



Assessment of Student Learning Report Form

Contact Person(s): Cynthia Hussain ED.D. **Date of Report Submission:** 10/11/2018

Academic Division: Liberal Arts **Semester Assessment Conducted:** Fall 2014

Discipline/Program/Department: Reading **Identify if assessment is:** First Time

Report Title: Fall 2014 Critical Reading-Thinking Assessment Reading Program

Identify level of assessment:
 Course/Discipline (for assessments within one course or sections of courses related within the discipline)
 Degree/Program (for program specific or core competency assessments within courses that make up a degree)

1a. Describe what you wanted to know about student knowledge, skills or attitudes/beliefs. (If applicable, include if this assessment is of entering students/existing students from programs of study) OR if this is a repeat assessment to "close the loop" - describe what was initially assessed and what changes were implemented.
Reading Faculty wanted to know if students improved their critical reading and thinking skills during the course of a semester.

1b. Identify the courses that were involved in this assessment study:
English 92-Critical Reading

1c. Identify the mode of delivery for participating courses: (Check all that apply.)
 Face-to-Face
 Online

1d. Identify the course objective(s), program/discipline goal(s) or core competency involved in this assessment:
English 92 Course Objectives:
By the end of the semester, the student will demonstrate
c. the ability to apply the critical reading strategy of analysis by breaking broad topics down into their component parts and explaining the relationship of the parts to each other and to the whole.
d. the ability to apply the critical reading strategy of synthesis to understand the connections between seemingly disparate details and make inferences and draw conclusions.
e. the ability to apply the critical reading strategy of evaluation to make judgments about an author's presentation and message.
Program Goals:
The student shall be able to:
Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate to critically read materials.
Institutional Core Competency of Critical Thinking.

2a. Describe how the assessment was conducted/completed:

Students were given a standardized critical reading-thinking pre-test at the beginning of the semester and then were given the same standardized critical reading-thinking post-test at the end of the semester.

2b. What tool was used to collect performance measures?

A standardized critical reading test (paper and online versions)

2c. What was the sample size of the group assessed & the number of possible students?

All English 92 students enrolled and present for the standardized critical reading test were given it. There were 303 students who took the pre-test and 299 students who took the post-test.

3a. What were the results of this assessment? (Organize data in a chart – no interpretation needed here.) If this is a repeat assessment, also share the previous assessment results:

ENG 92 Critical Reading Pre-Assessment Summary –Fall 2014

15 questions	Mean Score: 8.01/15	Standard Deviation: 2.42
Number of students: 303	Median Score: 7.99/15	High score: 14 Low score: 2

ENG 92 Critical Reading Post-Assessment Summary –Fall 2014

15 questions	Mean Score: 8.19/15	Standard Deviation: 2.56
Number of students: 299	Median Score: 8.4/15	High score: 15 Low score: 0

Additional Analysis:

116 scores decreased or 38.8% decreased (by any amount)

49 scores stayed the same or 15.4% remained the same

134 scores increased or 44.8% increased (by any amount)

ENG 92 Critical Reading -Assessment Analysis –Fall 2014

Gender: Male/Female/Pre/Post

	Gender Male Pre/Post		Gender Female-Pre/Post	
	Male- Pre	Male-Post	Female-Pre	Female-Post
Sample Size	102	102	195	195
Mean (out of 15)	8.3	8.1	7.9	8.3
Standard Deviation	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.5
Median	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Range of Scores	Low- 2 High- 13	Low- 0 High- 15	Low- 2 High- 14	Low- 2 High- 13

Race: Pre/Post-

Race-Pre/Post													
	White-Pre	White-Post	Black-Pre	Black-Post	Non-Specified-Pre	Non-Specified-Post	Asian-Pre	Asian-Post	Indian-Pre	Indian-Post	Hispanic-Pre	Hispanic-Post	
Sample Size	136	136	136	136	2	2	6	6	2	2	15	15	
Mean (out of 15)	8.4	8.8	7.9	7.8	9.0	7.0	6.5	7.8	6.5	6.0	6.7	7.5	
Standard Deviation	2.5	2.5	2.2	2.5	5.6	5.6	3.2	3.1	2.1	0.0	2.8	2.5	
Median	8.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	6.5	8.5	6.5	6.0	7.0	7.0	
Range of Scores	Low- 2 High- 14	Low- 3 High- 15	Low- 3 High- 12	Low- 0 High- 13	Low- 5 High- 13	Low- 3 High 11	Low- 3 High- 12	Low- 3 High- 11	Low- 5 High- 8	Low- 6 High- 6	Low- 2 High- 12	Low- 2 High- 12	

ENG 92 Critical Reading -Assessment Analysis –Fall 2014

Ages: Pre/Post

Ages-Pre/Post														
	<18-Pre	<18-Post	18-21-Pre	18-21-Post	22-25-Pre	22-25-Post	26-29-Pre	26-29-Post	30-33-Pre	30-33-Post	34-37-Pre	34-37-Post	38+-Pre	38+-Post
Sample Size	1	1	204	204	33	33	13	13	7	7	13	13	26	26
Mean (out of 15)	6.0	10.0	8.1	8.4	7.7	7.9	8.2	8.7	7.4	7.7	8.1	8.4	7.8	7.2
Standard Deviation	*	*	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.8	2.1	2.3	2.6
Median	6.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.5	7.0
Range of Scores	Low-6 High- 6	Low- 10 High- 10	Low- 2 High- 14	Low- 0 High- 15	Low- 4 High- 12	Low- 3 High- 13	Low- 5 High- 12	Low- 4 High- 11	Low- 5 High- 11	Low- 5 High- 12	Low- 3 High- 12	Low- 4 High- 11	Low- 3 High- 12	Low- 3 High- 12

3b. What was the cut-off point (benchmark) indicating satisfactory student performance for the goal/objective assessed?

Two benchmarks: one was that 70% of the students increased their scores from pre to post tests and secondly, that students have a post test mean score of 10.5 (70%).

4a. What is the faculty analysis/interpretation of these results/trend results?

Faculty believed that the pre and post test results pointed toward more than just ability level as a factor in passing or failing. 38.8% of students decreased between the pre and post tests. Surely they did not regress in their ability level during the course of a semester? While there were high scores of 15/15, there were also low scores of 0/15. If students tried their best on these post tests, how could they get 0 out of 15 correct? Faculty believed that motivation, attitude, and lack of positive academic behaviors played a part in the low post-test scores.

4b. Did the groups meet the benchmark?

No. 44.8% of the students increased from pre to post test scores and the post test mean score was 8.19 (54.6%).

4c. Were there differences in performance based on ethnicity, mode of delivery, GPA, participation in specific support activities, etc.?

Gender did not seem to play a role with the post test mean for males being 8.1 and the post tests mean for females being 8.3.

Only whites and African-Americans had enough numbers (N) to make the scores meaningful. Whites, with an N of 136, had a mean score of 8.8 while African-Americans, with a N of 136, had a mean of 7.9. So in this case, there did seem to be a correlation between ethnicity and the post-test scores.

According to ages, all groups scored means of 7 -8.

5. What changes, if any, do the faculty plan on implementing to improve student performance? [Note: The response to this question is printed in a public document, the OA Report, posted on www.swic.edu without the above information. Please write this response for summary stand-alone statement that the public will understand – what was assessed, analysis of results, and plans for action.]

English 92-Critical Reading students were given a standardized pre and post-test with critical reading questions. Faculty wanted 70% of the students to improve their scores from the pre to post-test but only 44.8% of the students did so. In fact, 38.8% of the students had lower scores on the post-test than they did on the pre-test. These data do not correlate with in-class student performance, which led faculty to conclude that other issues, such as motivation, engagement, and successful academic skills and strategies, played a role in addition to students' ability level. Faculty will work to choose reading materials that engage the students. Faculty recommend that students also enroll in a college success course, such as ED 101, and utilize the Success Center.

For Official Use Only

Submitted By: Hussain, Cynthia	Division: Liberal Arts
Date Reviewed: 2/21/2019	

ENG 92 Critical Reading Pre-Assessment Item Analysis –Fall 2014

15 questions
Number of students: 303

Mean Score: 8.01/15
Median Score: 7.99/15

Standard Deviation: 2.42
High score: 14 Low score: 2

Item No	Correct Answer	% correct	A_Freq	B_Freq	C_Freq	D_Freq	E_Freq
1	C	62.38	29	50	*189	33	0
2	D	30.69	111	73	24	*93	0
3	C	78.88	5	2	*239	57	0
4	A	71.95	*218	56	12	17	0
5	C	51.49	32	32	*156	82	0
6	B	31.02	88	*94	31	90	0
7	C	34.32	69	29	*104	101	0
8	A	81.52	*247	12	13	31	0
9	D	56.44	85	26	21	*171	0
10	C	68.32	37	20	*207	38	0
11	A	55.78	*169	42	79	8	4
12	C	46.53	41	59	*141	61	0
13	B	37.95	29	*115	70	88	0
14	B	56.11	45	*170	53	34	0
15	D	37.62	104	38	42	*114	0

ENG 92 Critical Reading Post-Assessment Item Analysis –Fall 2014

15 questions
Number of students: 299

Mean Score: 8.19/15
Median Score: 8.4/15

Standard Deviation: 2.56
High score: 15 Low score: 0

ItemNo	Correct Answer	% correct	A_Freq	B_Freq	C_Freq	D_Freq	E_Freq
1	C	62.88	32	55	*188	23	0
2	D	33.11	90	75	32	*99	0
3	C	76.92	16	3	*231	49	0
4	A	72.24	*216	58	8	17	0
5	C	50.84	39	34	*152	74	0
6	B	36.12	78	*108	28	85	0
7	C	38.8	48	26	*116	106	0
8	A	80.94	*243	17	13	27	0
9	D	57.53	70	41	16	*172	0
10	C	68.9	37	28	*206	28	0
11	A	54.52	*163	41	79	7	9
12	C	55.52	48	42	*166	42	0
13	B	35.45	25	*106	80	87	0
14	B	55.18	48	*165	56	30	0
15	D	40.47	91	48	39	*121	0

Additional Analysis:

116 scores decreased or 38.8% decreased

49 scores stayed the same or 15.4% remained the same

134 scores increased or 44.8% increased

ENG 92 Critical Reading -Assessment Analysis –Fall 2014

Gender: Male/Female/Pre/Post

	Gender Male Pre/Post		Gender Female-Pre/Post	
	Male- Pre	Male-Post	Female-Pre	Female-Post
Sample Size	102	102	195	195
Mean	8.3	8.1	7.9	8.3
Standard Deviation	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.5
Median	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Range of Scores	Low- 2 High- 13	Low- 0 High- 15	Low- 2 High- 14	Low- 2 High- 13

Race: Pre/Post-

	Race-Pre/Post											
	White- Pre	White- Post	Black- Pre	Black- Post	Non- Specified Pre	Non- Specified Post	Asian- Pre	Asian- Post	Indian- Pre	Indian- Post	Hispanic- Pre	Hispanic- Post
Sample Size	136	136	136	136	2	2	6	6	2	2	15	15
Mean	8.4	8.8	7.9	7.8	9.0	7.0	6.5	7.8	6.5	6.0	6.7	7.5
Standard Deviation	2.5	2.5	2.2	2.5	5.6	5.6	3.2	3.1	2.1	0.0	2.8	2.5
Median	8.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	6.5	8.5	6.5	6.0	7.0	7.0
Range of Scores	Low- 2 High- 14	Low- 3 High- 15	Low- 3 High- 12	Low- 0 High- 13	Low- 5 High- 13	Low- 3 High 11	Low- 3 High- 12	Low- 3 High- 11	Low- 5 High- 8	Low- 6 High- 6	Low- 2 High- 12	Low- 2 High- 12

ENG 92 Critical Reading -Assessment Analysis –Fall 2014

Ages: Pre/Post

Ages-Pre/Post														
	<18- Pre	<18- Post	18-21- Pre	18-21- Post	22-25- Pre	22-25- Post	26-29- Pre	26-29- Post	30-33- Pre	30-33- Post	34-37- Pre	34-37- Post	38+- Pre	38+- Post
Sample Size	1	1	204	204	33	33	13	13	7	7	13	13	26	26
Mean	6.0	10.0	8.1	8.4	7.7	7.9	8.2	8.7	7.4	7.7	8.1	8.4	7.8	7.2
Standard Deviation	*	*	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.8	2.1	2.3	2.6
Median	6.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.5	7.0
Range of Scores	Low-6 High- 6	Low- 10 High- 10	Low- 2 High- 14	Low- 0 High- 15	Low- 4 High- 12	Low- 3 High- 13	Low- 5 High- 12	Low- 4 High- 11	Low- 5 High- 11	Low- 5 High- 12	Low- 3 High- 12	Low- 4 High- 11	Low- 3 High- 12	Low- 3 High- 12