

GE Course Assessment Plan (Faculty/Instructor Version)

Please submit your GE course assessment plan to your chair as soon as possible. All plans need to be received by the chair of the GE Board, Dr. Lynn Spangler. The assessment plan should be emailed to spanglel@newpaltz.edu with a hard copy to her at Liberal Arts and Sciences, JFT 608.

Course Instructor Composition Program Faculty

Course Number ENG 180 and ENG 206

Course Name Composition II and General Honors English II

Particular Section(s) All

Area (GE Category or Competency) Basic Communication: Oral

1. Describe the assignment(s) that will be used to assess each learning outcome (objective) for this area, and state when in the semester the assignment will occur. (To insure proper sampling of students, we suggest that these be *required* assignments.)

In Composition II and Honors English II courses, all students will present an argumentative or persuasive presentation based on the MLA-documented research essay, which requires navigation of the SUNY New Paltz library website and materials, as well as basic research writing techniques specific to the essay assignment. The argument or analysis-based research essay will include a scholarly works cited page (including a variety of sources, such as books, reference materials, databases, scholarly journals, periodicals, microfilm, and microfiche).

In conducting assessment of Basic Communication: Oral, the Composition Committee will evaluate: Composition II and General Honors English II presentations about research essays.

2. Attach a rubric that describes the level of student performance that constitutes “Exceeds,” “Meets,” “Approaches,” and “Does not Meet” for each learning outcome. (Be sure to design assignments and rubrics so that clear distinctions can be drawn among the four levels.)

Please see attached. Note that the following point scale will be applied to ensure that the assessment is consistent for each level of proficiency. We developed the scale by multiplying three, the total number of learning outcome categories (Argument, Organization, and Delivery) by four, the total number of proficiency levels in descending order (Exceeds-4, Meets-3, Approaches-2, Does not Meet-1). For example, the highest total a student can earn within the Exceeds category equals 12 points (3 learning outcome categories x 4 proficiency levels), while the highest total s/he can earn for the Meets

proficiency is 9 points (3 learning outcome categories multiplied by 3, and so on). Since a score of 12 (perfect presentation) or otherwise exactly corresponding scores within other learning outcome categories (e.g., score of straight 3's in the "Meets" category) is rare, we offer a point range for each proficiency level. The point scale is: Exceeds (10-12); Meets (7-9); Approaches (5-6); and Does not Meet (4 or fewer).

Peer reviewers will apply the same rubric as our instructors to oral presentations, assessing each category (Argument, Organization, and Delivery) and then applying the point system (e.g., 3 through 12 possible) to determine overall level of proficiency (Exceeds, Meets, Approaches, or Does not Meet) for one learning outcome (i.e., Students will develop proficiency in oral discourse).

3. How will you ensure that different instructors will use the rubric consistently? (This is "inter-rater reliability." For example, samples of student work could be provided and instructors could evaluate assignments together in a "norming session.")

We will introduce the assessment and offer training in the teaching of Basic Communication: Oral for spring 2010 at our all-Composition faculty retreat on October 30, 2009. This meeting focuses on annual internal assessment of student writing, including practice calibration sessions to prepare instructors for portfolio internal assessment on Common Final Exam day.

Our program's writing rubric for internal assessment reflects the Basic Communication: Oral rubric for external assessment, specifically the criteria for argument and organization. The calibration session will reinforce programmatic expectations for our students' abilities in terms of both written and oral communication. It also will focus and unify our programmatic vision of what makes for successful, well-rounded, scholarly, and ethically sound student writing, on which the oral presentation assignment is based.

At the October 30 retreat, the teacher-training workshop for oral communication will be led by consultant Professor Anne Goding, Department of Communication and Media, SUNY New Paltz.

During February 2010, we will conduct additional Composition faculty calibration sessions to acquaint instructors with external assessment procedures for Basic Communication: Oral. The attached rubrics will be distributed and reviewed, then applied to sample oral presentations recorded in fall 2009 for this purpose.