.”)

The English department's one revenue request arises from the necessity of having two qualified resident English faculty on each of the three Southern campuses. In order to continue the successful progress of the last few years including having resident faculty teach a majority of the TRE 089, ENG 101, and courses required for the English AA major, the department needs to continue to be staffed by a minimum of seven resident faculty (since one of the Kingman resident faculty members by necessity teaches a majority of his load in communications and humanities and attends the Communication ATF). Since one of our current resident faculty members is retiring this spring, the department requests that the position be advertised and filled as soon as is possible once the temporary hiring freeze occasioned by state-mandated Expenditure Limitations issues has been lifted.

According to the last available census, the number of students who have declared the department's English AA degree as their prospective major stands at forty: seventeen on NCK, sixteen on BHC, six on LHC, and one on NMC. Between them these fine students were enrolled in an average of 2.5 classes.

As mentioned, the English department is growing in dual enrollment numbers. While in 2012 students enrolled in dual enrollment ENG 101 classes made up 24% of all MCC 101 students, by 2014, dual enrollment students comprised 32% of our college's total enrollment for all modalities of ENG 101. The statistics for ENG 102 are similar: 24% of that course's total student count in 2012 rose to 29% of 102 enrollments in 2014. More and more this vital, state-mandated program is becoming a significant part of fulfilling our college's mission to the citizens of our county. Therefore, the department appreciates its responsibility to ensure that these dual enrollment classes are comparable in content and outcome and meet the course competencies of our course packages. The completion data, however, suggest that the English dual enrollment courses warrant closer oversight. Completion rates in dual enrollment ENG 101 and ENG 102 classes are abnormally high, well outside the normal parameters for the other modalities of these courses. To a large degree, higher completion rates are to be expected since those who enroll are probably the better high school students, since dual enrollment students have almost twice as much class time as the college's more limited 45-48 hour on-ground modality, since by taking the classes largely at our county's high schools these students are under more stringent attendance policies, and since dual enrollment instructors may feel pressure to inflate grades for their students applying for scholarships and transferring to state universities. However, these figures are so abnormally high (in the fall semester of 2014, of the thirty-five students taking dual enrollment ENG 102 78% received grades of "A" and 12% "B" with no C, D, F, or W grades given) closer scrutiny and investigations are warranted.

**Success                  Success                  Non-**

			(A-C)	With Concerns (D)	Completion (F, W, WR)
MCC ENG	101s	2012	74%	7%	19%
Dual	Enr	101s	2012	94%	4%
2%					
MCC	ENG	101s	72%	7%	21%
	2013				
Dual	Enr	101s	91%	4%	5%
	2013				
MCC	ENG	101s	68%	5%	27%
	2014				
Dual	Enr	101s	93%	3%	4%
	2014				
MCC	ENG	102s	78%	4%	28%
	2012				
Dual	Enr	102s	98%	1%	1%
	2012				
MCC	ENG	102s	77%	3%	20%
	2013				
Dual	Enr	102s	96%	2%	2%
	2013				
MCC	ENG	102s	76%	3%	21%
	2014				
Dual	Enr	102s	96%	2%	2%
	2014				

According to the Arizona dual enrollment statute (15-1821-01), “College approved textbooks, syllabuses, course outlines and grading standards that are applicable to the courses if taught at the community college shall apply to these courses and to all students in the courses offered pursuant to this section.” The department has learned during the investigatory process that dual enrollment classes across Mohave County may not be following our “syllabuses, course outlines and grading standards” but packaging courses to serve their individual high school needs. Anecdotal evidence presented suggests that in one part of the county these courses are only available to honor students who are then dropped if they’re failing, which would provide some explanation for the contrast



in completion rates but may also violate our agreements as well as the spirit of the statute that makes this program available to all Arizona junior and senior high school students. Elsewhere in the county, dual enrollment instructors are said to “make up their own curriculum that follows the high school’s curriculum and not MCC’s curriculum.” Also noted is the absence of many dual enrollment faculty from the twice-year mandated faculty orientation sessions held before classes begin in the fall and spring. This potential noncompliance may be systemic across the college’s entire dual enrollment program, suggesting that the college may have neglected its compliance responsibilities in recent semesters. While the English department will monitor the situation closely to ensure that courses taught through the dual enrollment program agreement conform in all ways to the requirements of their respective MCC course packages, given the potential level of non-compliance to our dual enrollment agreements, the department asks for assistance at the administrative level to insure these agreements are being honored and followed by high school administrations as well as with all dual enrollment classroom instructors in all academic departments.

To further explore the college-wide institutional assessment question from 2014, “With what degree of consistency do different sections of a course achieve similar outcomes?” on analyzing completion statistics, the department has found no statistical difference in student completion rates between courses offered onground and online (this is also evidenced in comparing data between modalities in the different assessment projects discussed in section 4, “Assessment of Student Learning,” page 12).

	<b>% Success (A-C)</b>	<b>% Success With Concerns (D)</b>	<b>% Non- Completion (F, W, WR)</b>
Fall 2012			
On-Ground 101	76%	6%	18%
Online 101	64%	4%	32%
Spring 2012			
On-Ground 101	66%	8%	26%
Online 101	66%	7%	27%
Summer 2012			
On-Ground 101	76%	8%	16%
Online 101	59%	10%	31%
Fall 2013			
On-Ground 101	68%	9%	23%
Online 101	61%	12%	27%
Spring 2013			
On-Ground 101	62%	6%	32%
Online 101	74%	1%	25%
Summer 2013			
On-Ground 101	74%	10%	16%
Online 101	85%	0%	15%
Fall 2014			
On-Ground 101	66%	6%	29%
Online 101	71%	6%	23%
Spring 2014			
On-Ground 101	67%	5%	28%
Online 101	66%	4%	30%
Summer 2014			
On-Ground 101	83%	3%	14%
Online 101	73%	5%	22%
Fall 2012			

On-Ground 102	81%	2%	17%
Online 102	71%	7%	22%
Spring 2012			
On-Ground 102	76%	5%	19%
Online 102	78%	3%	19%
Summer 2012			
On-Ground 102	92%	0%	8%
Online 102	74%	2%	24%
Fall 2013			
On-Ground 102	72%	1%	17%
Online 102	61%	12%	27%
Spring 2013			
On-Ground 102	62%	6%	32%
Online 102	75%	1%	24%
Summer 2013			
On-Ground 102	74%	10%	16%
Online 102	85%	0%	15%
Fall 2014			
On-Ground 102	65%	5%	29%
Online 102	71%	6%	23%
Spring 2014			
On-Ground 102	68%	5%	27%
Online 102	66%	4%	30%

Summer 2014			
On-Ground 102	83%	3%	14%
Online 102	73%	5%	22%

The consistently higher completion rates for the shorter summer eight-week classes versus the full fall/spring classes may be due to the single focus on one or two classes that the summer semester affords. Perhaps the shorter, more condensed learning experience that allows students to center their attention on one or two courses is the cause of the higher success rate (along with the reality that a shorter timeframe lessens the chance for life-issues to trigger withdrawals). The department is therefore open to bringing back eight week condensed courses if students' class schedules can be limited in the number of semester hours taken.

### 3. Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT Analysis)

The following provides an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats/challenges for the Department of English:

#### **Strengths (S)**

1. The English Department exhibits enthusiasm, teamwork, and collaboration. Despite faculty members residing on different campuses and carrying varied course loads and duties, they are committed to enhancing the program, meeting departmental needs, and improving student success at all levels.
2. English faculty can adapt to the changes in students' interests, skills, and patterns of different abilities, learning styles, and diverse backgrounds.
3. New resident and associate faculty members are paired with a veteran faculty member to assist with departmental expectations, policies, pedagogical practices, and course development within the college's new faculty mentoring program.
4. The department is blessed with a number of skilled associate faculty with stable longevity and documented histories of quality teaching and empathy towards students.

5. Department faculty members have access to different mediums of technology through the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELТ), open educational resources, and other faculty resources via Schoology, the college's learning management system, which facilitate and support their instructional efforts.
6. The department's course-package objectives emphasize the students' development of higher order critical, analytical, and creative thinking skills.
7. A range of courses within the department are designed to meet the needs of MCC students interested in literary study and creative writing; these courses cater especially to those students who plan to transfer to a four-year college or university.
8. In response to declining on-ground enrollment in literature and creative writing courses across all campuses, and in light of the college's robust online numbers, the department decided to offer those courses strictly in an online format effective fall of 2014. To date, that decision has resulted in solid and consistent enrollment for all literature and creative writing courses, which in turn has reduced the number of canceled courses in these areas to zero. In addition, the enrollment in the 200-level literature courses suggests the potential for an increase in the number of English majors, a possible expansion that could create a variety of opportunities for the department including a more diversified offering of literature courses.

### **Weaknesses (W)**

1. A large number of associate and online faculty members are not adequately connected to the resident faculty. Since on-ground enrollment has decreased and online enrollment has increased, many associate faculty members are not regularly on campus. In the past resident faculty would often meet and work with associate faculty one-on-one; however, such connections are now more difficult to instigate. As a result, some associate and online faculty members overlook or misconstrue important information regarding key departmental items such as curriculum and assessment, among others.
2. The quality of associate faculty cannot be accurately assessed because resident faculty are not involved enough in the hiring process and do not have access to associate faculty members' credentials, application materials, transcripts, and teaching history. It is imperative that the department and the college ensure the quality and committed efforts of these instructors.
3. Recently the department has discovered probable grade inflation in the dual enrollment program. In response, the department is currently working to

ensure that dual enrollment courses are comparable to other learning modalities in rigor, quality, goals, objectives, and competencies.

### **Opportunities (O)**

1. The English Department provides students with learning opportunities to write and speak more clearly and persuasively, to express themselves more creatively, to develop a greater understanding of humanity through the study of literary works, to become more aware of diverse cultures, and, ultimately, to become more informed, well-rounded and open-minded members of society.
2. Many opportunities exist for resident and associate faculty members to collaborate in teaching projects and to share special instructional techniques useful for illuminating particular assignments from texts or course packages. Such information and materials are shared via the resources area in Schoology.
3. Recent assessment projects have led to the department exploring ways of standardizing developmental teaching to make the experiences students have with different resident and associate faculty members closer in quality in order to achieve more success from students taking TRE 089 before enrolling into ENG 101.
4. The recent push for open educational resource courses within the discipline allows the department to lower the cost of materials for students, support professional development and collaboration among faculty, and advance both the department and the college's mission of excellence.

### **Threats/Challenges (T)**

1. The department now faces a population of students who cannot, or will not, read lengthy and complex texts either for information or leisure. Too often recent technologies have promoted instant communication, ephemeral writing, and rapid information retrieval to the detriment of students' reading, writing, and critical thinking skills.
2. Many students today have a consumerist attitude toward education and expect all learning to take place within class time. Some students demand that the instructor accommodate their job schedules and family lives, while other students simply lack an understanding of their own roles in the learning process and academia and do not seek tutoring, supplemental instruction, or other learning resources beyond the classroom.

3. Due to state-mandated Expenditure Limitations, the college is facing potential budget cuts. As a result, currently the department is not replacing departing resident faculty, which lessens effectiveness. When resident faculty members retire or leave the college, associate faculty fill the void and teach the courses that have been vacated. However, the department's findings from recent Cycle of Learning assessment reports indicate that resident faculty members who teach TRE 089 have more successful students go on to ENG 101 and ENG 102. The department will incessantly lobby to replace its resident faculty members.

4. Recent demographic information shows that communication classes have decreased enrollments in Hispanic students. The lack of diversity negatively impacts students preparing for work in an ever-changing global society. Learning with people from a variety of backgrounds and cultures encourages collaboration and fosters innovation, which benefits all students.

## 4. Assessment of Student Learning

From 2012 to 2014, the English department focused our primary assessment efforts on English 101, the class with the highest enrollment and arguably the highest significance to the liberal arts core. The following ENG 101 goal was chosen for learning outcome evaluation: "Goal 10: Write an argumentative essay that demonstrates sound logical development." All ENG 101 students over all modalities were asked to write an argumentative essay mapped to this tenth learning outcome, which coincides with the following general education philosophy for communication skills:

### 2. Communication Skills

2.1 Presents substantially error-free prose in both argumentative and narrative forms to general and specialized audiences.

All ENG 101 instructors were given the following standardized, college-wide argumentative essay assignment to give their students along with a grading rubric used to evaluate their class's essay, which students were provided access to beforehand. (For the full assignment and grading rubric, see Appendix F: Notification of Assessment, 2013-14 & 2014-15"; Appendix G, "Common Assessment Instructions 2013-14 & 2014-15"; Appendix H, "Grading Rubric"; Appendix I: Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2013-14.") The crux of the assignment was as follows:

1. Provide a thesis statement that states clearly your position on an issue.

2. Address all of the supporting arguments for your position on the issue.
3. Refute the major arguments of the opposition.
4. Develop your arguments through elaboration and examples.
5. The final essay will be 1,250 words (5 double-spaced pages with 12-point font).

The focus of the assessment was to evaluate two of the five standardized rubric categories, how well students handled matters of “Organization & Coherence” and “Mechanics.” The goal would be considered “Met” if students scored a 3.00 or above in these two standardized rubric categories. The ENG 101 students “Met” the goal for Organization & Coherence (3.07) but the goal for Mechanics was “Not Met” (2.78). Disappointed with the results, the department voted to continue this assessment for another year and compiled recommendations and an action plan designed to improve teaching and ultimately improve these measurable learning outcomes. The following is the action plan devised from the 2012-2013 assessments:

1. The department chair will communicate the results of this 2013-2014 Cycle of Learning Assessment and the importance of active participation in the current 2014-2015 data collection and report. Instructions will be revised and shared early in the process and verified in multiple ways including conference calls, email, and shell audits. Assistance will be provided as needed or requested.
2. Data collection will be automated as much as possible. A standard online assessment will be provided or, if needed, automatically attached to the course management shells of all participating classes. This assessment will improve the data collection process and enable the department to set benchmarks and future goals. If a rubric is included, composition instructors will benefit from the ease and usefulness of this comprehensive tool, and students will benefit from having access to their instructor’s expectations, which should guide their writing process from inception through revision.
3. Faculty will be encouraged to strongly promote both the Student Success Center (to improve student mastery of organization and mechanics) and the availability of free online tools (including Smarthinking and MySkillsTutor).
4. Faculty will be asked to include additional support materials in their course management class shells to supplement areas of weakness revealed in ongoing departmental assessments (this Cycle of Learning report and others in the future). This present report has revealed a possible gap in mechanics skills; links to specific sites such as GrammarGirl.com or ChompChomp.com in each weekly folder can be used to improve student awareness of essential grammar skills. Faculty will be asked to share OER-style materials with other department faculty as the semester progresses.



5. The department will advocate more active involvement in the data-gathering stages by communicating results of ongoing assessments, surveys, and institutional data analysis to all our faculty (Resident Faculty, Associate Faculty, and Dual Enrollment Faculty). Results will reveal the level of success of this report's action plan and determine the next steps in improving student achievement in written communications.
6. The department will continue to score a quiz or assignment college-wide each semester. While this year's data was limited, by increasing participation to all 101 classes, over time we will collect an abundance of data providing benchmark information as to our students' performance on significant competencies. These heightened efforts will provide more accurate assessment of student learning and ability and will guide the English Department in modifying curriculum, delivery, and presentation for better student mastery.

After following these recommendations and working with ENG 101 instructors for greater compliance, the results in 2014 showed marked improvement. For this year, the goal would be considered "Met" if students scored a 3.00 or above, "Met with Concerns" if students scored a 2.00-2.99, and "Not Met" if students scored a 1.99 or below. The 2014 assessment showed notable improvement with both rubric categories attaining a score of "Met." (For the full assignments and grading rubric, see Appendix F: Notification of Assessment, 2013-14 & 2014-15"; Appendix G, "Common Assessment Instructions 2013-14 & 2014-15"; Appendix H, "Grading Rubric"; Appendix I, "Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2012-13 & 2013-14"; Appendix J: "Assignment Sheet for ENG101 Class.")

	2013	2014
Organization/Coherence	3.07	4.12
Mechanics	2.79	3.72

Organization & Coherence improved from 3.07 to 4.12, up 25%, while Mechanics improved from 2.79 to 3.72, up 33% over the 2013-14 scores. The department was pleased that the identical data collected and evaluated indicated notable improvement in both categories, suggesting that our recommendations and accompanying action plan from 2013 did lead to heightened improvement in our students' performance.

For the 2014 assessment, the department also analyzed the data in response to the college-wide institutional question for 2014: "With what degree of consistency do different sections of a course achieve similar outcomes?" The 2014 data was analyzed on whether results would be consistent between on-ground and online

sections of ENG 101. The data revealed a high level of consistency overall with no appreciable differences between these modalities of instruction.

	2013 Classes Classes	On-Ground 2014	Online
Organization/Coherence	4.33	3.99	
Mechanics	3.54	3.84	

The English department credited much of the success in raising the assessed results to following recommendations created and followed in response to the disappointing numbers from 2013:

- a) Working to achieve greater compliance in the number of ENG 101 sections participating in the mandatory project.
- b) Promoting our college's Student Success Centers by encouraging students to utilize the tutoring services.
- c) Changing the perception that requesting tutoring is a sign of inadequacy or weakness to viewing peer instruction as a vital to the educational process.
- d) Encouraging students to take advantage of on-line resources such as Smarthinking and MySkillsTutor as well as other pedagogical tools placed in the class's course shell.
- e) Advocating more active involvement of all faculty in department decisions and ongoing communications, including ongoing discussions of best practices in the field.

After this extended project subjectively assessing student's writing abilities in the areas of organization, coherence, and mechanics, for the 2015 assessment the English department agreed to develop an objective assessment method to evaluate our ENG 101 students' knowledge of a different but vital topic that lies at the heart of our ENG 101 course competencies: the thesis statement. A thesis statement quiz was devised to assess how well our students understand the basic foundational knowledge of what a thesis is, what the guiding principles are for constructing and evaluating strong thesis statements, and what common errors students should avoid in drafting their own theses. While the true application of this knowledge would occur when students use this foundational knowledge to compose their own strong thesis statements as the controlling ideas of their expository and argumentative essays, given the structural importance of the thesis statement to the essay, the department felt that students' success as essay writers was dependent on their attaining mastery of the foundational knowledge being assessed.

The department therefore created an objective ten-question quiz to test students on their understanding of correct thesis statement principles. (See Appendix L, “Fall 2015 English Department Assessment”; Appendix M, “Thesis Quiz”; and Appendix N, “Notification to All ENG 101 Instructors”; and Appendix O: Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2015.) Questions were crafted to assess ENG 101 students on the following learning outcomes:

1. Define a “thesis statement” as the main point or controlling idea of an essay.
2. Assert that all aspects of an essay should work together to support the thesis statement.
3. Identify where in the essay a thesis will most frequently be located.
4. Explain that a thesis must argue a writer’s opinion rather than merely assert a clear fact.
5. Conclude that a thesis is generally stated as a declarative assertion and only in rare cases as an interrogative question.
6. Summarize the need to avoid such first person expressions as “I believe,” “in my opinion” and “in this essay I’ll argue that . . . .”
7. Identify thesis statements containing an essay map.
8. Differentiate between strong and weak thesis statements.

All ENG 101 students were asked to take the quiz, which was mapped to the following general education philosophy:

2. Communication Skills
  - 2.6 Write effectively in a college setting.

The quiz also assessed the college’s institutional question for 2015, “Do students demonstrate college-level proficiency in the general education outcomes across their program of study?” as well as assessed the following ENG 101 Competency and Objectives:

- Competency 3 Generate thesis statements.  
Objective 3.1 Evaluate stated and implied thesis statements.  
Objective 3.2 Design thesis statements that demonstrate an understanding of the assigned topics and/or assigned rhetorical strategies.

In scoring the ten-question Thesis Statement Quiz, the department determined that the assessment would be considered “Met” if a student scored seven or higher correct (70-100%), would be considered “Met with Concerns” if the score was six correct (60%), and would be considered “Not Met” if the score was five or less correct (0 to 50%).

Thirteen ENG 101 classes reported results, nine on-ground sections and four online sections whose numbers participating totaled 239 student respondents (for full results, see Appendix X, page X). Of these, 87% “Met” the assessment goal, 6% “Met with Concerns,” and 7% were scored as “Not Met” (failed). Comparing scores of the two course delivery methods assessed found no notable differences between the overall success rates between on-ground and on-line modalities: 88% of on-ground students “Met” the goal while 6% “Met with Concerns” and 7% were scored as “Not Met.” The on-line classes notched a 85% “Met” rate with 8% “Met with Concerns” and 7% “Not Met.” However, the department found interesting variances among sections and modalities when comparing individual questions missed. On-ground students were less likely to identify which thesis statement presented included an “essay map” than online students, while online students were less likely to differentiate the strong thesis statement from weak thesis statements than their on-ground counterparts. Overall, students proved that they understand the thesis statement both by identifying its definition and by recognizing the correct principles of writing strong thesis statements.

In response to what was learned through the assessment, the department asked ENG 101 instructors to adopt the following recommendations and action plan:

1. Remind students on assigning expository and argumentative essays to focus on crafting a strong thesis statement that will be the controlling idea, the *raison d'être*, of the entire essay.
2. During peer editing sessions have students locate and evaluate each other's thesis statements as to how well they conform to the correct principles learned.
3. In written responses on grading student essays, evaluate each student's thesis statement in light of the principles taught, articulating notable strengths or weaknesses.
4. In revising the thesis statement quiz for use in later semesters (to collect comparable data in order to measure departmental improvement), the department will reword those questions that appear to have created reading comprehension errors.

Question #4, “Which one of the following is NOT a guideline for writing a good thesis?” might become “All of the following are guidelines for writing a good thesis EXCEPT?”

Question #5, “Which one of the following guidelines regarding common errors to be avoided in thesis statements should NOT be followed” might be revised as “All of the following are common errors to be avoided in composing thesis statements EXCEPT?”

## ACTION PLAN

1. Instructors are encouraged to provide additional practice in identifying correct thesis-formation principles in exercises where students identify strong thesis statements from weak statements that include common thesis errors to be avoided. As such exercises are developed or found, instructors are encouraged to share these and other thesis statement exercises in our departmental group site on Schoology.
2. Instructors are encouraged to continue to teach the value of the “essay map” while discussing and assigning expository and argumentative essays. A possible exercise could involve breaking students up into small groups and giving them topics to develop into strong thesis statements structured with clear “essay maps” that identify the essays’ main points or assertions.
3. As the thesis statement quiz is given relatively early in the semester and as students who fail the quiz have proven likely to fail the class, instructors should consider the quiz an early indicator of which students require intervention in order to be successful completers of ENG 101.
4. Likewise, students whose quiz results were “Met with Concerns” or “Not Met” should be directed to our college’s new Student Success Centers on their respective campuses and encouraged to utilize Smarthinking, a free service, for additional tutoring in developing thesis statements for their expository and argumentative papers.
5. The department will retest ENG 101 students in the 2017-18 college year using a revised version of the thesis statement quiz to measure the effectiveness of our efforts to better teach this significant composition skill.

For spring semester 2016, the department has changed focus from ENG 101 to ENG 102 by conducting a college-wide assessment on in-text citations that corresponds to the following General Education Student Learning Outcome and ENG 102 Student Learning Outcomes:

### 2. Communication Skills

#### 2.6 Write effectively in a college setting

Competency 8 Identify and apply Modern Language Association (MLA) guidelines to all written work for the course.

Objective 8.1 Identify and apply proper MLA style for matters of formatting.

Objective 8.2 Identify and apply proper MLA style for all in-text citations.

Results will be collected in the spring semester of 2016, and the analysis with recommendations and action plan completed in September. (For “Notification of Assessment” and “In-Text Citation Quiz, please see Appendix X and X, pages XX and XX).

## 5. Evaluation of Progress Toward Previous Goals

The last English Program Review (2011) presented five goals designed to improve near-term departmental performance. Of these five goals, two were very similar: “Establish a set of departmental academic standards” and “Establish departmental minimums for the number of papers required and the number of words required for ENG 101 and ENG 102” (the similarity being that this second goal enumerated a specific academic standard that could be included in the first). The first goal, probably too general in its wording, was controversial to many department members who respect and desire instructors to exercise academic freedom in how they teach course competencies though its inclusion seemed warranted in reaction to the growing tendency for English courses to be taught online by instructors the department had never met or vetted, thus, giving the department little assurance other than the submitted course syllabus that English course packages were being followed by unknown instructors from afar. In the intervening years, however, this worry has been lessened by MCC resident and local (on-ground) associate faculty teaching more classes online (for our online modality, the department currently feels more confident we’re in control of our own curriculum). Steps were taken, however, to establish set academic standards within English classes. First, the department agreed on a grading rubric for argumentative essays that was presented to students in ENG 101 and largely followed in letter or spirit to grade other English essays as well. Next, the department revised the vast majority of English course packages in 2012 to include a mandated word length for virtually all English classes including, where appropriate, requiring specific essays/writing projects.

A third goal recommended “the hiring of a resident faculty member in languages.” Since Todd Miller, the sole resident faculty in non-English language instruction (Spanish), was leaving to take another position elsewhere, the department was concerned that without resident faculty attention the college would lose ground in this academic area. This recommendation was heard but respectfully declined as other faculty hiring positions took greater priority in 2011. While American Sign Language has remained fairly constant, enrollment in Spanish has significantly decreased over the last few years with the third and fourth semester of Spanish language study having been suspended.

A fourth goal, the most detailed proposal the department considered in 2011, was to “explore the possibility of mandating inclusion of particular authors or works in

each of the four survey courses among ENG 233, ENG 234, ENG 235, and ENG 236.” Again, the department was feeling cautious given the uncertainty involved in losing control of core English courses to unknown online faculty. By mandating that certain works and authors be taught within each of the literature survey courses, the department felt it would technically regain more control over course content and continuity. But before a list of authors and works were agreed upon, this situation was resolved by the teaching of these sophomore lit courses being taken over largely by the department’s own resident faculty as online course offerings. Since courses were assigned to resident faculty of known expertise in the literary periods taught, the department no longer registered this issue as a need requiring action.

The college helped the department fulfill its fifth goal: “Explore the feasibility of establishing an on-ground or online writing center.” Due to the need to transition from a Title III federally subsidized tutoring program to a college controlled tutoring program, the college accepted the department’s recommendation and established Student Success Centers at each of the local campuses. While these centers do also include advising, counseling, and other student services functions, given their primary purpose is to tutor students in math and English, the centers function in part as “on-ground writing centers.” The college also followed the English department’s recommendation to license Smarthinking as a helpful, online resource that serves our students as an “online writing center.”

## 6. Short Term Program Goals

1. Develop greater cooperation among all MCC English faculty by utilizing the Languages Group in Schoology for support and sharing ideas.
2. Create a database of outstanding student writing to be used as models in teaching the various types of essays including research papers, narratives, descriptive papers, and all variations of expository essays. Papers volunteered for this project, though presented anonymously, will be secured with their student writer’s signed release forms. These files will then be made available to instructors in all modalities as models worth emulating.
3. Develop a structured courseware for TRE to improve the quality and delivery of the class curriculum.
4. Develop ENG 233 as an OER course.

5. Continue to attend and support English and Communication ATFs and adjust course requirements as needed for continued articulation with our state universities.

## 7) Long Term Course Goals

1. Ensure the continuation of a dynamic, diverse, and caring teaching faculty.
2. Offer classes and programs that align department priorities with student and university needs.
3. Promote the college's Student Success Centers actively, both for peer tutoring and as a neutral location for English faculty to work with students outside class on-on-one or in groups. English faculty members are providing weekly assistance in MCC's new Student Success Centers for students who may not be as comfortable to take advantage of faculty office hours.
4. Create and codify assessment strategies that identify programmatic and curricular priorities and track student learning outcomes. These heightened efforts will provide more accurate assessment of student learning and ability and will guide the English Department in modifying curriculum, delivery, and presentation for better student mastery.
5. Improve quality and consistency of on-line courses by standardizing the course shells for on-line English Course offerings.

## Appendix A: Total MCC Student Enrollment by Ethnicity

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>
2 or more races	127	143	158
Asian	93	84	103
Black	93	81	76
Hispanic	1,068	1,105	1,100
Native American	120	125	130
Nonresident Alien	7	13	31
Pacific Islander/Hawaiian	43	37	37
Unknown	354	282	234



White	4,913	4,619	4,058
Total	6,500	6,192	5,656

## Appendix B: COM/ENG/TRE Demographics

PREFIX	ETHNICITY	2012	2013	2014	Total
<b>COM</b>		180	234	227	621
	<b>ASIAN</b>	2	5	2	9
	<b>BLACK</b>	0	1	0	1
	<b>HISPANIC</b>	32	24	14	68
	<b>NOT AVAILABLE</b>	1	3	2	6
	<b>PACIFICISLANDER/HAWAIIAN</b>	2	2	4	8
	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	6	1	1	7
	<b>WHITE</b>	118	116	80	305
	<b>Total</b>	<i>341</i>	<i>386</i>	<i>330</i>	<i>1,025</i>
<b>ENG</b>		1,425	1,469	1,483	3,753
	<b>ASIAN</b>	20	21	13	49
	<b>BLACK</b>	7	6	2	13
	<b>HISPANIC</b>	75	73	63	182
	<b>NOT AVAILABLE</b>	14	5	8	22
	<b>PACIFICISLANDER/HAWAIIAN</b>	8	7	8	21
	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	14	16	9	34
<b>ENG</b>	<b>WHITE</b>	541	441	322	1,109
	<b>Total</b>	<i>2,104</i>	<i>2,038</i>	<i>1,908</i>	<i>5,183</i>
<b>TRE</b>		248	223	156	605

	<b>ASIAN</b>	6	2	4	11
	<b>BLACK</b>	0	0	1	1
	<b>HISPANIC</b>	26	11	5	41
	<b>NOT AVAILABLE</b>	1	1	0	2
	<b>PACIFICISLANDER/HAWAIIAN</b>	1	1	3	5
	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	2	0	1	3
	<b>WHITE</b>	52	46	29	124
	<b>Total</b>	336	284	199	792
<b>Total</b>		2,558	2,491	2,245	6,034

AGE  
GROUP

<b>PREFIX</b>	<b>AGE GROUP</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>COM</b>	<b>11-17</b>	175	202	194	556
	<b>18-19</b>	24	31	22	74
	<b>20-21</b>	18	22	12	50
	<b>22-24</b>	19	22	25	63
	<b>25-29</b>	28	37	18	82
	<b>30-39</b>	35	36	28	96
	<b>40-49</b>	29	27	22	74
	<b>50-59</b>	10	9	8	26
	<b>60-100</b>	3	0	1	4
	<b>Total</b>	341	386	330	1,025
<b>ENG</b>	<b>11-17</b>	1,196	1,297	1,314	3,279

	<b>18-19</b>	131	95	90	280
	<b>20-21</b>	110	101	70	237
	<b>22-24</b>	118	102	100	269
	<b>25-29</b>	146	125	101	318
	<b>30-39</b>	207	163	124	418
	<b>40-49</b>	144	120	84	287
	<b>50-59</b>	46	30	20	83
	<b>60-100</b>	6	5	5	12
	<b>Total</b>	<i>2,104</i>	<i>2,038</i>	<i>1,908</i>	<i>5,183</i>
<b>TRE</b>	<b>11-17</b>	162	159	113	420
	<b>18-19</b>	26	16	19	61
	<b>20-21</b>	15	9	11	33
	<b>22-24</b>	22	18	10	48
	<b>25-29</b>	24	14	11	49
	<b>30-39</b>	40	31	19	86
	<b>40-49</b>	32	25	10	63
	<b>50-59</b>	13	11	5	28
	<b>60-100</b>	2	1	1	4
	<b>Total</b>	336	284	199	792
<b>Total</b>		2,558	2,491	2,245	6,034

GENDER

<b>PREFIX</b>	<b>GENDER</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>COM</b>	<b>F</b>	215	239	204	634

	<b>M</b>	126	147	126	391
	<b>Total</b>	<i>341</i>	<i>386</i>	<i>330</i>	<i>1,025</i>
<b>ENG</b>	<b>F</b>	1,340	1,307	1,193	3,264
	<b>M</b>	762	730	712	1,913
	<b>U</b>	2	1	3	6
	<b>Total</b>	<i>2,104</i>	<i>2,038</i>	<i>1,908</i>	<i>5,183</i>
<b>TRE</b>	<b>F</b>	176	158	115	438
	<b>M</b>	160	126	84	354
	<b>Total</b>	<i>336</i>	<i>284</i>	<i>199</i>	<i>792</i>
<b>Total</b>		<i>2,558</i>	<i>2,491</i>	<i>2,245</i>	<i>6,034</i>

### Appendix C: ENG/COM Revenue

		2012	2013	2014
Program	(Prefix)	ENG/COM	ENG/COM	ENG/COM
<b>COUNTS</b>				
Number	of Sections	123	120	112
StudentHead	Count in all Sections	1,906	1,842	1,611
Duplicated	StudentEnrollment	2,237	2,180	1,911
	Credit Hours	6,801	6,540	5,733
<b>REVENUE SOURCES</b>				
	<b>Tuition</b>	\$539,106	\$548,481	\$496,974
<b>Course Fees</b>	<b>(2014 includes</b>			
<b>Program</b>	<b>Fees where</b>	\$-	\$-	\$0
	<b>applicable)</b>			

Program Fees: 2012 and 2013 only	\$-	\$-	-
Instructional Income: Tuition + Course Fees + Program Fees	\$539,106	\$548,481	\$496,974
State Allocation based on hours	\$157,945	\$151,826	\$138,037
Revenues: Instructional Income + State Allocation	\$697,051	\$700,307	\$635,011
State Allocation as a % of Revenues	23%	22%	22%
<b>EXPENSES</b>			
Expenses	\$668,589	\$676,401	\$677,226
Net: Revenues – Expenses	\$28,463	\$23,906	(\$42,215)
Non-Faculty Costs: Those not related to faculty wages or benefits			\$0
2nd Net: Net + Non-Faculty Costs			(\$42,215)
<b>RATIOS</b>			
Net per Student	\$14.93	\$13	(\$26)
Net per Hour	\$4.19	\$4	(\$7)
Net per Section	\$231.40	\$199.22	(\$377)
Expense to Income Ratio	0.96	0.97	1.07
Income to Expense Ratio	1.04	1.04	0.94
Profit Margin	4.1%	3.4%	-6.6%
Cost per credit hour	\$98.31	\$103.43	\$118.13
Revenue per credit hour	\$102.49	\$107.08	\$110.76
Tuition only per credit hour	\$79	\$84	\$87

Instructional income per credit hour	\$79	\$84	\$87
Average Hours per student	3.6	3.6	3.6
Average Hours per course	55.3	54.5	51.2
Average Hours per section	3.0	3.0	3.0
<b>Breakeven Hours</b>	<b>6,523.3</b>	<b>6,316.7</b>	<b>6,114.1</b>
<b>Breakeven Headcount</b>	<b>1,828</b>	<b>1,779</b>	<b>1,718</b>
<b>Breakeven FTSE</b>	<b>217.4</b>	<b>210.6</b>	<b>203.8</b>

## Appendix D: ENG 101 & ENG 102 Grades by Modality

ENG 101 Grades		A	B	C	D	F	W	WR2
<b>Term/Mode</b>								
<b>2012FA</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>College</b>	190	140	75	30	102	25	3	
<i>Ground</i>	134	99	53	22	58	10	1	
<i>Online</i>	56	41	22	8	44	15	2	
<b>Dual</b>	160	86	47	13	6	1		
<i>Ground</i>	160	86	47	13	6	1		
<b>2012SP</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>College</b>	116	106	76	36	80	33	4	
<i>Ground</i>	81	73	49	26	54	20	4	

<i>Online</i>	35	33	27	10	26	13	
<b>Dual</b>	24	11	2				
<i>Ground</i>	24	11	2				
<b>2012SU</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>College</b>	23	35	15	10	17	9	1
<i>Ground</i>	13	20	4	4	6	1	1
<i>Online</i>	10	15	11	6	11	8	
<b>2013FA</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>College</b>	149	170	85	59	119	24	7
<i>Ground</i>	112	118	60	37	83	11	6
<i>Online</i>	37	52	25	22	36	13	1
<b>Dual</b>	151	98	67	15	9	11	
<i>Ground</i>	151	98	67	15	9	11	
<b>2013SP</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>College</b>	129	101	40	16	89	24	5
<i>Ground</i>	67	70	27	15	64	16	4
<i>Online</i>	62	31	13	1	25	8	1
<b>Dual</b>	26	9	4		1		
<i>Ground</i>	26	9	4		1		
<b>2013SU</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>College</b>	37	23	14	3	11	3	

<i>Ground</i>	2	14	6	3	4	1	
<i>Online</i>	35	9	8		7	2	
<b>2014FA</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>College</b>	163	123	71	26	103	33	9
<i>Ground</i>	92	86	53	16	71	29	5
<i>Online</i>	71	37	18	10	32	4	4
<b>Dual</b>	177	101	60	14	11	5	
<i>Ground</i>	177	101	60	14	11	5	
<b>2014SP</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>College</b>	109	72	43	16	68	21	6
<i>Ground</i>	64	47	30	11	42	11	4
<i>Online</i>	45	25	13	5	26	10	2
<b>Dual</b>	37	25	10	1			
<i>Ground</i>	37	25	10	1			
<b>2014SU</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>College</b>	27	21	11	3	6	6	1
<i>Ground</i>	12	13	6	1	2	2	1
<i>Online</i>	15	8	5	2	4	4	

ENG 102 Grades

<b>Term/Mode</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>WR2</b>
<b>2012FA</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>23</b>	



<b>College</b>	113	90	33	12	37	23	
<i>Ground</i>	62	56	20	3	18	11	
<i>Online</i>	51	34	13	9	19	12	
<b>Dual</b>	6	6	3				
<i>Ground</i>	6	6	3				
<b>2012SP</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>College</b>	160	82	39	15	42	25	3
<i>Ground</i>	63	62	26	10	24	13	1
<i>Online</i>	97	20	13	5	18	12	2
<b>Dual</b>	160	92	33	3	2	2	
<i>Ground</i>	160	92	33	3	2	2	
<b>2012SU</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>College</b>	21	18	10	1	8	5	
<i>Ground</i>	9	2	1		1		
<i>Online</i>	12	16	9	1	7	5	
<b>2013FA</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>18</b>	
<b>College</b>	103	66	30	7	39	18	
<i>Ground</i>	65	41	21	2	19	7	
<i>Online</i>	38	25	9	5	20	11	
<b>Dual</b>	18	9	1				
<i>Ground</i>	18	9	1				

<b>2013SP</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>30</b>	
<b>College</b>	129	83	41	9	40	28	
<i>Ground</i>	66	60	30	5	21	18	
<i>Online</i>	63	23	11	4	19	10	
<b>Dual</b>	174	91	51	7	6	2	
<i>Ground</i>	174	91	51	7	6	2	
<b>2013SU</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>College</b>	34	13	4		4	4	
<i>Ground</i>	10	4			1	1	
<i>Online</i>	24	9	4		3	3	
<b>2014FA</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>College</b>	79	57	26	4	19	20	4
<i>Ground</i>	32	28	14	2	11	7	3
<i>Online</i>	47	29	12	2	8	13	1
<b>Dual</b>	25	7					
<i>Ground</i>	25	7					
<b>2014SP</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>College</b>	97	72	29	10	36	30	3
<i>Ground</i>	52	42	18	7	21	17	1
<i>Online</i>	45	30	11	3	15	13	2
<b>Dual</b>	152	111	49	8	7	1	

<i>Ground</i>	152	111	49	8	7	1	
<b>2014SU</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>College</b>	45	15	6	1	2	4	1
<i>Ground</i>	14	7	3		2	3	1
<i>Online</i>	31	8	3	1		1	

ENG 101

<b>Term/Mode</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>WR2</b>
<b>2012FA</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	34%	25%	13%	5%	18%	4%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	36%	26%	14%	6%	15%	3%	0%
<i>Online</i>	30%	22%	12%	4%	23%	8%	1%
<b>Dual</b>	51%	27%	15%	4%	2%	0%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	51%	27%	15%	4%	2%	0%	0%

<b>2012SP</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>College</b>	26%	24%	17%	8%	18%	7%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	26%	24%	16%	8%	18%	7%	1%
<i>Online</i>	24%	23%	19%	7%	18%	9%	0%
<b>Dual</b>	65%	30%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	65%	30%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>2012SU</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>1%</b>

<b>College</b>	21%	32%	14%	9%	15%	8%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	27%	41%	8%	8%	12%	2%	2%
<i>Online</i>	16%	25%	18%	10%	18%	13%	0%
<b>2013FA</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>College</b>	24%	28%	14%	10%	19%	4%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	26%	28%	14%	9%	19%	3%	1%
<i>Online</i>	20%	28%	13%	12%	19%	7%	1%
<b>Dual</b>	43%	28%	19%	4%	3%	3%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	43%	28%	19%	4%	3%	3%	0%
<b>2013SP</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>College</b>	32%	25%	10%	4%	22%	6%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	25%	27%	10%	6%	24%	6%	2%
<i>Online</i>	44%	22%	9%	1%	18%	6%	1%
<b>Dual</b>	65%	23%	10%	0%	3%	0%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	65%	23%	10%	0%	3%	0%	0%
<b>2013SU</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	41%	25%	15%	3%	12%	3%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	7%	47%	20%	10%	13%	3%	0%
<i>Online</i>	57%	15%	13%	0%	11%	3%	0%
<b>2014FA</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>College</b>	31%	23%	13%	5%	20%	6%	2%

<i>Ground</i>	26%	24%	15%	5%	20%	8%	1%
<i>Online</i>	40%	21%	10%	6%	18%	2%	2%
<b>Dual</b>	48%	27%	16%	4%	3%	1%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	48%	27%	16%	4%	3%	1%	0%
<b>2014SP</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>College</b>	33%	21%	13%	5%	20%	6%	2%
<i>Ground</i>	31%	22%	14%	5%	20%	5%	2%
<i>Online</i>	36%	20%	10%	4%	21%	8%	2%
<b>Dual</b>	51%	34%	14%	1%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	51%	34%	14%	1%	0%	0%	0%
<b>2014SU</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>College</b>	36%	28%	15%	4%	8%	8%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	32%	35%	16%	3%	5%	5%	3%
<i>Online</i>	39%	21%	13%	5%	11%	11%	0%

ENG 102 Grades

<b>Term/Mode</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>WR2</b>
<b>2012FA</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>23</b>	
<b>College</b>	113	90	33	12	37	23	
<i>Ground</i>	62	56	20	3	18	11	
<i>Online</i>	51	34	13	9	19	12	
<b>Dual</b>	6	6	3				

<i>Ground</i>	6	6	3				
<b>2012SP</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>College</b>	160	82	39	15	42	25	3
<i>Ground</i>	63	62	26	10	24	13	1
<i>Online</i>	97	20	13	5	18	12	2
<b>Dual</b>	160	92	33	3	2	2	
<i>Ground</i>	160	92	33	3	2	2	
<b>2012SU</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>College</b>	21	18	10	1	8	5	
<i>Ground</i>	9	2	1		1		
<i>Online</i>	12	16	9	1	7	5	
<b>2013FA</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>18</b>	
<b>College</b>	103	66	30	7	39	18	
<i>Ground</i>	65	41	21	2	19	7	
<i>Online</i>	38	25	9	5	20	11	
<b>Dual</b>	18	9	1				
<i>Ground</i>	18	9	1				
<b>2013SP</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>30</b>	
<b>College</b>	129	83	41	9	40	28	
<i>Ground</i>	66	60	30	5	21	18	

<i>Online</i>	63	23	11	4	19	10	
<b>Dual</b>	174	91	51	7	6	2	
<i>Ground</i>	174	91	51	7	6	2	
<b>2013SU</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>College</b>	34	13	4		4	4	
<i>Ground</i>	10	4			1	1	
<i>Online</i>	24	9	4		3	3	
<b>2014FA</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>College</b>	79	57	26	4	19	20	4
<i>Ground</i>	32	28	14	2	11	7	3
<i>Online</i>	47	29	12	2	8	13	1
<b>Dual</b>	25	7					
<i>Ground</i>	25	7					
<b>2014SP</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>College</b>	97	72	29	10	36	30	3
<i>Ground</i>	52	42	18	7	21	17	1
<i>Online</i>	45	30	11	3	15	13	2
<b>Dual</b>	152	111	49	8	7	1	
<i>Ground</i>	152	111	49	8	7	1	
<b>2014SU</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>College</b>	45	15	6	1	2	4	1
<i>Ground</i>	14	7	3		2	3	1
<i>Online</i>	31	8	3	1		1	

ENG 102

<b>Term/Mode</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>WR2</b>
<b>2012FA</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	37%	29%	11%	4%	12%	7%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	36%	33%	12%	2%	11%	6%	0%
<i>Online</i>	37%	25%	9%	7%	14%	9%	0%
<b>Dual</b>	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>2012SP</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	44%	22%	11%	4%	11%	7%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	32%	31%	13%	5%	12%	7%	1%
<i>Online</i>	58%	12%	8%	3%	11%	7%	1%
<b>Dual</b>	55%	32%	11%	1%	1%	1%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	55%	32%	11%	1%	1%	1%	0%
<b>2012SU</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	33%	29%	16%	2%	13%	8%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	69%	15%	8%	0%	8%	0%	0%



<i>Online</i>	24%	32%	18%	2%	14%	10%	0%
<b>2013FA</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	39%	25%	11%	3%	15%	7%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	42%	26%	14%	1%	12%	5%	0%
<i>Online</i>	35%	23%	8%	5%	19%	10%	0%
<b>Dual</b>	64%	32%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	64%	32%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>2013SP</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	39%	25%	12%	3%	12%	8%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	33%	30%	15%	3%	11%	9%	0%
<i>Online</i>	48%	18%	8%	3%	15%	8%	0%
<b>Dual</b>	53%	27%	15%	2%	2%	1%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	53%	27%	15%	2%	2%	1%	0%
<b>2013SU</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	58%	22%	7%	0%	7%	7%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	63%	25%	0%	0%	6%	6%	0%
<i>Online</i>	56%	21%	9%	0%	7%	7%	0%
<b>2014FA</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>College</b>	38%	27%	12%	2%	9%	10%	2%
<i>Ground</i>	33%	29%	14%	2%	11%	7%	3%

<i>Online</i>	42%	26%	11%	2%	7%	12%	1%
<b>Dual</b>	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>2014SP</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>College</b>	35%	26%	10%	4%	13%	11%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	33%	27%	11%	4%	13%	11%	1%
<i>Online</i>	38%	25%	9%	3%	13%	11%	2%
<b>Dual</b>	46%	34%	15%	2%	2%	0%	0%
<i>Ground</i>	46%	34%	15%	2%	2%	0%	0%
<b>2014SU</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>College</b>	61%	20%	8%	1%	3%	5%	1%
<i>Ground</i>	47%	23%	10%	0%	7%	10%	3%
<i>Online</i>	70%	18%	7%	2%	0%	2%	0%

## Appendix E: ENG 101 Outcome for TRE 089 Students

ENG 101 Outcome for students who took TRE 089

<b>Term</b>	<b>Success</b>	<b>Unsuccessful</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Pct Success</b>
<b>2012FA</b>	52	28	80	65%
<b>2012SP</b>	25	19	44	57%
<b>2012SU</b>	7	3	10	70%
<b>2013FA</b>	49	23	72	68%

<b>2013SP</b>	22	5	27	81%
<b>2013SU</b>	0	4	4	0%
<b>2014FA</b>	36	10	46	78%
<b>2014SP</b>	5	1	6	83%

Term is the one in which the student took the TRE course.

Success = A, B, or C  
grade

Same data by

Faculty Type:

Term/Level	Success	Unsuccessfull	Total	Pct Success
<b>2012FA</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>65%</b>
<i>Associate</i>	33	18	51	65%
<i>Resident</i>	19	10	29	66%
<b>2012SP</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>57%</b>
<i>Associate</i>	11	12	23	48%
<i>Resident</i>	14	7	21	67%
<b>2012SU</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>70%</b>
<i>Associate</i>	7	3	10	70%
<b>2013FA</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>68%</b>
<i>Associate</i>	22	9	31	71%
<i>Resident</i>	27	14	41	66%
<b>2013SP</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>81%</b>

<i>Associate</i>	8	3	11	73%
<i>Resident</i>	14	2	16	88%
<b>2013SU</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0%</b>
<i>Associate</i>		4	4	0%
<b>2014FA</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>78%</b>
<i>Associate</i>	7	4	11	64%
<i>Resident</i>	29	6	35	83%
<b>2014SP</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>83%</b>
<i>Associate</i>	1		1	100%
<i>Resident</i>	4	1	5	80%

## Appendix F: Notification of Assessment, 2012-13 & 2014-15.

### NOTIFICATION OF ASSESSMENT

Dear Faculty Member,

Mohave Community College is expanding its college-wide assessment of student learning activities. The college is a participant in the Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) Academy for the Assessment of Student Learning. The MCC Academy project is entitled "Writing Across the Curriculum at Mohave." The major goals of this 4-year project are to measure student-writing skills over time and to answer the question: "With what degree of consistency do different sections of a course achieve similar outcomes?"

Resident faculty in the English, Languages, and Communications Department have created an assignment that we ask all faculty teaching ENG101 to include as an assignment in the course for the next four years. Details for this assignment are provided below. Key points for implementation of this project are as follows:

- The general education student learning outcome, “Write effectively in a college setting,” is directly related to the English 101 learning outcome. This assessment will be used by the Office of Instruction to identify areas of strength and weakness in MCC student writing from all WAC-designated courses across the curriculum. Updated reports similar to this report will be compiled and distributed to the department; the report will note newest results, notable changes in the results, and possible changes in the reporting process.
- Students will complete the argument essay as assigned by the instructor. Topics and total number of points are determined by the instructor and are not limited by this assessment. Upon completion, student will submit the assignment in an ANGEL drop box, which will, prior to the summer or winter break (depending on the semester), be labeled “Argumentative WAC Paper.” Note: The label for this drop box may be changed by the instructor at any point during the semester.
- The content rubric shown below will be used to assess the student’s submission; the score will count toward the final grade in the course. The rubrics will be provided as content items to be uploaded into shells by the faculty or department chair. Instructions will follow and one-on-one assistance will be available through the department chair.
- All English faculty members will participate in this assessment this semester. By submitting this report and recommendations, the English department has agreed that an accurate measurement of MCC students’ strengths and weaknesses in written communications is needed and can be achieved through this assessment process.

The department chair for your department is Kata Alvidrez; her contact information is listed below. Kata is available to answer questions you may have on the assignment and/or the content rubric. If you need help on this project immediately and Kata is not available, contact your campus Associate Dean for assistance.

At the end of each semester, the Office of Instruction will pull the rubric scores from the ANGEL drop box and the Office of Institutional Research will collect the data and provide a report on our overall ratings. These ratings will be based on ALL students polled and will not be used for anything other than general observations about student mastery.

At the end of the academic year, Institutional Research will generate a list of student names randomly selected from all courses participating in the project. The Office of Instruction will pull the students’ writing samples from the ANGEL drop box. To ensure the students’ anonymity, all student information other than the student identification number will be expunged from the assignment samples. At some point in time, over the summer or at the start of the fall term, a team of faculty will score the writing samples using the Writing Across the Curriculum Rubric found at the end of this document. These data will be provided to the faculty the following fall semester for analysis and department recommendations for ways we can improve student learning.

Thank you for participating in this project.

HLC Academy Team Members:

Dr. Andra Goldberg, Resident Faculty for CIS, Neal Campus Kingman  
 Laurel Clifford, Resident Faculty for Math, Lake Havasu Campus  
 Kata Alvidrez, Department Chair/Resident Faculty for English, Bullhead City Campus  
 Penni Ellis, Associate Faculty for Nursing, Bullhead City Campus  
 Rosemarie LeFebvre, Director of Student Learning Initiatives for the Office of Instruction

## Appendix G: Common Assessment Instructions 2012 -13 & 2014-15

<b>Department:</b>	English	<b>Course:</b>	ENG 101
<b>Department Chair:</b>	Kata Alvidrez	<b>Contact Information:</b>	Bullhead City Campus 928. 758. 3926 x4443 <a href="mailto:kalvidrez@mohave.edu">kalvidrez@mohave.edu</a>
<b>General Education Student Learning Outcome:</b>	1. Communicate effectively. 1. 1. Read and comprehend at a college level. 1. 2 Write effectively in a college setting.		
<b>Course Student Learning Outcome:</b>	<b>Goal 10.</b> Write an argumentative essay that demonstrates sound logical development.		
<b>Common Assignment:</b>	The Argumentative Essay. <b>Directions for Final (Argumentative) Paper</b> 1. Provide a thesis statement that states clearly your position on an issue. 2. Address all of the supporting arguments for your position on the issue. 3. Refute the major arguments of the opposition. 4. Develop your arguments through elaboration and examples. 5. The final essay will be 1,250 words (5 double-spaced pages with 12-point font).		

<p><b>Common Assignment Directions:</b></p>	<p>The instructor will assess the students' final draft of the required Argumentative Essay using the WAC Rubric, which provides a fairly comprehensive enumeration of the elements of an argumentative essay. The instructor should evaluate each element of the argumentative essay and assign a number between 1 and 5. The number 3 denotes competence and the number 5 denotes excellence. The WAC Rubric can be used to grade students' papers, and the statistical data it provides will assist the English Department in focusing on those areas of instruction that need attention.</p>
<p><b>Submission Instructions:</b></p>	<p>Faculty will create a drop box in ANGEL for students to use to submit this assignment. The drop box name for this assignment will be "<b>Argumentative WAC Paper.</b>" Please place the drop box</p>
	<p>under the Assignments tab directly, not in a weekly folder. This provides ease of access to the student writing samples. Faculty will grade the assignment using the writing across the curriculum rubric (points for this piece are designated at faculty discretion). If students are unable to submit this assignment in ANGEL, please send hard copies to Rosemarie LeFebvre in the Office of Instruction, Kingman Campus.</p>
<p><b>Content Rubric:</b></p>	<p>WAC Rubric</p>
<p><b>Writing Across the Curriculum Rubric</b></p>	<p>See below. Student samples will be scored using the WAC Rubric for the WAC Project.</p>

## Appendix H: Grading Rubric 2012-13 & 2014-15

The A  
paper  
5  
points

**Ideas**

Excels in responding to assignment.

Interesting, demonstrate

s

n sophisticated of thought. Central idea/thesis is clearly communicated, worth developing; limited enough to be manageable.

Paper recognizes some complexity of its thesis: may acknowledge its contradiction

s,

s, qualification or limits and follow out their logical implications.

Understands and critically evaluates its sources, appropriately limits and defines terms.



**Organization & coherence**

Uses a logical structure appropriate to paper's subject, purpose, audience, and disciplinary field. Sophisticated transitional sentences often develop one idea from the previous one or identify their logical relations. It guides the reader through the chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.

**The B paper 4 points A**

solid paper, responding appropriately to assignment. Clearly states a thesis/central idea, but may have minor lapses in development. Begins to acknowledge the complexity of central idea and the possibility of other points of view. Shows careful reading of sources, but may not evaluate them critically. Attempts to define terms, not always successful.

Shows a logical progression of ideas and uses fairly sophisticated transitional devices; e.g., may move from least to more important idea. Some logical links may be faulty, but each paragraph clearly relates to paper's central idea.

The paper points	C 3	The	D paper points	The 2	F paper point	1
but and effective, responding less to assignment. Presents idea general often on or Usually not acknowledge other Shows comprehension of perhaps lapses in understanding. If defines often on definition.	Adequate weaker less possibly well central in terms, depending on platitudes clichés. does other views. basic sources, with in it terms, depends on dictionary	Does	not have a clear central idea or does not respond appropriately to the assignment Thesis may be too vague or obvious to be developed effectively.	Does	not respond to the assignment, lacks a thesis or central idea, and may neglect to use sources where necessary.	
May ideas arrange randomly than any logical May transitions, but are to sequential (first, second, third) rather logicbased. While paragraph relate central logic not clear. Paragraphs have sentences may overly and	list or them rather using evident structure. use they likely be (first, second, third) than each to idea, is always topic but be general,	tand May e	Paper may misunderstand sources. have random organization, ; lacking internal paragraph coherence and using few or inappropriate transitions.	No	appreciable organization lacks transitions and coherence.	
		Paragraphs	may lack topic sentences or main ideas, or may be too general or too specific to be effective. Paragraphs may not all relate to paper's thesis.			

						arrangement of sentences within paragraphs may lack coherence.					
<b>Support</b>	Uses evidence appropriately and effectively, providing sufficient evidence and explanation to convince.	Begins to offer reasons to support its points, perhaps using varied kinds of evidence.	Often offers reasons to support its points, perhaps using varied kinds of evidence.	Often uses generalizations to support its points. May use examples, but they may be obvious or not relevant.	Often depends on unsupported opinion or personal experience, or assumes that evidence speaks for itself and needs no application to the point being discussed.	Depends on clichés or overgeneralizations for support, offers little evidence of any kind. May be personal narrative rather than summary rather than analysis.	Uses irrelevant details or lacks supporting evidence entirely. May be unduly brief.				
<b>Style</b>	Chooses words for their precise meaning and uses an appropriate level of specificity.	Generally uses words accurately and effectively but may sometimes be too general.	Uses words accurately and effectively but may sometimes be too general.	Uses relatively vague and general words, may use some inappropriate language.	May be too personal and specific. Usually contains several awkward or ungrammatical sentences; sentence	Usually contains many awkward sentence misuses words, employs inappropriate language.					

y. Sentence style fits paper's audience and purpose. Sentences are varied, yet clearly structure and carefully focused, not long and rambling.

Sentences generally clear, well structure and focused, though some may be awkward or ineffectiv

structure generally correct, but sentences may be wordy, unfocused repetitive, or confusing.

structure is simple or monotonous.

**Mechanics** Almost entirely of free spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors. May contain a few errors, which may annoy the reader but not impede understanding. Usually contain several mechanical errors, which may temporarily confuse the reader but not impede the overall understanding. Usually contain many mechanical errors or a few important errors that block the reader's understanding and ability to see connections between thoughts. Either or few errors block the reader's understanding and ability to see connections between thoughts. Usually contain so many mechanical errors that it is impossible for the reader to follow the thinking from sentence to sentence.

## Appendix I: Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2012-13

### Assessment Changes

			English Department
Restructure Outcome Statement	<input type="radio"/> No Changes	<input type="radio"/> Budget Item	All
Revise Measurement Approach	<input type="radio"/> Implemented Changes <input checked="" type="radio"/> Planned Changes	<input type="radio"/> Budget Item	All – Improve delivery of instructions and verify compliance with assessment projects.

Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information	<input type="radio"/> Implemented Changes <input checked="" type="radio"/> Planned Changes	<input type="radio"/> Budget Item	All – Assessment scores will be pulled from all Angel drop boxes for department-level data analysis.
Methods of Data Collection	<input type="radio"/> No changes <input checked="" type="radio"/> Planned Changes	<input type="radio"/> Budget Item	All – Draft and approve a common Angel rubric for the departmental assessment (for the assessment used in this 2013-2014 report, see below).
Other			All- Provide additional OER-style materials in Angel for students who need help in mechanics and grammar skills.
Describe Changes	We plan to be more proactive in our efforts to engage the entire faculty in providing samples for a more valid data set and to identify future goals.		Faculty will be engaged via email, telephone, and departmental meetings to comply with procedures for collecting assessment data. Results will be shared and discussed with resultant goals and recommendations then developed by all English Faculty members.
Budget Items: If a budget item is identified above, please provide a description of the item(s), approximate cost(s), and its justification.			

## Programmatic Changes

		Person/Group Responsible for Action; Target date for implementation and Priority (High/Med/Low)
Revamp Services	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Make Technology Related Improvements	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Make Personnel Related Changes	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Implement Additional Training	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Add New Service(s) or Program(s)	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Delete Service(s) or Program(s)	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Other:		
Describe Changes:		
Additional Information		
Describe any additional resources needed (include budgetary requests): no additional resources required.		

## Appendix J: Assignment Sheet for ENG 101 Class

### ENG101-211 Argumentation Essay

Write an argumentative essay of 1250+ words. Choose an

argumentative/persuasive topic of your choice: a national issue, a local issue, or an occupational issue of interest to you and your core audience, your classmates (you might look over the textbook’s suggested topics on pages 301-02 for ideas). Exclude topics involving personal religious faith, creationism/evolution, and abortion unless you have permission of the instructor.

If you choose to utilize outside sources as evidence, you are obligated to cite them and avoid plagiarism. Follow the MLA guidelines found in your Hacker Handbook. If you’re not sure how to cite and paraphrase without committing plagiarism (a skill expected of college-level students), I strongly suggest that you bring your paper by during my office hours for assistance or to Lexi in the tutoring center.

The final draft should be double-spaced with proper MLA heading and pagination (see policy statement) and with a correct Works Cited page if outside sources are used. Besides turning in a hard copy in class, please submit your final draft by 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 6 through both the Turn-It-In Argumentative Essay Box and Argumentative WAC Paper box in Angel.

This assignment is a common assessment for all sections of ENG101 at Mohave Community College. Because of this, you should pay careful instructions to the assignment guidelines and the attached rubric. You will be submitting the paper through two different Turn-It-In Drop-boxes since this paper may grading be used to track student progress college-wide.

## Appendix K: Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2014-15

### Assessment Changes

			English Department
Restructure Outcome Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ No Changes</li> </ul>	○ Budget Item	All English Resident Faculty. Aug 10-21, 2015. High Priority.

Revise Measurement Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ Planned Changes</li> </ul>	○ Budget Item	All English resident faculty agreed on new assessment project for 2015/16 with clear instructions , reporting forms, and notice of mandatory compliance.
			Aug. 21, 2015. High Priority.
Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ Planned Changes</li> </ul>	○ Budget Item	All ENG 101 Instructors. Assessment scores will be emailed by all ENG 101 instructors to the English Lead Faculty during 2015 Fall semester. High Priority.
Methods of Data Collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ Planned Changes</li> </ul>	○ Budget Item	All ENG 101 Instructors – Test students and report results on Excel file along with analysis of strengths/weaknesses by end of Fall semester 2015.
Describe Changes	<p>In April and May of 2015, English department voted to revise the assessment tool to focus on a different ENG 101 competency for 2015: the thesis statement. The assessment, an objective thesis quiz, was developed and unanimously accepted by Aug. 18, 2015.</p>		All ENG Resident Faculty 4/2015-8/2015. High Priority.



Budget Items: If a budget item is identified above, please provide a description of the item(s), approximate cost(s), and its justification.		N/A
--	--	-----

### Programmatic Changes

English Department		
Review Cycle of Learning assessment data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ Planned Changes</li> </ul>	For 2014/15 report, all English Resident Faculty evaluated
	Changes	assessment data for strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. November 2015. High Priority.
Make Technology Related Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ Planned Changes</li> </ul>	For 2015/16 report, English department created a clear assessment test with Excel reporting and analysis forms.

Make Personnel Related Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ Planned Changes</li> </ul>	All ENG 101 faculty members were sent the mandatory assessment project. Followup should insure compliance.
Implement Additional Training	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Add New Service(s) or Program(s)	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Delete Service(s) or Program(s)	Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:	
Other:		
Describe Changes:		
Additional Information		
Describe any additional resources needed (include budgetary requests): no additional resources required.		

## Appendix L: Fall 2015 English Department Assessment

<b>Department:</b>	ENGLISH	<b>Course:</b>	ENG101 English Composition I
<b>Lead Faculty; Associate Dean:</b>	Dr. John Kitts Dr. Cheryl Hall	<b>Contact Information:</b>	John Kitts <a href="mailto:jkitts@mohave.edu">jkitts@mohave.edu</a> 928-692-3018

<b>General Education Student Learning Outcome:</b>	<b>Communication Skills</b> 2.6 Write effectively in a college setting.																		
<b>Course Student Learning Outcome:</b>	Competency 3 Generate thesis statements. Objective 3.1 Evaluate stated and implied thesis statements. Objective 3.2 Design thesis statements that demonstrate an understanding of the assigned topics and/or assigned rhetorical strategies.																		
<b>Common Assignment:</b>	<b>Thesis Quiz</b> Students in all MCC ENG101 classes scheduled during Fall 2015 will take a ten question multiple choice quiz after reading Chapter 2 in <i>Steps to Writing Well with Additional Readings</i> and further discussing the correct guidelines for constructing thesis statements and thesis maps in class or in the course shell in Schoology. The quiz should be given after the instructor has completed teaching the material (rather than being used as a quiz to assess comprehension directly after students have read the text chapter but before the topic is discussed).																		
<b>Common Assignment Directions:</b>	For on-ground sections of ENG101, instructors may photocopy the quiz and have the class take the quiz during class or embed the quiz in Schoology and have students take the quiz on-line outside of class. On-line sections will take the quiz in Schoology. Instructors will then record the results of the quiz on the Thesis Quiz Reporting Form attached with this notification (directions included) and email to John Kitts at <a href="mailto:jkitts@mohave.edu">jkitts@mohave.edu</a> .																		
<b>Content Rubric:</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">Correct Answers:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td>1. B</td> <td>6.</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. C</td> <td>7.</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. A</td> <td>8.</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. D</td> <td>9.</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. D</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>10.</td> <td>A</td> </tr> </table>	1. B	6.	B	2. C	7.	B	3. A	8.	C	4. D	9.	C	5. D				10.	A
1. B	6.	B																	
2. C	7.	B																	
3. A	8.	C																	
4. D	9.	C																	
5. D																			
	10.	A																	

<p><b>Scoring Metrics: At what level did the students demonstrate the intended student learning outcome?</b></p> <p><b>(Assignment metrics will vary from discipline to discipline)</b></p>	<p>Met: Students will have demonstrated college-level proficiency in their understanding of the guidelines and principles in constructing thesis statements if they attain a score of 70 – 100% on the assessment instrument.</p> <p>Met with Concerns: Students will have demonstrated some college-level proficiency in their understanding of the guidelines and principles in constructing thesis statements if they attain a score of 60% on the assessment instrument.</p> <p>Not Met: Students will have failed to demonstrate college-level proficiency in their understanding of the guidelines and principles in constructing thesis statements if they attain a score below 60% on the assessment instrument.</p>
<p><b>Data Submission Instructions:</b></p>	<p>After your students complete the quiz, follow the directions to complete the Thesis Quiz Reporting Form (attached). Next, fill out the Signature Assignment Assessment Data Sheet (attached). For this form, all students who have a score of 7-10 (correct responses) have met the expected outcome, those who score a 6 have met the expected outcome with concerns, and those who score 0 – 5 have failed to meet the expected outcome. Please analyze the results of any questions missed by fewer than 30% of the class to determine strengths and questions missed by more than 30% to determine needed improvements.</p> <p>Then please send both data sheets attached to an email (or as a reply to this assessment announcement letter to John Kitts at <a href="mailto:jkitts@mohave.edu">jkitts@mohave.edu</a> Please contact John Kitts with any questions.</p>

## Appendix M: Thesis Quiz

### Thesis Quiz

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Which of the following best defines “Thesis Statement”? A. The topic statement of a paragraph.
- B. The main point or controlling idea of an entire essay.
- C. The concluding sentence of an essay’s introduction.
- D. The theme of a personal narrative.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Which one of the following is true about thesis statements? A. The thesis statement is often posed as a question.  
B. The draft of the paper should not be started until the thesis statement is finalized.  
C. Everything in your essay should support the thesis statement.  
D. The more complex the thesis, the better the paper.

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Where in the essay is the thesis statement most frequently located? A. In the essay's first or second paragraph.  
B. In the conclusion of the essay.  
C. In the essay's title.  
D. Nowhere since it should be implied rather than clearly stated.

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. Which one of the following is NOT a guideline for writing a good thesis? A. A good thesis has something worthwhile to say.  
B. A good thesis states the writer's clearly defined opinion on some subject.  
C. A good thesis is clearly stated in specific terms.  
D. A good thesis should state a fact rather than an opinion.

\_\_\_\_\_ 5. Which one of the following guidelines regarding common errors to be avoided in thesis statements should NOT be followed?  
A. Don't select an idea that is self-evident or dead-ended.  
B. Don't clutter your thesis with timid expressions as "in my opinion," "I believe," and "in this essay I'll argue that...."  
C. Don't express your thesis in the form of a question unless the answer is already obvious to the reader.  
D. Don't revise your thesis; always stick to your original plan and instead revise the paper.

\_\_\_\_\_ is a good principle for writing a thesis statement? 6. Which of the following

- A. Keep your reader in suspense: don't give away your opinion in the opening paragraphs.
- B. Let the thesis statement enlighten the reader as to the writer's subject, opinion, and purpose in writing the essay.
- C. Essay maps should be saved for the concluding paragraph to restate and clarify your ideas.
- D. The broader your handling of the subject matter, the more enlightening your essay will be to the reader.

\_\_\_\_\_ thesis statements includes an essay map? 7. Which one of the following

- A. MCC's newly revamped Student Success Centers offer some great new services to help students attain their academic goals.
- B. Our college's new Student Success Centers help students accomplish their academic goals by providing knowledgeable tutors, trained academic advisors, and access to professional counselors.
- C. Students should consider visiting our college's new Student Success Centers for three important reasons that will be explained in the following paragraphs.
- D. There are many terrific reasons why students at MCC should avail themselves of the opportunities provided by our new Student Success Centers conveniently located at our college's various campuses.

\_\_\_\_\_ following is the best thesis statement? 8. Which one of the

- A. The US stock market is located in lower Manhattan.
- B. Should a college student be investing in the stock market?
- C. Because of their quarterly dividends and lower volatility, utility stocks are a relatively safe bet for the beginning investor.
- D. The stock market is a great place to gamble your life savings.

\_\_\_\_\_ 9. Which one of the following is the best thesis statement?

A. In my opinion, the new *Mission Impossible: Rogue Nation* was the best film this past summer.

B. Why would moviegoers sit through the film *Woman in Gold* unless they were old and Jewish?

C. *Tomorrowland's* failure critically and at the box office can be best explained by its failure to conform to basic principles of narrative.

D. In this essay I'm going to explain to you why *Antman*, though a minor player in the Marvel universe, was a terrific choice for film adaptation.

\_\_\_\_\_ 10. Which one of the following is the best thesis statement?

A. MCC students would benefit from the convenience of on-campus child care.

B. It's my belief that a college education can teach you quite a bit about life.

C. Registering for class shouldn't be such a frustrating process.

D. My essay will tell you why I gave up a modeling career to pursue a college education.

## Appendix N: Notification to all ENG 101 Instructors

### Departmental Email Notification to all ENG 101 Instructors.

August 18, 2015

Dear ENG 101 Faculty Member,

Resident faculty at Mohave Community College revised the general education student learning outcomes (SLOs) in 2013. As a result, the faculty has implemented a new student learning assessment study to help the College answer this question: "Do students demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education outcomes across their program of study?"

Resident faculty members in English have created an assignment for inclusion as a graded assignment in the course. Key points for this assignment are:

- The assignment is the same across all sections of this course, and this semester (Fall 2015) will be in the form of a thesis statement quiz to be given to your class after they've read chapter 2 of *Steps to Writing Well with Additional Readings* and after you have taught the material to them in class (please quiz them only after you've carefully covered the material on thesis statements rather than as a reading comprehension quiz).
- The quiz rubric (quiz answers) is included on the enclosed assessment form under "content rubric." Please first use the Thesis Quiz Reporting Form (attached) to record the quiz results, and then analyze those results on the attached Signature Assignment Assessment Data Sheet. (We'll be including your analysis with a departmental analysis of the results on this year's Cycle of Learning Report.)
- As far as how to use this quiz grade in your course grading, while we leave this up to the individual instructor, we suggest you consider using the quiz as a daily grade in the participation average. The quiz provides vital information needed for our accreditation projects this year, but we also hope it will be a useful tool to measure your students' knowledge of this significant composition topic.
- Since our English 101 instructors will undoubtedly be assigning chapter two in *Wyrick* and teaching the thesis statement well before mid-semester given its foundational importance to expository writing, please return the two data sheets to John Kitts, this year's English Lead Faculty, via an email attachment by November 1.

Please note that this assessment project is **mandatory**; in order that our assessment efforts and reports to HLC, our college's accrediting agency, be successful by accurately reflecting our students' learning, we expect 100% compliance with all 101 sections reporting results. Our goal in collecting and analyzing this data is to improve student-learning outcomes. Thank you for participating in



this project. Please let us know if you have questions.

Cordially,

Your English Resident Faculty

(Please note the 4 attachments: the assessment notification, the quiz, and the two reporting forms.)

## Appendix O: Assessment and Programmatic Changes 2015

### Assessment Changes

			English Department
Restructure Outcome Statement	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Implemented Changes <input type="radio"/> Planned Changes	<input type="radio"/> Budget Item	All English Resident Faculty. Dec .10, 2015 – Jan. 15, 2016. High Priority.
Revise Measurement Approach	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Implemented Changes <input type="radio"/> Planned Changes	<input type="radio"/> Budget Item	On being asked to change the semester's assessment to cover a different course
			objective, all English resident faculty members voted on December 10 to develop an in-text citation quiz for the spring 2016 departmental assessment for our ENG 102

			<p>classes.  This quiz, along with instructions, reporting/evaluation forms, and a notice of mandatory compliance were developed and sent to ENG102 faculty by January 15.  High Priority.</p>
<p>Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ Planned Changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Budget Item</li> </ul>	<p>All MCC ENG 102 instructors will email assessment scores and their evaluation of the data (the Signature Assignment Assessment Data Sheet) during the spring 2016 semester.  High Priority.</p>
<p>Methods of Data Collection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Implemented Changes</li> <li>○ Planned Changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Budget Item</li> </ul>	<p>All ENG 102 instructors will test students and report results on a provided excel file along with their evaluation of strengths/weaknesses by the end of the spring 2016</p>

			semester. High Priority.
Describe Changes	For the fall and spring 2016/17 school year, the College has chosen to have all academic departments devise an appropriate measurement tool to test our students' reading comprehension over a multi-year period. For this first year the test will serve as each department's Cycle of Learning project. The English department is currently designing a reading comprehension assessment for these next two semesters and will revise our thesis statement and in-text citation quizzes	All English resident faculty. On February 24, 2016, the English department, approved a reading comprehension assessment based on the principles of writing narrative. This assessment (with any later revisions), notifications, and reporting forms will be sent to all fall ENG 101 instructors by August 1, 2016. High Priority.	
	In the years following in order to have measurable data to evaluate student learning progress.		
Budget Items:			

		N/A
--	--	-----

### Programmatic Changes

English Department		
Make Technology Related Improvements	<p>Implemented Changes:</p> <p>Planned Changes:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Since the Excel data reporting form created for this Fall 2015 Cycle of Learning report (Quiz Reporting Form) proved an adequate tool to collect data, the form was revised and used in spring 2016 for the in-text citation quiz. High Priority.</p>

<p>Make Personnel Related Changes</p>	<p>Implemented Changes: Yes. Planned Changes:</p>	<p>Due to a failure to notice that Dual Enrollment classes are not listed in current course schedules, Dual Enrollment classes were inadvertently left out of the Fall 2015 assessment. The department noted the oversight and has included all ENG 102 faculty in the spring 2016 assessment and will continue in future assessments to include all course modalities. High Priority.</p>
<p>Implement Additional Training</p>	<p>Implemented Changes: Yes. Planned Changes:</p>	<p>Rather than providing a single notification package to instructors prior to or at the beginning of the semester, reminders are being sent mid-semester and as necessary to encourage compliance.</p>
<p>Add New Service(s) or Program(s)</p>	<p>Implemented Changes: Planned Changes:</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Delete Service(s) or Program(s)</p>	<p>Implemented Changes: Planned Changes</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Other:</p>		

Describe Changes: :	
Additional Information	
Describe any requests):	additional resources needed (include budgetary no additional resources required.