## GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT: BASIC COMPOSITION (BC)

## RUBRIC DATA FOR BC FOR 2018-2019

During Fall 2018 and Winter 2019, the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) began the process of data collection in BC courses (see Appendix A) in order to assess the new General Education Program. Historically, Basic Composition (BC) has had a well-developed set of assessment criteria, and thus was selected as one of the first areas for review in this process. Data collection concluded in Summer 2019. Below is a brief overview of the results.

## SCORING

Essays from $B C$ courses were scored from 1-6 using a rubric of the criteria within each of the seven $B C$ learning outcomes (see Appendix B). Those scores correspond to General Education's four-point scale as follows:

| Numeric Score | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Education <br> Scale Conversion | High <br> evidence | Moderate evidence |  | Low evidence | No/Limited <br> evidence |  |

Faculty scored a total of $n=690$ essay assignments selected from the English Department's ENG 1020 and ENG 1050 courses, with 100 different essays selected from this pool of 690 essays for scoring of each learning outcome. They selected the "Researched Argument Project" to score learning outcomes 1 through 3 and the "Reflective Letter Project" to score learning outcomes 4 through 6. Two teams of faculty scored the selected essays and assigned each essay two scores. The English Department averaged these scores, calculating non-whole number ratings for each essay. The average agreement between raters is displayed for each learning outcome under the term "inter-rater reliability," where 1 indicates complete agreement and 0 indicates no agreement. For the Fall 2018 and Winter 2019 data presented here, agreement among raters ranged from 0.642 to 0.843 which indicates moderate to high levels of agreement between the teams (Cicchetti, 1994).

Overall, results indicated a large percentage of students in the sample of BC courses performed at the "moderate" level or higher. Figures 1-8 display the results for each of the seven learning outcomes and a composite of all seven learning outcomes for BC.


Figure 1 is the distribution of average student scores across all seven BC learning outcomes. A large majority of students scored "moderate" or above across every outcome.

Sample Size: 690

Note: Totals in each figure may not sum to $100 \%$ due to rounding.

## INDIVIDUAL LEARNING OUTCOME RESULTS



Basic Composition Learning Outcome 1:
Use reading strategies in order to identify, analyze, evaluate, and respond to arguments, rhetorical elements, and genre conventions in college-level texts and other media.

Inter-rater Reliability:
Team 1: 0.735
Team 2: 0.771
Sample Size: 100



Basic Composition Learning Outcome 2:
Learn flexible research methods in order to effectively identify, select, evaluate, and apply secondary research that is appropriate to the scope and topic of a persuasive argument.

## Inter-rater Reliability:

Team 1: 0.772
Team 2: 0.843
Sample Size: 100

## Basic Composition Learning Outcome 3:

Develop critical literacy strategies to effectively and responsibly quote, paraphrase, summarize, and synthesize secondary research sources in order to compose persuasive arguments.

Note: Percent total in figure 4 is an average of two criteria, and therefore does not sum to $100 \%$.

Inter-rater Reliability:
Criterion 1 Team 1: 0.737
Criterion 1 Team 2: 0.772
Criterion 2 Team 1: 0.740
Criterion 2 Team 2: 0.820
Sample Size: 100



## Basic Composition Learning Outcome 4:

Learn theories and practices of written composition and rhetoric related to the writing process, including genre conventions of public and/or academic discourse communities and strategies for reading, drafting, writing, rewriting, and editing.

Inter-rater Reliability:
Team 1: 0.744
Team 2: 0.741
Sample Size: 135

## Basic Composition Learning Outcome 5:

Applies rhetorical knowledge to develop persuasive research-based written arguments intended for public and/or academic audiences, including techniques of rhetorical analysis of written texts and rhetorical strategies for composing arguments.

Inter-rater Reliability:
Team 1: 0.671
Team 2: 0.778
Sample Size: 60


Basic Composition Learning Outcome 6:
Compose persuasive arguments using a flexible writing process that includes instructor and peer feedback through multiple drafts of writing projects that incorporate varied writing media.

Inter-rater Reliability:
Team 1: 0.642
Team 2: 0.786
Sample Size: 60


Basic Composition Learning Outcome 7:
Use reflection and reflective writing to develop metacognition on the writing and research processes to plan, monitor, and evaluate one's own learning and writing.

Inter-rater Reliability:
Team 1: 0.811
Team 2: 0.788
Sample Size: 135
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| College/School | Department | Course Number | Course Title |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Liberal Arts and Science | English | ENG 1020 | Introductory College Writing |
| Liberal Arts and Science | English | ENG 1050 | Freshman Honors: Introductory College <br> Writing |

## APPENDIX B: BASIC COMPOSITION (BC) RUBRIC

Outcome 1 (Reading): Use reading strategies in college-level texts and other media in order to analyze, evaluate, and respond to arguments, rhetorical elements, and genre conventions

|  | High <br> evidence | Moderate evidence |  | Low evidence |  | Limited/No <br> evidence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Responds to, <br> evaluates, and/or <br> analyzes college level <br> texts/media | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Outcome $\mathbf{2}$ (Research): Learn flexible research methods in order to effectively identify, select, evaluate, and apply secondary research that is appropriate to the scope and topic of a persuasive argument.

|  | High <br> evidence | Moderate evidence |  | Low evidence |  | Limited/No <br> evidence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection of multiple <br> varied resources <br> (including popular and <br> academic) sources in <br> text and/or works cited | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Outcome 3 (Citation): Develop critical literacy strategies to effectively and responsibly quote, paraphrase, summarize and synthesize secondary-research sources in order to compose persuasive arguments.

|  | High <br> evidence | Moderate evidence |  | Low evidence |  | Limited/No <br> evidence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summarizes, quotes, <br> and/or paraphrases <br> secondary sources | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Synthesizes secondary <br> research (puts texts in <br> conversation with one <br> another) | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Outcome 4 (Writing): Learn theories and practices of written composition and rhetoric related to the writing process, including genre conventions of public and/or academic discourse communities and strategies for reading, drafting, writing, rewriting, and editing.
Decision Rule: Record only the lower score of the two for each essay.

|  | High <br> evidence | Moderate evidence |  | Low evidence |  | Limited/No <br> evidence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paragraph organization <br> (topic sentence, <br> paragraph <br> development) | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Editing (grammar, <br> punctuation, spelling, <br> awkward sentences) | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Outcome 5 (Argument): Applies rhetorical knowledge to develop persuasive research-based written arguments intended for public and/or academic audiences, including techniques of rhetorical analysis of written texts and rhetorical strategies for composing arguments

|  | High <br> evidence | Moderate evidence |  | Low evidence |  | Limited/No <br> evidence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Relates rhetorical <br> awareness in written <br> arguments (audience, <br> purpose, rhetorical <br> moves, varied <br> argument types, etc.) | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |

Outcome 6 (Process): Compose persuasive arguments using a flexible writing process that includes instructor and peer feedback through multiple drafts of writing projects that incorporate varied writing media.

|  | High <br> evidence | Moderate evidence |  | Low evidence |  | Limited/No <br> evidence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demonstrates a flexible <br> process for composing <br> (annotating texts, <br> rereading, <br> incorporating <br> instructor feedback, <br> engaging in peer <br> review, planning or <br> prewriting, drafting <br> and revising, editing <br> and formatting) | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |

Outcome $\mathbf{7}$ (Reflection): Use written reflection to evaluate one's own learning and writing.
Decision rule: Record only the lower score of the two for each essay.

|  | High <br> evidence | Moderate evidence |  | Low evidence |  | Limited/No <br> evidence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argument (thesis, <br> claim, relation to <br> course outcomes) | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Evidence (examples, <br> analysis, experiences, <br> discussion) | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

