# Table 4.1 Outcomes Assessment Implementation Summary 2011-2012

| Assessment information collected from Department Assessment Plan. | • Diagnostic essay  
| • Mid-semester essay  
| • A documented research paper.  
| • All in-class exercises, writing, homework, drafting, and revisions related to this research paper.  
| • Writing Center 6 Trait Rubric (content, organization, voice, word choice, sentence structure, writing conventions)  
| • English 111 Guidelines for Teachers (incorporate revision, use research to support a specific position, practice library skills, analyze, synthesize, and interpret outside sources, emphasize critical reflection, MLA citation)  
| • **Essays came from Fairbanks campus only. Essays selected from 7 sections of English 111x (6 TA and 1 Adjunct Sections). All students who were enrolled provided their work.** |

| Conclusions drawn from the information collected above and how are faculty collectively involved in drawing conclusions | 1. Composition Program does not have Student Learning Outcomes for English 111x.  
| 2. Student writing did not draw from the same prompt for the diagnostic essay.  
| 3. Research papers met length requirements. They were deductive in nature and report like in effect.  
| 4. Global and local revision took place.  
| 5. Inductive analysis was not a prominent feature of the writing in the sample because essays were largely deductive and or interpretive.  
| 6. Synthesis occurred in the final essay from the use of sources and evidence, such as encyclopedias and author biographies.  
| 7. Reflective writing was not systematically assigned or collected; instead, it was a feature of the process of the research paper and also the diagnostic essay.  
| 8. Explicit instruction was occurring for citation, formatting, and accuracy. Sections required a library visit. |
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| Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above | 1. Composition Program will develop Student Learning Outcomes for English 111x in consultation with the Core Revitalization Committee, with a focus on analysis. A philosophy of the program needs to be developed that addresses the relationship between the 100-level and 200-level core writing component so that it enable knowledge transfer about written communication.  
2. Since mandatory writing placement is now in effect, the “diagnostic” essay will now be referred to as a literacy letter to the instructor, given on the first day of class. The prompt will be shared across sections.  
3. Composition Committee, under the guidance of the Director, needs to re-assess the research paper so that critical thinking is evident.  
4. No change. Continue to emphasize writing as a process and use of the Writing Center.  
5. Drawing on the Frameworks for Student Success document, Composition Committee, under the guidance of the Director, will develop a unit-based, progressive curriculum that supports students with critical analysis and supports instruction on how to assess and scaffold inductive analysis in writing.  
6. Since students are not showing a contextual understanding of evidence, Composition Committee will revise the current guideline that instructs teachers to approach research as support for a position. Related to this revision, more institutional support on what this revision means for pedagogy and assessment in the various contexts of this writing course will be needed.  
7. Reflection, or meta-cognition, in English 111 will be more systematic to enable knowledge transfer.  
8. The Composition Program will continue to partner with the library. Given technological changes as well as UAF’s students’ linguistic diversity, rhetorical situation and context impacts how writers approach writing conventions. The Composition Committee, the Core Revitalization Committee, and teachers of writing across the UAF system including upper-level and graduate courses must contextualize correctness since what makes writing good depends on the situation, the audience and purpose of the text. With the support of the Provost, the Director will work next year to support writing in other contexts at UAF beyond the first year course. |
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