Illinois Valley Community College

Course(s) Assessment Report: Interpreting and Reflecting Upon Assessment Results

Assessment Reports describe how faculty approached assessing a course or series of courses, what their results indicate, especially over time, and what the implications are for the future of the teaching, assessing, and evaluation of the course or courses. These build on the Assessment Plans that list which ILOs are permissible avenues for collecting, based on the objectives and competencies from the master course outline.

Course Subject: ENG   **Course Number(s):** 1001 and 1002

Assessed Section #(s): Multiple

Initial Report Date: **22 April 2025**

First Follow-up Report Date: TBD

Report Author(s) Name(s): *The Department of English*
(Kimberly M. Radek-Hall, Kirk Lockwood, Lori Cinotte, Delores Robinson, Nora Villarreal, Tracy Lee, and the late Jean Forst)

Department/Discipline: English

Division: Humanities, Fine Arts, & Social Sciences

Program: Transfer

Which ILOs were assessed? Please check the applicable boxes.

Goal 1. Communication*: To communicate effectively*	
Is the student proficient in **communicating to or with a specific audience?** (Outcome 1.1)	■
Is the student proficient in **demonstrating purpose and organization?** (Outcome 1.2)	☐
Is the student proficient in **synthesizing and supporting ideas?** (Outcome 1.3)	☐
Goal 2. Inquiry*: To apply critical, logical, creative, aesthetic, or quantitative analytical reasoning to formulate a judgment or conclusion*	
Is the student proficient in **gathering and selecting information?** (Outcome 2.1)	☐
Is the student proficient in **analyzing or investigating data?** (Outcome 2.2)	☐
Is the student proficient in **articulating reasons for decisions or solutions?** (Outcome 2.3)	☐
Goal 3. Social Consciousness*: To articulate what it means to be a socially conscious person, locally and globally*	
Is the student proficient in **describing a social system, theoretical framework, culture, or lifestyle?** (Outcome 3.1)	☐
Is the student proficient in **appreciating diverse perspectives or differences within social, theoretical, or cultural systems?** (Outcome 3.2)	☐
Goal 4. Responsibility: To recognize how personal choices affect self and society	
Is the student proficient in **articulating an assessment of self in relation to others?** (Outcome 4.1)	☐
Is the student proficient in **demonstrating awareness of personal responsibility and positioning within a larger context, culture, community, or system of thought?** (Outcome 4.2)	☐

Please describe how these were assessed. Feel free to comment upon or describe significant differences across sections.

For this first at-bat, we considered the first ILO criterion: the students' proficiency communicating to or with a specified audience. We explain in our Assessment Plan that we assess formal student essays that 1) are persuasive or argumentative, 2) use and quote from sources, 3) are of at least three (ENG 1001) or four (ENG 1002) pages in length, 4) have been revised from an earlier draft, and 5) adhere to the rules of standard English grammar and style—and which are submitted in the second half of the course. Then, as we grade the essay with our standard rubric (see below), we also evaluate the student's work against the relevant ILOs and enter that data into our Brightspace courses to be captured. If students direct their arguments to the expected audience and address the essay's requirements in terms of support, expression, and style, then we feel comfortable that they understand their rhetorical situation.

The Grading Criteria for Writing Assignments of Illinois Valley Community College's English Department		
Purpose	Thesis	The thesis is the central idea of the essay that is appropriate for the assignment, gives the essay a controlling sense of purpose, and establishes a sustained and consistent focus. The thesis statement concisely expresses the main idea and previews the supporting ideas.
	Audience	The content and style are tailored for the intended audience.
	Format	The essay is formatted according to the standards of the discipline.
	Content	The essay meets assignment requirements.
Organization	Essay Structure	The essay demonstrates a logical progression of ideas, provides clear and smooth transitions among ideas, and uses structure appropriate to an academic essay.
	Body Paragraphs	All body paragraphs include a main idea expressed in a topic sentence strongly tied to the stated thesis, unified supporting details, and clear connections among ideas.
	Introduction and Conclusion	The introduction captures the reader's attention, transitions to the topic by giving context or background information, and presents the thesis statement. The conclusion reemphasizes the essay's thesis and main ideas and provides a sense of closure.
Support	Development of Ideas	The body supports the thesis with ample evidence; uses a variety of specific examples, quotations, or other details; and explains the evidence to show its connections to the thesis.
	Level of Thought	The essay presents clear, sophisticated, insightful ideas that recognize the complexity of the topic without inaccuracies or errors in reasoning.
	Use and Documentation of Sources	The essay accurately quotes and paraphrases credible sources, effectively balances source material with the writer's own ideas, and cites and documents correctly according to the standards of the discipline.
Expression	Use of Standard Written English	The essay is written in Standard English without errors in sentence boundaries, spelling, punctuation, mechanics, and grammar.
	Style	The essay is written in a consistent, academic tone, using varied sentence structure and accurate and precise word choice.

What were your assessment results?

ENG RESULTS (1001 AND 1002)

	# of Assessments	Success Rate	# of Assessments	Success Rate	# of Assessments	Success Rate	# of Assessments	Success Rate	# of Assessments	Success Rate	# of Assessments	Success Rate
	COM01.01	COM01.01	COM01.02	COM01.02	COM01.03	COM01.03	INQ02.01	INQ02.01	INQ02.02	INQ02.02	INQ02.03	INQ02.03
20FA	15	.87	11	1	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
21SP	11	.82	39	.8	47	.89	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
21FA	38	.79	0	NA	0	NA	17	076	17	.59	17	.86
22SP	28	.86	29	.97	0	NA	20	.9	7	.86	20	.9
22FA	106	.89	11	.64	54	.79	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
23SP	21	.91	5	1	86	.79	15	.93	0	NA	0	NA
	219		95		187		52		24		37	

Prior to Spring 2023 we did not have easily separable data from ENG 1001 and 1002, and we were not necessarily

all evaluating formal writing. The Assessment Plan came after the initial piloting of the ILOs in Blackboard, and the process is much improved since then.

As we began to use Brightspace for data collections, we could see that we had higher participation levels, since from Fall 2020 to Spring 2023 (see above), we assessed 219 students on this ILO criterion. By Summer 2023 to Summer 2024, we had assessed nearly 1500 students (1493) and even had three Dual Credit (non FT-IVCC) faculty contributing to those totals.

Proficiency by Semesters by Course

ENG 1001

9 instructors

995 students

ENG 1002

6 instructors

498 students

			ENG 1001		ENG 1002
1	ILO1.1				
2					
3			ENG 1001		ENG 1002
4					
5	Summer 2023		77.3		
6	Fall 2023		79.8		89.5
7	Spring 2024		78		91.9
8	Summer 2024		94.1		88.5
9	Fall 2024		88.7		
10					

Did students meet, exceed, or fall below expectations? Why? (Feel free to delineate each ILO separately and include supporting explanation.)

As assessment participation goes up, we have seen student proficiency scores of ILO 1.1 go up. We will watch to see if this trend continues or if we just had a more skilled class of students over 2024, as compared to 2023. What gets interesting and comforting is that we began to see Adjunct/Dual Credit data added to full-time faculty's reported data and, in comparing the proficiency rates between them, we see that they are very consistent.

On another note, in ENG 1002, the proficiency rates for ILO 1.1 seem very high. There might be multiple reasons for this:

1) This could be because students have mastered this in ENG 1001.

2) This could be because the assessment that occurs at the end of ENG 1002 has afforded them much more practice (i.e., learning).

3) This could be because we do not have enough people reporting data from ENG 1002, compared to in ENG 1001, as the culminating product of the research paper takes so much time to grade that faculty may be unwilling or unable to take the extra time to report that data from that course with the rush to grade those essays, especially as students must pass the research paper to get a C in the class and have it count in the IAI transfer program.

We did notice that four sections of ENG 1001 had lower than 70% proficiency rates, three Fall Dual Credit sections (one 2023, two 2024) and a Spring 2024 online one—but given that those students are generally less prepared, we see it as a sign of integrity in the process rather than a cause for concern. If these numbers continue to be low, we may want to consider some interventions or support for those students.

Proficiency by Delivery Method	
ENG 1001	
On-campus	86.6
Online	86.2
Blended	100
Dual Credit	80.7
ENG 1002	
On-campus	88.7
Online	88.5
Blended	
Dual Credit	**100**

Where we assessed the most students, we see what we believe are the most accurate results. Over time, as we assess more students, our results may go down—but the general average success rate for all students from this period is trending toward over 80%, which we are pleased with. Future semesters' data might make us determine that interventions in curriculum or support are necessary, but with this ILO at this time, we are satisfied—and will try to increase our participation in reporting this data from ENG 1002.

What does studying the data suggest is an area that could or should be focused upon for improvement?

Our first takeaway is that we need to document our students' successes more frequently and accurately in ENG 1002, especially—and in both courses in their off semesters, i.e., assessing in ENG 1001 in the Spring and ENG 1002 in the Fall—so that we can see the big picture of the data. Comparing this to other ILOs in future reports will give us more information about what and how our students are learning, and comparing all of that data to the DWF rates might be very instructive.

What methods or resources are within your control to use to try to enact positive change?

While satisfied with our initial efforts and the students' success rates on this lone ILO, we do believe that more support of students who are not successful—in ENG 0909 or 0920—should help increase our success rates. Likewise, we can refer students to our office hours or to tutoring support or the Writing Center more regularly, as well.

What institutional changes might be implemented to improve these results?

With just this data, we cannot speculate—but it will give us a very good baseline to see how some proposed changes (if implemented) change our outcomes in the future. Certainly, if our numbers go down, we want to look at our curriculum or perhaps rethink how we accept students into the class (if they are not really prepared for it), how many students are in each class, how we remediate or support students who have inferior skills.

Who else should know about these results? How do they fit with the mission, values, and strategic or other plans of the college?

The academic dean should be aware of these results, as well as the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The Dual Credit high school principals might want to see this data, too. As a department, we interpret the data as indicating that we are successfully teaching the skills necessary for students to master ILO 1.1, and the students are successfully demonstrating their competence. This data provides a good baseline for some discussions about complying with state and federal policies regarding communication general education and has implications for developmental offerings, as well.

Of course, students who have demonstrated this outcome illustrate that we are supporting the mission and communicating our core values to the students, who, ideally, can then communicate them to their family and friends. Further, students who do not learn this outcome will be unlikely to be able to explain to anyone anything that they've learned. The knowledge they accrue, otherwise, is not as valuable if it cannot be communicated.

Please submit the completed report to the Assessment Committee.

Follow-up Report #1 Date: **Target Spring 2026**

Which ILOs were assessed? Please check the applicable boxes.

Goal 1. Communication: *To communicate effectively*	
Is the student proficient in **communicating to or with a specific audience?** (Outcome 1.1)	☐
Is the student proficient in **demonstrating purpose and organization?** (Outcome 1.2)	☐
Is the student proficient in **synthesizing and supporting ideas?** (Outcome 1.3)	☐
Goal 2. Inquiry: *To apply critical, logical, creative, aesthetic, or quantitative analytical reasoning to formulate a judgment or conclusion*	
Is the student proficient in **gathering and selecting information?** (Outcome 2.1)	☐
Is the student proficient in **analyzing or investigating data?** (Outcome 2.2)	☐
Is the student proficient in **articulating reasons for decisions or solutions?** (Outcome 2.3)	☐
Goal 3. Social Consciousness: *To articulate what it means to be a socially conscious person, locally and globally*	
Is the student proficient in **describing a social system, theoretical framework, culture, or lifestyle?** (Outcome 3.1)	☐
Is the student proficient in **appreciating diverse perspectives or differences within social, theoretical, or cultural systems?** (Outcome 3.2)	☐
Goal 4. Responsibility: To recognize how personal choices affect self and society	
Is the student proficient in **articulating an assessment of self in relation to others?** (Outcome 4.1)	☐
Is the student proficient in **demonstrating awareness of personal responsibility and positioning within a larger context, culture, community, or system of thought?** (Outcome 4.2)	☐

Please describe how these were assessed.

What were your assessment results? Did the students' performance improve or decline compared to the past assessment results? Why? (Feel free to delineate each ILO separately and include supporting explanation.) What are possible reasons for these changes, if any?

(Please copy the above form to add another assessment cycle to this report.)

What does studying (and comparing) the data suggest is an area that could or should be focused upon for improvement? What methods or resources are within your control to use to try to enact positive change? What institutional changes might be implemented to improve these results?

Please submit the completed follow-up report to the Assessment Committee.