Wichita State University English 101 Assessment Breakdown and Evaluation Academic Year Fall 2010 through Spring 2011 Submitted by Darren DeFrain, Director of the Writing Program

OBJECTIVES: The goal of this assessment was to help determine student perception of course goals effectiveness, faculty effectiveness, and overall curriculum effectiveness as well as the students' practical application of essay-writing skills (the emphasis of English 101). This assessment also was designed to look closely at sections of English 101 Science Writing (for fall 2010 and also with brief commentary on English 102 spring 2011) and English 101 Online.

The anonymous survey, also included, asks students a series of questions regarding their satisfaction with the way their class met prescribed course goals, the specific effectiveness of their instructor, and the curriculum's effectiveness in helping them to learn appropriate writing skills. Each question asked students to rate their answers on a three point scale reflecting dissatisfaction, satisfaction, or exceeding expectations. There was also room for additional commentary at the end of the survey. This survey was conducted near the end of the semester.

The expectations for the survey were that the course goals, instructor, and curriculum would average out at least meeting student perceptions for success. In all sections of the survey an average score of > or = 2 on any response would indicate overall satisfaction with those goals. The individualized statistics, including the numbers of valid responses, numbers of missing responses, mean, median, and standard deviation are all included on the frequencies sheets attached to this report.

This assessment also considers the practical application of students essay writing abilities by comparing scores of diagnostic essays done at the start of the semester with the students' exam examination grade (following the exact same guidelines as the diagnostic but with different essay prompts). Both of the essays (diagnostic and exit exam) were graded on the same 5 point scale using the English 101 grading rubric. These scores and the grading rubric are also included with the supplementary materials of this report.

OUTCOMES: Where applicable and as helpful I will compare statistics to previous years. Most of these 101 courses were taught by our first year Graduate Teaching Assistants (or GTAs). Most of these GTAs have had little-to-no teaching experience when they start here in the fall, and every year our spring assessment shows significant improvement in satisfaction scores. Of note: A solid number of respondents (262 or 63.7%) marked their GTA's "knowledge of materials" as a perfect score of 3 in the fall semester.

The fall 2010 average exit examination grade was 3.01 (equivalent to a strong C grade by our standards the equivalency scale is also included in the supplementary materials). This grade v markedly higher than those of our adjunct instructors (2.38) and lower

than those of our concurrent faculty (3.22). The historical range of these scores has been fairly consistent with adjuncts recording lower grades than GTAs and concurrents recording the highest grades. The fall course grade was a 2.34 for courses taught by GTAs (up from the previous year), 2.38 for instructors (down from the previous year's 3.02), and 3.22 (statistically equivalent to the 3.29 the previous year) for concurrent faculty. The average grade of 2.52 is consistent with the exit exam grade equivalent of a C and is within range of the prior year's 2.49. The diagnostic average for GTA courses was 2.0, demonstrating good progress over the semester. Adjunct instructor diagnostics averaged 2.9, showing less improvement but consistency with the other scores above. Concurrents did not provide date even after repeated attempts to solicit cooperation. Online sections had only 2.3 diagnostics, 2.15 exit exam average, and a low 1.59 overall grade average. These sections had low reporting and low overall numbers affected by several students "unofficially dropping" the course without withdrawing (earning them failing grades). The Science Writing courses had diagnostic averages of 3.4, exit exam averages of 3.83, and overall grade averages of 3.0. All well above overall averages.

The spring 2011 average course grade for GTA courses was 2.15, for adjunct-taught courses the average was markedly higher at 3.30, though only one adjunct faculty reported for this semester. For concurrent teachers the average grade was 3.22. The concurrent grade was again noticeably higher than the on-campus sections, however the differential continues to improve. The average diagnostic score for GTAs was 2.43. Concurrents failed to report scores for the third time in as many years. The adjunct instructor also did not report diagnostic scores. GTA exit exams scores averaged 2.62, inconsistent with the average grade of 3.49 by the lone instructor section and 3.76 from concurrents, but consistent with the 2.84 overall average. The exit exam scores are especially significant as they are graded by the course instructor and another instructor and then averaged for the final grade. All of these scores are included with the supplementary materials. Science Writing 101 was not taught in the spring, but as the overall 102 curriculum was being "overhauled" by our new 102 coordinator, Mary Sherman, including her development of new assessment procedures more in line with 101, I would like to record here that the 102 Science Writing scores were as follows: diagnostic average of 3.4, exit exam average of 3.62 (a full point higher than the 101 averages for GTAs), and overall grade average of 2.79. Though it is comparing apples to oranges in most ways to look at comparisons between 101 and 102 exit exam scores, the 1 point difference here combined with the very high scores in 101 at the very least demonstrate the real potential for these courses.

Survey data is included in this package and marked as 'Faculty', 'Concurrent' and unmarked. The latter group consists of GTA averages. All scores were consistent with previous years' reports and within expectations.

RECOMMENDATIONS: While the spring surveys indicate an improved overall satisfaction with our English 101 curriculum I think we will need to continue this assessment for the foreseeable future. We have made some changes to our 101 curriculum, though the most notable has been a shift to a new publisher for the coming year and an investment in Turning Point Clicker technology to try to address sentencelevel concerns. We have maintained the same modes-based progression, though, and will continue to use that approach for the foreseeable future.

We will continue to require that GTAs, adjunct instructors, and concurrent instructors all submit data for these assessments. Due to the complete disregard for assessment compliance by one of our concurrent schools, North High, I have to recommend that they no longer be allowed to participate as a concurrent program affiliated with WSU. I hope this will send a message to our other concurrent teachers who have, typically at best, sporadic compliance with assessment requests.

Concerns with the higher grades given to concurrent students will also be continuously monitored. Concurrent teachers typically have students who are more motivated and are upper quartile or 2nd quartile students vs. the wide array of abilities we see in the campus classes, so this may allow for some elevation of scores in those courses. Regardless, everyone teaching English 101 for WSU will be made aware of these results and will be encouraged to dialogue with the Composition Committee about concerns, recommendations, and supportive comments.

Supplementary Material Index

- \mathbf{A} WSU English 101 Exit Survey
- Frequencies for Fall 2010 Exit Exam В
- Frequencies for Spring 2011 Exit Exam \mathbf{C}
- Fall 2010 Exit Exam and Final Grade Data D
- Spring 2011 Exit Exam and Final Grade Data \mathbf{E}
- \mathbf{F} Exit Exam Grade Equivalency Memo
- G 6 Trait Grading Rubric



Wichita State University Writing Program English 101 Student Exit Survey

Note to students: W.S.U. continually measures and assesses achievement of its program educational outcomes. Through this survey, The Writing Program collects information for such assessment. This information is strictly confidential and we try to collect it in as anonymous and unobtrusive manner as possible. None of the information collected here is used to influence or determine grades. For these reasons, please <u>do not write your name or ID number on this form</u>. Also, to help us best record and tabulate our analysis we ask that you complete all sections of the survey. Thank you for your cooperation, and know that by participating in this survey you are helping to ensure that Wichita State University continues to improve its already high levels of academic rigor and achievement.

1. Course Goals Survey. Rate your impression of the overall effectiveness of your English 101 course based on your experience and using the scale below.

Questions	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I feel that, overall, this course has helped me learn to			
recognize weak points in the ways I express and organize my			
ideas.			
2. This course has helped me find ways to generate ideas for		:	
writing assignments.			
3. This course has helped me learn how to best structure my	1		
essays so that they are unified, coherent, and organized.			
4. This course has helped me learn how to best structure my			
approach to writing assignments. (After taking this class I			
better understand how to create an effective writing strategy,			
work in draft stages, and organize my materials).			
5. This course has prepared me to better locate surface and/or			
mechanical problems in my writing.			
6. This course has helped me more effectively re-think and			
revise drafts of my work.			

2. Course Faculty Survey. Rate the overall effectiveness of your English 101 instructor based on your experience and using the scale below.

FACULTY SURVEY	Poor	Adequate	Good to Excellent
1. How would you rate this instructor's overall effectiveness?			
2. How would you rate this instructor's classroom management skills?			
3. How would assess this instructor's willingness to assist you outside of class?			
4. How would you assess this instructor's availability to assist you outside of class?			
5. How would you rate this instructor's knowledge of the materials covered?			·
6. How would you rate this instructor's ability to communicate other facilities and programs on campus where you could seek additional help as necessary?			-

3. Course Curriculum Survey. Rate how effectively your English 101 course was in helping you

to develop appropriate writing skills.

CURRICULUM SURVEY	Disagree	Agree	Strongly
·			Agree
1. This course helped me to better understand sentence			
structure.			
2. This course helped me to better understand paragraph			
structure and how to improve weak paragraphs.			
3. After taking this course I can correctly identify topic			
sentences in paragraphs.			
4. After taking this course I have a better understanding of			
effectively structuring my essays.			
5. This course helped me develop effective logic strategies			
related to my writing.			
6. I was provided with the opportunity to consider the			
reading and writing assignments through in-class			-
discussions.			
7. My instructor provided me with the opportunity to work			
with her/him on specific aspects of my writing.			
8. This course has helped improve my understanding of			
correct punctuation.			

- 4. GENERAL COMMENTS:
- A) Instructional effectiveness
- B) Course/Classroom management
- C) Out-of-classroom assistance
- D) Do you have comments or suggestions for improvement?

Frequencies

Statistics

Otation							
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	١	J					
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation		
Recognize weak points	29	0	2.45	3.00	.632		
Generate ideas differently	29	0	2.48	3.00	.634		
Structure essays better	29	0	2.45	2.00	.506		
Approach assignments effectively	29	.0	2.28	2.00	.649		
Better in locating problems	29	0	2.28	2.00	.528		
Effectively revise drafts	29	0	2.48	3.00	.574		
Instructors overall effectiveness	28	1	2.89	3.00	.315		
Instructors management skills	29	. 0	2.86	3.00	.351		
Willingness to assist outside of class	29	0	2.69	3.00	.541		
Availability outside of class	29	0	2.66	3.00	.553		
Instructors knowledge of materials	29	0	2.90	3.00	.310		
Instructors ability to communicate	29	0	2.48	3.00	.688		
Understand sentence structure	29	0	2.00	2.00	.655		
Understand paragraph structure	29	0	2.34	2.00	.553		
Can identify topic sentences	29	0	2.38	2.00	.561		
Can effectively structure essays	29	0	2.41	2.00	.568		
Develop effective logic strategies	29	0	2.41	2.00	.501		
Consider assignments through discussions	29	0	2.83	3.00	.384		
Opportunity to work with instructor	29	0	2.24	2.00	.636		
Understands correct punctuation	28	1	2.14	2.00	.651		

Frequency Table

Recognize weak points

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	6.9	6.9	6.9
-	Agree	12	41.4	41.4	48.3
	Strongly Agree	15	51.7	51.7	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Generate ideas differently

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	6.9	6.9	6.9
	Agree	11	37.9	37.9	44.8
	Strongly Agree	16	55.2	55.2	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Structure essays better

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	16	55.2	55.2	. 55.2
	Strongly Agree	13	44.8	44.8	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Approach assignments effectively

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	10.3	10.3	10.3
	Agree	15	51.7	51.7	62.1
	Strongly Agree	11	37.9	37.9	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Better in locating problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
	Agree	19	65.5	65.5	69.0
ŀ	Strongly Agree	9	31.0	31.0	100.0
•	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Effectively revise drafts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
Ag	Agree	13	44.8	44.8	, 48.3
	Strongly Agrée	15	51.7	51.7	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Instructors overall effectiveness

		Frequencý	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	3	10.3	10.7	10.7
	Good to Excellent	25	86.2	89.3	100.0
	Total	. 28	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	3.4		
Total		29	100.0		

Instructors management skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	4	13.8	13.8	13.8
1	Good to Excellent	25	86.2	86.2	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Willingness to assist outside of class

•		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
	Adequate	7	24.1	24.1	27.6
	Good to Excellent	21	72.4	72.4	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Availability outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
	Adequate	8	27.6	27.6	31.0
	Good to Excellent	20	69.0	69.0	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Instructors knowledge of materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	3	10.3	10.3	10.3
	Good to Excellent	26	89.7	89.7	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Instructors ability to communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	3	10.3	10.3	10.3
vana	Adequate	9	31.0	31.0	41.4
	Good to Excellent	17	58.6	58.6	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Understand sentence structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	6	20.7	20.7	20.7
	Agree	17	58.6	58.6	79.3
	Strongly Agree	6	20.7	20.7	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Understand paragraph structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
V CINC	Agree	17	58.6	58.6	62.1
	Strongly Agree	11	37.9	37.9	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Can identify topic sentences

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
Valla	Agree	16	55.2	55.2	58.6
	Strongly Agree	12	41.4	41.4	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Can effectively structure essays

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
	Agree	15	51.7	51.7	55.2
	Strongly Agree	13	44.8	44.8	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Develop effective logic strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	17	58.6	58.6	58.6
	Strongly Agree	12	41.4	41.4	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Consider assignments through discussions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	5	17.2	17.2	17.2
	Strongly Agree	. 24	82.8	82.8	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Opportunity to work with instructor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	10.3	10.3	10.3
	Agree	16	55.2	55.2	65.5
	Strongly Agree	10	34.5	34.5	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Understands correct punctuation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	13.8	14.3	14.3
	Agree	16	55.2	57.1	71.4
	Strongly Agree	8	27.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	28	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	3.4		
Total	1	29	100.0		

Frequencies

Statistics

	N	Į.			_
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
Recognize weak points	121	0	2.49	3.00	.549
Generate ideas differently	121	0	2.38	2.00	.581
Structure essays better	121	0	2.47	2.00	.549
Approach assignments effectively	121	0	2.41	2.00	.615
Better in locating problems	121	0	2.44	2.00	.561
Effectively revise drafts	. 121	0	2.40	2.00	.640
Instructors overall effectiveness	121	0	2.83	3.00	.373
Instructors management skills	121	0	2.81	3.00	.415
Willingness to assist outside of class	121	0	2.70	3.00	.494
Availability outside of class	121	0	2.60	3.00	.555
Instructors knowledge of materials	121	0	2.87	3.00	.340
Instructors ability to communicate	121	0	2.59	3.00	.587
Understand sentence structure	121	0	2.31	2.00	.578
Understand paragraph structure	121	0	2.50	3.00	.579
Can identify topic sentences	121	0	2.55	3.00	.516
Can effectively structure essays	121	0	2.60	3.00	.493
Develop effective logic strategies	121	0	2.45	2.00	.532
Consider assignments through discussions	121	0	2.60	3.00	.541
Opportunity to work with instructor	121	0	2.50	3.00	.593
Understands correct punctuation	121	0	2.48	3,00	.564

Frequency Table

Recognize weak points

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	- 3	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Agree Strongly Agree	56	46.3	46.3	48.8
		62	51.2	51.2	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Generate ideas differently

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	6	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Agree	63	52.1	52.1	57.0
	Strongly Agree	52	43.0	43.0	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Structure essays better

·		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Agree	58	47.9	47.9	50.4
Strongly Agree	60	49.6	49.6	100.0	
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Approach assignments effectively

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	8	6.6	6.6	6.6
Agree		55	45.5	45.5	52.1
	Strongly Agree	58	47.9	47.9	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Better in locating problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Agree	60	49.6	49.6	52.9
	Strongly Agree	57	47.1	47.1	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Effectively revise drafts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	10	8.3	8.3	8.3
	Agree	52	43.0	43.0	51.2
Strongly Agre	Strongly Agree	59	48.8	48.8	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	-

Instructors overall effectiveness

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	20	16.5	16.5	16.5
	Good to Excellent	101	83.5	83.5	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Instructors management skills

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	.8	.8	.8
	Adequate	21	17.4	17.4	18.2
	Good to Excellent	99	81.8	81.8	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Willingness to assist outside of class

	***************************************	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	2	1.7	. 1.7	1.7
	Adequate	32	26.4	26.4	28.1
	Good to Excellent	87	71.9	71.9	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Availability outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	4	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Adequate	40	33.1	33.1	36.4
	Good to Excellent	77	63.6	63.6	100.0
	Total	. 121	100.0	100.0	

Instructors knowledge of materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	16	13.2	13.2	13.2
	Good to Excellent	105	86.8	86.8	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Instructors ability to communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	6	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Adequate	38	31.4	31.4	36.4
	Good to Excellent	77	63.6	63.6	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Understand sentence structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	7	5.8	5.8	5.8
	Agree	69	57.0	57.0	62.8
	Strongly Agree	45	37.2	37.2	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Understand paragraph structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	4.1	4.1	4.1
	Agree	51	42.1	42.1	46.3
	Strongly Agree	65	53.7	53.7	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Can identify topic sentences

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	.8	.8	.8
	Agree	53	43.8	43.8	44.6
	Strongly Agree	67	55.4	55.4	100.0
•	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Can effectively structure essays

-		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	49	40.5	40.5	40.5
	Strongly Agree	72	59.5	59.5	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Develop effective logic strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	1.7	1.7	1.7
	Agree	63	52.1	52.1	53.7
	Strongly Agree	56	46.3	46.3	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Consider assignments through discussions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	2.5	2.5	2.5
-	Agree	43	35.5	35.5	38.0
	Strongly Agree	75	62.0	62.0	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Opportunity to work with instructor

·		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	6	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Agree	48	39.7	39.7	44.6
	Strongly Agree	67	55.4	55.4	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Understands correct punctuation

•		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Agree	55	45.5	45.5	48.8
-	Strongly Agree	62	51.2	51.2	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies

Statistics

Cattotico							
	N			•	, ·		
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation		
Recognize weak points	10	0	2.20	2.00	.789		
Generate ideas differently	10	0	2.30	2.50	.823		
Structure essays better	10	0	2.30	2.00	.675		
Approach assignments effectively	10	0	2.10	2.00	.876		
Better in locating problems	10	0	1.80	2.00	.789		
Effectively revise drafts	10	0	1.90	1.50	.994		
Instructors overall effectiveness	10	0	2.50	3.00	.707		
Instructors management skills	10	0	2.40	2.50	.699		
Willingness to assist outside of class	10	0	2.40	2.50	.699		
Availability outside of class	10	0	2.30	2.00	.483		
Instructors knowledge of materials	10	0	2.50	2.50	.527		
Instructors ability to communicate	- 10	0	2.50	2.50	.527		
Understand sentence structure	9	1_	1.89	2.00	.928		
Understand paragraph structure	9	1	1.89	2.00	.928		
Can identify topic sentences	9	1	2.00	2.00	.866		
Can effectively structure essays	9	1	2.22	2.00	.833		
Develop effective logic strategies	9	1	2.22	2.00	.833		
Consider assignments through discussions	9	1	2.00	2.00	.707		
Opportunity to work with instructor	9	1	2.11	2.00	.782		
Understands correct punctuation	8	2	2.25	2.00	.707		

Frequency Table

Recognize weak points

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Agree	4	40.0	40.0	60.0
	Strongly Agree	4	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Generate ideas differently

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Agree	3	30.0	30.0	50.0
	Strongly Agree	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Structure essays better

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
, , , , , ,	Agree	5	50.0	50.0	60.0
	Strongly Agree	4	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Approach assignments effectively

*******		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Agree	3	30.0	30.0	60.0
-	Strongly Agree	4	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Better in locating problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	4	40.0	40.0	80.0
	Strongly Agree	2	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Effectively revise drafts

-		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Agree	1	. 10.0	10.0	60.0
	Strongly Agree	4	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Instructors overall effectiveness

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	10,0	10.0	10.0
	Adequate	3	30.0	30.0	40.0
	Good to Excellent	6	60.0	60.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Instructors management skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Adequate	4	40.0	40.0	50.0
	Good to Excellent	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Willingness to assist outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Adequate	4	40.0	40.0	50.0
	Good to Excellent	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Availability outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	7	70.0	70.0	70.0
T LING	Good to Excellent	3	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Instructors knowledge of materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
Valla	Good to Excellent	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
F	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Instructors ability to communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
Vana	Good to Excellent	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Understand sentence structure

.,,		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	40.0	44.4	44.4
	Agree	2	20.0	22.2	66.7
	Strongly Agree	3	30.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	10.0		
Total		10	100.0		

Understand paragraph structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	40.0	44.4	44.4
	Agree	2	20.0	22.2	66.7
	Strongly Agree	3	30.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	.9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	10.0		
Total		10	100.0		

Can identify topic sentences

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	30.0	33.3	33.3
	Agree	3	30.0	33.3	66.7
	Strongly Agree	3	30.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	10.0		·
Total	<u> </u>	10	100.0		

Can effectively structure essays

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	20.0	22.2	22.2
	Agree	3	30.0	33.3	55.6
	Strongly Agree	4	40.0	44.4	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	10.0		
Total		10	100.0		

Develop effective logic strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	20.0	22.2	22.2
	Agree	3	30.0	33.3	55.6
	Strongly Agree	4	40.0	44.4	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	- 1	10.0		
Total		10	100.0		

Consider assignments through discussions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	20.0	22.2	22.2
	Agree	5	50.0	55.6	77.8
	Strongly Agree	2	20.0	22.2	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	10.0		
Total			100.0		

Opportunity to work with instructor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	20.0	22.2	22.2
	Agree	4	40.0	44.4	66.7
	Strongly Agree	3	30.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	10.0		
Total		10 100.0			

Understands correct punctuation

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	10.0	12.5	12.5
	Agree	4	40.0	50.0	62.5
	Strongly Agree	3	30.0	37.5	100.0
	Total	8	80.0	100.0	
Missing	System	2	20.0		
Total		10	100.0		

Frequencies

Statistics

	١	1			
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
Recognize weak points	410	1	2.21	2.00	.660
Generate ideas differently	410	1	2.05	2.00	.675
Structure essays better	410	1	2.21	2.00	.635
Approach assignments effectively	410	1	2.09	2.00	.695
Better in locating problems	410	1	2.11	2.00	.677
Effectively revise drafts	410	1	2.16	2.00	.683
Instructors overall effectiveness	410	1	2.39	2.00	.659
Instructors management skills	410	1	2.41	2.00	.643
Willingness to assist outside of class	410	1	2.58	3.00	.613
Availability outside of class	409	2	2.50	3.00	.611
Instructors knowledge of materials	410	1	2.60	3.00	.565
Instructors ability to communicate	409	2	2.40	2.00	.631
Understand sentence structure	409	2	1.97	2.00	.684
Understand paragraph structure	409	2	2.07	2.00	.695
Can identify topic sentences	409	2	2.21	2.00	.677
Can effectively structure essays	409	2	2.22	2.00	.647
Develop effective logic strategies	409	2	2.09	2.00	.682
Consider assignments through discussions	409	2	2.40	2.00	.594
Opportunity to work with instructor	407	4	2.26	2.00	.697
Understands correct punctuation	403	8	2.13	2.00	.682

Frequency Table

Recognize weak points

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	55	13.4	13.4	13.4
	Agree	214	52.1	52.2	65.6
	Strongly Agree	141	34.3	34.4	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total		411	100.0		

Generate ideas differently

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	84	20.4	20.5	20.5
	Agree	223	54.3	54.4	74.9
•	Strongly Agree	103	25.1	25.1	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total		411	100.0		

Structure essays better

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	48	11.7	11.7	11.7
	Agree	226	55.0	55.1	66.8
	Strongly Agree	136	33.1	33.2	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2	·	
Total		411	100.0		

Approach assignments effectively

-		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	82	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Agree	209	50.9	51.0	71.0
,	Strongly Agree	119	29.0	29.0	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total	1	411	100.0		

Better in locating problems

	,	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	73	17.8	17.8	17.8
	Agree	217	52.8	52.9	70.7
	Strongly Agree	120	29.2	29.3	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total	<u></u>	411	100.0		

Effectively revise drafts

	itive Time	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	68	16.5	16.6	16.6
	Agree	209	50.9	51.0	67.6
	Strongly Agree	133	32.4	32.4	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2	·	
Total	<u>, l</u>	411	100.0		

Instructors overall effectiveness

	<u> </u>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	40	9.7	9.8	9.8
	Adequate	170	41.4	41.5	51.2
	Good to Excellent	200	48.7	48.8	100.0
*	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total	J	411	100.0		

Instructors management skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	35	8.5	8.5	8.5
	Adequate	173	42.1	42.2	50.7
	Good to Excellent	202	49.1	49.3	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total	2	411	100.0	-	

Willingness to assist outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Α	Poor	27	6.6	6.6	6.6
	Adequate	118	28.7	28.8	35.4
	Good to Excellent	265	64.5	64.6	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total		411	100.0		

Availability outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	25	6.1	6.1	6.1
	Adequate	156	38.0	38.1	44.3
	Good to Excellent	228	55.5	55.7	100.0
	Total	409	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total	1 *	411	100.0		

Instructors knowledge of materials

<u> </u>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	16	3.9	3.9	3.9
	Adequate	132	32.1	32.2	36.1
	Good to Excellent	262	63.7	63.9	100.0
	Total	410	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		`
Total		411	100.0		

Instructors ability to communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	32	7.8	7.8	7.8
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Adequate	180	43.8	44.0	51.8
	Good to Excellent	197	47.9	48.2	100.0
	Total	409	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		411	100.0		

Understand sentence structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	101	24.6	24.7	24.7
	Agree	218	53.0	53.3	78.0
	Strongly Agree	90	21.9	22.0	100.0
	Total	409	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total	1	411	100.0		

Understand paragraph structure

•		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	86	20.9	21.0	21.0
	Agree	210	51.1	51.3	72.4
	Strongly Agree	113	27.5	27.6	100.0
	Total	409	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		411	100.0		

Can identify topic sentences

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	60	14.6	14.7	14.7
	Agree	205	49.9	50.1	64.8
	Strongly Agree	144	35.0	35.2	100.0
	Total	409	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		411	100.0		

Can effectively structure essays

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	50	12.2	12.2	12.2
	Agree	218	53.0	53.3	65.5
	Strongly Agree	141	34.3	34.5	100.0
	Total	409	99.5	100.0	`
Missing	System	2	.5		-
Total	<u> </u>	411	100.0		

Develop effective logic strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	78	19.0	19.1	19.1
	Agree	216	52.6	52.8	71.9
	Strongly Agree	115	28.0	28.1	100.0
	Total	409	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total	1	411	100.0		

Consider assignments through discussions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	23	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Agree	201	48.9	49.1	54.8
	Strongly Agree	185	45.0	45.2	100.0
	Total	409	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total	J	411	100.0		

Opportunity to work with instructor

	,	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	60	14.6	14.7	14.7
	Agree	183	44.5	45.0	59.7
	Strongly Agree	164	39.9	40.3	100.0
	Total	407	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.0		
Total	J	411	100.0		

Understands correct punctuation

,		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	70	17.0	17.4	17.4
	Agree	209	50.9	51.9	69.2
	Strongly Agree	124	30.2	30.8	100.0
	Total	403	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.9		
Total		411	100.0		

Frequencies

Statistics

	N	ļ			
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
Recognize weak points	9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Generate ideas differently	9	0	2.67	3.00	.500
Structure essays better	. 9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Approach assignments effectively	9	0	2.78	3.00	.441
Better in locating problems	9	0	2.89	3.00	333
Effectively revise drafts	9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Instructors overall effectiveness	9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Instructors management skills	9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Willingness to assist outside of class	9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Availability outside of class	9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Instructors knowledge of materials	9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Instructors ability to communicate	9	0	2.89	3.00	.333
Understand sentence structure	8	1	2.63	3.00	.518
Understand paragraph structure	8	1	2.38	2.00	.518
Can identify topic sentences	8	1	2.38	2.00	.518
Can effectively structure essays	8	1	2.63	3.00	.518
Develop effective logic strategies	8	1	2.75	3.00	.463
Consider assignments through discussions	8	1	2.75	3.00	.463
Opportunity to work with instructor-	8	11	2.63	3.00	.518
Understands correct punctuation	7	2_	2.71	3.00	.488

Frequency Table

Recognize weak points

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Strongly Agree	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Generate ideas differently

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Strongly Agree	6	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Structure essays better

	tion ages	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	1	11.1	. 11.1	11.1
	Strongly Agree	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Approach assignments effectively

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	2	22.2	22.2	22.2
	Strongly Agree	7	77.8	77.8	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	. 100.0	

Better in locating problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Strongly Agree	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Effectively revise drafts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Strongly Agree	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Instructors overall effectiveness

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Good to Excellent	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Instructors management skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	1	11.1	11.1	- 11.1
	Good to Excellent	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Willingness to assist outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
Valid	Good to Excellent	. 8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Availability outside of class

	<u> </u>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Good to Excellent	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Instructors knowledge of materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Good to Excellent	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

Instructors ability to communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	1	11.1	11.1	, 11.1
, cana	Good to Excellent	8	88.9	88.9	100.0
-	Total	.9	100.0	100.0	

Understand sentence structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	3	33.3	37.5	37.5
	Strongly Agree	5	55.6	62.5	100.0
! 	Total	8	88.9	100.0	-
Missing	System	1	11.1		٠
Total	•	9	100.0		

Understand paragraph structure

	,	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	5	55.6	62.5	62.5
	Strongly Agree	3	33.3	37.5	100.0
	Total	8	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	11.1		
Total		9	100.0		

Can identify topic sentences

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	5	55.6	62.5	62.5
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Strongly Agree	3	33.3	37.5	100.0
	Total	8	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	11.1		
Total		9	100.0		

Can effectively structure essays

<u></u>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	3	33.3	37.5	37.5
	Strongly Agree	5	55.6	62.5	100.0
	Total	8	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	11.1		
Total	•	9	100.0		

Develop effective logic strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	2	22.2	25.0	25.0
	Strongly Agree	6	66.7	75.0	100.0
	Total	8	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	11.1		
Total		9	100.0		

Consider assignments through discussions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	2	22.2	25.0	25.0
	Strongly Agree	6	66.7	75.0	100.0
	Total	8	88.9	100.0	•
Missing	System	1	11.1		
Total	•	9	100.0		

Opportunity to work with instructor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	3	33.3	37.5	37.5
	Strongly Agree	5	55.6	62.5	100.0
	Total	8	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	11.1		
Total	·	9	100.0		

English 101 Student Exit Survey - SP2011 Faculty

Understands correct punctuation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	2	22.2	28.6	28.6
	Strongly Agree	5	55.6	71.4	100.0
	Total	7	77.8	. 100.0	
Missing	System	2	22.2		
Total		9	100.0		

CFT Priothack On.

Frequencies

Statistics

	١	1						
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation			
Recognize weak points	47	0	2.57	3.00	.542			
Generate ideas differently	47	0	2.28	2.00	.682			
Structure essays better	47	0	2.64	3.00	.568			
Approach assignments effectively	47	0	2.62	3.00	.573			
Better in locating problems	47	0	2.55	3.00	.583			
Effectively revise drafts	47	0	2.32	2.00	.663			
Instructors overall effectiveness	47	0	2.79	3.00	.463			
Instructors management skills	47	0	2.38	2.00	.677			
Willingness to assist outside of class	47	0	2.91	3.00	.282			
Availability outside of class	46	1	2.83	3.00	.383			
Instructors knowledge of materials	47	0	2.96	3.00	.204			
Instructors ability to communicate	47	0	2.36	2.00	.605			
Understand sentence structure	47	0	2.53	3.00	.620			
Understand paragraph structure	47	0	2.62	3.00	.610			
Can identify topic sentences	47	0	2.62	3.00	.534			
Can effectively structure essays	47	0	2.66	3.00	562			
Develop effective logic strategies	47	0	2.43	2.00	.617			
Consider assignments through discussions	47	0	2.53	3.00	.584			
Opportunity to work with instructor	47	0	2.57	3.00	.617			
Understands correct punctuation	46	1	2.76	3.00	.480			

Frequency Table

Recognize weak points

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
	Agree	18	38.3	38.3	40.4
	Strongly Agree	28	59.6	59.6	100.0
<u> </u> 	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Generate ideas differently

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	6	12.8	12.8	12.8
	Agree	22	46.8	46.8	59.6
	Strongly Agree	19	40.4	40.4	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Structure essays better

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	4.3	4.3	. 4.3
ĺ	Agree	13	27.7	27.7	31.9
	Strongly Agree	32	68.1	68.1	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Approach assignments effectively

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	4.3	4.3	4.3
ł	Agree	14	29.8	29.8	34.0
ļ	Strongly Agree	31	66.0	66.0	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Better in locating problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	4.3	4.3	4.3
-	Agree	17	36.2	36.2	40.4
	Strongly Agree	28	59.6	59.6	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Effectively revise drafts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	, 5	10.6	10.6	10.6
	Agree	22	46.8	4 6.8	57.4
	Strongly Agree	20	42.6	42.6	100.0
,	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Instructors overall effectiveness

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
1 4.1.6	Adequate	8	17.0	17.0	19.1
Good to Excellent	38	80.9	80.9	100.0	
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Instructors management skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	5	10.6	10.6	10.6
· cano	Adequate	19	40.4	40.4	51.1
Good to Excellent	23	48.9	48.9	100.0	
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Willingness to assist outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	4	8.5	8.5	8.5
Valid	Good to Excellent	43	91.5	91.5	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	·

Availability outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	8	17.0	17.4	17.4
Vana	Good to Excellent	38	80.9	82.6	100.0
	Total	46	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.1		
Total	<u> </u>	47	100.0		

Instructors knowledge of materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	2	4.3	4.3	4.3
Valla	Good to Excellent	4 5	95.7	95.7	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Instructors ability to communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	3	6.4	6.4	6.4
	Adequate	24	51.1	51.1	57.4
	Good to Excellent	20	42.6	42.6	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Understand sentence structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	6.4	6.4	6.4
İ	Agree	16	34.0	34.0	40.4
	Strongly Agree	28	59.6	59.6	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Understand paragraph structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	6.4	6.4	6.4
	Agree	12	25.5	25.5	31.9
	Strongly Agree	32	68.1	68.1	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Can identify topic sentences

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
	Agree	16	34.0	34.0	36.2
1	Strongly Agree	30	63.8	63.8	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	. 100.0	

Can effectively structure essays

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Agree	12	25.5	25.5	29.8
	Strongly Agree	33	70.2	70.2	100.0
	Total	47	100,0	100.0	

Develop effective logic strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	-3	6.4	6.4	6.4
	Agree	21	44.7	44.7	51.1
	Strongly Agree	23	48.9	48.9	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Consider assignments through discussions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	. 2	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Agree	18	38.3	38.3	42.6
	Strongly Agree	27	57.4	57.4	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Opportunity to work with instructor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	. 3	6.4	6.4	6.4
<u> </u>	Agree	14	29.8	29.8	36.2
	Strongly Agree	30	63.8	63.8	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Understands correct punctuation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	2.1	2.2	2.2
	Agree	9	19.1	19.6	21.7
	Strongly Agree	36	76.6	78.3	100.0
	Total	46	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.1		
Total		47	100.0		

Frequencies

Statistics

	N				:
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
Recognize weak points	237	2	2.32	2.00	.623
Generate ideas differently	237	2	2.13	2.00	.628
Structure essays better	237	2	2.27	2.00	.585
Approach assignments effectively	237	. 2	2.14	2.00	.655
Better in locating problems	237	2	2.16	2.00	.653
Effectively revise drafts	237	2	2.23	2.00	.650
Instructors overall effectiveness	236	3	2.58	3.00	.602
Instructors management skills	236	3	2.59	3.00	.557
Willingness to assist outside of class	235	4	2,68	3.00	.519
Availability outside of class	235	4	2.54	3.00	.586
Instructors knowledge of materials	235	4	2.75	3.00	.497
Instructors ability to communicate	235	4	2,55	3.00	.585
Understand sentence structure	235	4	2.14	2.00	.639
Understand paragraph structure	235	4	2.16	2.00	.660
Can identify topic sentences	234	5	2.28	2.00	.589
Can effectively structure essays	235	4	2.27	2.00	.621
Develop effective logic strategies	235	4	2.16	2.00	.638
Consider assignments through discussions	235	4	2.41	2.00	.580
Opportunity to work with instructor	234	5	2.34	2.00	.602
Understands correct punctuation	229	10	2.24	2.00	.650

Frequency Table

English 101 Student Exit Survey - SP2011

Recognize weak points

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	20	8.4	8.4	8.4
	Agree	121	50.6	51.1	59.5
ŀ	Strongly Agree	96	40.2	40.5	100.0
	Total	237	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		239	100.0		

Generate ideas differently

	<u> </u>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	33	13.8	13.9	13.9
	Agree	140	58.6	59.1	73.0
	Strongly Agree	64	26.8	27.0	100.0
	Total	237	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total	-	239	100.0		

Structure essays better

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	17	7.1	7.2	7.2
1	Agree	139	58.2	58.6	65.8
	Strongly Agree	81	33.9	34.2	100.0
	Total	237	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System .	2	.8		
Total		239	100.0		

English 101 Student Exit Survey - SP2011

Approach assignments effectively

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	36	15.1	15.2	15.2
Vana	Agree	131	54.8	55.3	70.5
· ·	Strongly Agree	70	29.3	29.5	100.0
	Total	237	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	/ 2	.8		
Total	-,	239	100.0		

Better in locating problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	34	14.2	14.3	14.3
Vallu	Agree	130	54.4	54.9	69.2
	Strongly Agree	73	30.5	30.8	100.0
	Total	237	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total	,	239	100.0		

Effectively revise drafts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	29	12.1	12.2	12.2
Valid	Agree	125	52.3	52.7	65.0
	Strongly Agree	83	34.7	35.0	100.0
ļ Ī	Total	237	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total	-,	239	100.0		·

English 101 Student Exit Survey - SP2011

Instructors overall effectiveness

·		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	14	5.9	5.9	5.9
	Adequate	70	29.3	29.7	35.6
	Good to Excellent	152	63.6	64.4	100.0
	Total	236	98.7	100.0	
Missing	4 `	1	.4	•	
	System	2	.8		
	Total	3	1,3		
Total	·	239	100.0		

Instructors management skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	8	3.3	3.4	3.4
, can ca	Adequate	80	33.5	33.9	37.3
	Good to Excellent	148	61.9	62.7	100.0
	Total	236	98.7	100.0	
Missing	4	1	.4		
	System	2	.8		
•	Total	3	1.3		
Total		239	100.0		

Willingness to assist outside of class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	6	2.5	2.6	2.6
	Adequate	63	26.4	26.8	29.4
	Good to Excellent	166	69.5	70.6	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	
Missing	4	1	.4		
	System	3	1.3		
	Total	4	1.7		
Total		239	100.0		

English 101 Student Exit Survey - SP2011

Availability outside of class

,		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	11	4.6	4.7	4.7
	Adequate	86	36.0	36.6	41.3
	Good to Excellent	138	57.7	58.7	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	
Missing	4	1	.4		
	System	3	1.3	:	·
	Total	4	1.7		
Total		239	100.0		

Instructors knowledge of materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	7	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Adequate	44	18.4	18.7	21.7
	Good to Excellent	184	77.0	78.3	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		239	100.0		

Instructors ability to communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	11	4.6	4.7	4.7
	Adequate	84	35.1	35.7	40.4
	Good to Excellent	140	58.6	59.6	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	4
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		239	100.0	·	

English 101 Student Exit Survey - SP2011

Understand sentence structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	34	14.2	14.5	14.5
· ·	Agree	135	56.5	57.4	71.9
	Strongly Agree	66	27.6	28.1	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	• 4	1.7		
Total		239	100.0		

Understand paragraph structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	35	14.6	14.9	14.9
	Agree	127	53.1	54.0	68.9
	Strongly Agree	73	30.5	31.1	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total	- 	239	100.0		

Can identify topic sentences

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	17	7.1	7.3	7.3
	Agree	135	56.5	57.7	65.0
	Strongly Agree	82	34.3	35.0	100.0
	Total	234	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.1		
Total	-	239	100.0		

English 101 Student Exit Survey - SP2011

Can effectively structure essays

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	22	9.2	9.4	9.4
ļ	Agree	128	53.6	54.5	63.8
	Strongly Agree	85	35.6	36.2	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		239	100.0		<u> </u>

Develop effective logic strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	32	13.4	13.6	13.6
	Agree	134	56.1	57.0	70.6
	Strongly Agree	69	28.9	29.4	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	:
Missing	System	4	1.7		·
Total		239	100.0		

Consider assignments through discussions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	11	4.6	4.7	4.7
	Agree	117	49.0	49.8	54.5
	Strongly Agree	107	44.8	45.5	100.0
	Total	235	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		239	100.0		

English 101 Student Exit Survey - SP2011

Opportunity to work with instructor

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	16	6.7	6.8	6.8
	Agree	123	51.5	52.6	59.4
	Strongly Agree	95	39.7	40.6	100.0
	Total	234	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.1		i
Total	·	239	100.0		

Understands correct punctuation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	27	11.3	11.8	11.8
	Agree	119	49.8	52.0	63.8
	Strongly Agree	83	34.7	36.2	100.0
	Total	229	95.8	100.0	
Missing	System	10	4.2		
Total	-	239	100.0		

SEE Printback-On

ASSESSMENT	(C)	
. 1	7	
English	10	

;				74/		_ _		1	_ -	10	2.	31 4	(4)	.	_		در		1 cd		1		1 911	111	(CRN)	Section	ASSE	C
5		16765	16760	16758	846.9	700	1777	6763	6775	6770	6755	16746	6766	16752	7384		7		7099	2011			- 0		3		ASSESSMENT - English 101	
			+		-	_				29917	=	(J8)	ARID	ARID	BALE	OTA.	ON		GROLE	30 9	1	SCI + ENGO TOTALS		したこくだら	200	Instructor	T - Engl	7
	LONT.		Ť		Moss CYNTHIA		3	We bruse worry	MARTELL	LIFFS 11		GOODALL, ZAC	ARIDA NATE	ARIDA, NATE	. 1		ON-HUE		GROLEMUND, MATT	CN-LINE		ENC D		- 1	[, Y	옥	ish 101	10
		1/	BRANDON	11	JTHIA	ا 1 کا کا	1	MOLL	217		=	ZAC	TE	E.	Sass	16-WK	TOTALS		MATT	377		TOTAL		11 64 000	\$ 1 PM			
			Į						A. \			N)	13	یر	N		w ₁			7/		8 29		ا ا		No.		<u> </u>
)	J W	24	22	33	٠ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲	- W	22/	<u>ک</u> کر - ا	23/	7	25	U	25/		72		2							5.0		
					N		-		-	N	-		W	-								-			_	4.75 4		
		,	- ار		1				-	N -		-		_	~		· k	16		/		=(e	Uj .	4.50 4		
	-	┦	<u>۱</u> ار	ر ار	1	ζ	-		1-	υ ₍ ;		-	-	W	_	ļ .		<u>را</u>	12			7		w	- l	4.25 4.0		_
			i u	+-	w		- بب ادر	-			-	+	, \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	6	2	-	\ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	2	10	w		2		-	N	3.75		
			\ -\v	1.	\ <u>\</u>	W.	5,	7	ľ	2	η <i>γ</i>	7 /	J	_ _	-		1	10		N			\	W		υ :5		
	-		£ 1			1	T 1	- - -	ŀ	+-,+) U	7	-		U	3		-+`	<u> </u>		-	4 2	(83)	1	2 2	3.25 3.0	1 1	
			I x	2 1		-1	W						U	7 7	\ -	1	1	5	6		-	N	Ť	-	2	0 2.75		į.
	-	-		- °		-		7 3			- 7	-	4		-	<u>.</u>										2.5 2		
			- 	- }		-		w	-	-			-	_	٨	j						<u> </u> ,				0.7 57		
	-			-		-							N -	- -	- - U	-		_		-			-			7./3		
						_			-			N	-	- '			_		3				6			1-	п	
	-								-								-		2					<u> </u>	_	1.60		
	•	-			_							Ŋ	W	2	N.	0		16		= 0,		-			-	1 1_	0 0 0	
			3.40	1 3.05	, i		たかって し	11	7 2.60	15 N		1	ii	2		2,20		2.15	4.30	1,250	-	٥	202	7.160	0 0 7	Ave.	Class	
			7 04	7			ر الا – ال		0 6	<u> </u>	4	1	4	- 1	N	0 9		S	3	7 4				6	2 =		A -	
			∞	2	10	0 -		+-	9.2	o o		22	7			υ ₁	1.5.7	\\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\	1 1	T M	1 1		الد		T X	`	0 N	+
			6			7	× >	η 1 4	7	e u	7	-	-	W)				7					N		-1		0	
			0	N	T			בען	1	1 1	-6	l	W			0		17. 2		U X X			w)	67		ر د م	DE DE	
	,		<u> </u>	, W	<i>\\</i> \\	î.	1. J. J.) \(\frac{1}{2}\)	24	(U) 3	. N S ™	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\) \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	> .	ペププ	たが、マ	4	2:36	H.73	10 JU	J		1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	05.9	30,00	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	~~~	

٠_

21.10 cont.

と こ

-																						32 V 101ALS MLL		(CRN)	Section Instructor	,	ASSESSMENT - English 101	~
	-					-	-									-						000	2/2	Stu.	No. 5.0			
								<u> </u>															3 3	133	4.75			
				-																		ţ	21 50		4.50 4.25 4			İ
. -	-		•								-						-					-	0 01 38		4.0 3./5 3.5	1		-
-		-												-									101 00 00	3	5 3.23 3.0	נ נ		
-	-						-			-		-				-							58 26		2.7.2	7		
					-						-			,		-							11/42		2.20	2 25, 2 0		
													<u>.</u>	- -									6 1		!	1.75 1.5	-	
		-							 		•						-						-	(105)		1.25 1.0		
																			-	:			86 3.01 /69	96,33	Ave.	0.0 Class		
															v	.,						2:52	60			В	n m	
-															-								47 33 109			0	- 0	
,												-				<u></u>	· <u> </u>	<u></u>				<u></u>	77	118.9			!_	1

u

									•	-											3								·	
L	-			-	-	-	-	-		-																				
	+		-	-	-	-	+	+	-	1											-					-				
	-	10,	(2/15		-												20		1 1	(Ī			N	7	217	sub totals	1	(a) #	20
N	69	222	5/2	46 155	22		56	N	2	N	Л	7	3	26	10	EL	200	2 0	ב	3		100	1		1			t l		
<u>E</u>						7300	-	-		-						1	V		N	12			-		-	2			_	77-12
W			10	e c		2000	-	-						-	-)	2 M	-		-1-		1/2	-	-	-	17	MARON	WIRTZ, AA	<u> </u>	24478
ا در		-			0	200	+	-	+	-				N		7	2	N	<u> </u>	-		<u> </u>		ļ <i>,</i>		20				24459
70/	-	-	٦,		- -		V	-	-	-	-			-		N		-		-	-	W				Ĭ	WILLIAM	SKINNER, W		8544C
<u>ي</u> -	70	-					10	-			-	-	W	1	W	4		-							-	N		1.1	+	ンのたちの
	112	-		1 4	0		-								1	- 2		2								7 0	<u> </u>	VAN DR	-	7503
ńχ	7	_	. w	6			6					w	<u>l</u>				W		N	<u>ټ</u>	w	_			1) - -			\dashv	MJPhC MACA
<u>, 'w</u>	-		- -	+-			-	-		-			N		_	-		-	-	_						Ē .	7	200		24116
رَيْ.	V	K		≪	7	Ziv	U				-	-		12		<u>-</u> -	:			رن	-					9	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	200	-+	0 E 1
λ	ł) -	-	1	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	1262	1	-			-	Ì				-						-				N	つくれている	\$5 P.Y	SSRW	25629
Ž		- 1	1	N N	1	U	-				*journey.		Residence.	w	-	Service:		N		Ŋ					_	5				24462
1 2	N	N	2 4	W) 2.	N	-				N		N		-					Ŋ					_	1	Margay AN TAY		56.466
	1	N		た	7	100	W						W		Ŋ	W	-				-		-			2	1	THE CONCENTRACES	\top	のかだって
		4	7	47	6		W					r		Ŋ	1			N					1		-	\tilde{o}	777	7 0 7 5	$\exists \top$	Y-7-1
Ž		N		-	7 2	. t	7	-					_		W	ħ	T		W	_	'n				_	<i>w</i>	1. 1.1.	1) 14 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	7	アプログ
Ž	1		-		T		Vì	-				_	7	_			1	N		-		^	77			i	+4-2)	- 1	_	人このよう
Į.	1	/	7				-							- 1			N	-		. ئىر	-	- 1				5 E	Į.	11	-	VC 20
7 <u>Y</u>	. 1		N	1	0,	1.86	7						N	-		N			r							2	ρ̈́		F	タピンプ
1	T		Vì	2		2/15	N	-	1		_	-	W	1	נאל			7			1		J .	Ŋ		u l	1,"		H COOPER	コンドラ
પ્ર		-	\mathcal{W}		w	1.96	Ø					h				W		W		-	-	-	_			2		1	GMS-	
													_				_	+			-		-):	
- T				V	U	u à						-				N	1		W	'n			Ų.	<i>></i>		13	ALS.	ONLINE TOTALS	ONL	7
(n)	t				J) 0						***************************************			 	(9)	-		-	-		(2)				Table Description	The second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second se			1
			3)	1/c	(0.00				-	-	1	-	-		1			W		N	U	- U ²		:	w	() () () () () () () () () () () () () (しがも ママ ママできのこ	Dr. Lo	アンクント
W	4			4	N	707						-	-		_	7	_	+)	-		1_				Stu.		ON-LINE &	6N-	(CRN)
Ç	-	D	C	æ	Þ	Class	0,0	1.0	1.25	1.5	1.75	2.0 1	2.25 2	(C)	2.75 2	3.0 2.		3.5 3.25	4	0 3.75	4.25 4.0	0 4	4.50	4.75	5.0	No.		tor	Instructor	Section
<u>z</u> .			1	u							_	_	-			:					-		-	1				0		
		-			-																							ASSESSMENT - English 101	NT - En	SXSME
											1.	-											-					No yall	Q.	ر من ا
		7																					,							-

SP 2011 cont.

	75	25992	25999	2 LhhC	Section (CRN)	ASSESSME
	TOTALS - ALL	WHEPLEY KATHY WHEPLEY KATHY	+-	ADJUNCT FLORES, BRYAN	MAXWELL, CYNTHIA	ASSESSMENT - English 101
	403	40 2	237	28	v Stu.	
	w	1 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			5.0	
]	4				4.75	
	 -0	10) 10F0 SUBMITTED	p	6	4.50	
-	22	7		6	4.25	
	, W	W g	N	· w	2 4.0	
	34	\$	NW	N	3.75 3	
	57	J.	f =	9	3.5 3.25	
-	34 +	3 (3)		N	25 3.0	
	45 20			(E) N) 2.75	
	30	250000000000000000000000000000000000000			2.5	
-	20	Call of the Call o			2.25	
	4	The second secon			2.0 1	
ļ	2				1.75 1	
	2 2				1.5 1.25 (d)	
-	10				1.0	
	57				0.0	
	2.84	3.73	3,65	3,45	Class Ave.	
-	75	14	6 00	11		t.
	12/2/	\$\frac{1}{2}\text{\tint{\text{\tin}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tex{\tex	6 8		www.	N N
-	67 22	12 W	w	300		~
-	2 74					0
L	 12/2	1*5	- [m) c	

なな

Memorandum

To: All Professors, Instructors and GTAs teaching ENGL 101/102 Fall 2010

From: Darren DeFrain, Director of the Writing Program

Date: November 23, 2010

Re: Finals Grading

I again wanted to send along a consistent grade breakdown giving appropriate equivalencies for our 1-5 scale now that we are using the plus/minus system. Also, if you have been asked to take part in our assessment this semester please remember to forward me the surveys from your 101 sections and keep record your diagnostic scores from the start of the semester on your final grade sheets (provided under separate cover). I'm always here if you have any questions.

EXAM GRADE	LETTER	100 PT SCORE EQUIVALENCY
5	A+	99-100
4.75	A	93-98
4.5	A-	90-92
4.25	B+ .	88-89
4	В	86-87
3.75	В	83-85
3.5	B-	80-82
3.25	C+	78-79
3	C	74-77
2.75	C-	70-73
2.5	D+	68-69
2.25	Ð	63-67
2	D-	60-62
1.75	F	55-59
1.5	F	50-54
1	F	<49

All exams should be awarded grades on a .5 scale. The .25 and .75 grades should only be the result of the average of the two readers' scores. As usual, it is at the instructor's discretion what the final numerical grade should be for each student. So, for example, if one of your students receives a 4 from you and 3.5 from your peer they may receive anywhere from an 83 to an 85. BE CONSISTENT with these final scores.

Remember that while students are not failed or passed along simply for their performance on this final exam these grades can be important to their final course grades. They are obviously also of great personal importance to the students.



author's voice and the sentence fluency of the run-ons). The author utilizes sentence variety thesis uses strong verbs, adequate details, and complete sentences (avoiding fragments and The introduction is inviting and original. The The author not only uses words correctly but also very effectively. The wording is precise The punctuation is strong and varied. There is clear evidence of proofing. essay contains fully-developed examples and grammatical errors. The author uses correct details in a well-focused manner. The reader makes a clear assertion about the topic. The The essay is easy to read. Concise, accurate effective, logical order using transitions and can effortiessly follow the essay's logic and wording. The author takes risks in an effort person are consistent throughout the paper. assignment in the most appropriate manner. MLA format. The verb tense and pronoun details and main points are presented in an author uses strong action verbs rather than and specific while remaining natural. The The ideas are interesting and original. The apparent through the natural and genuine The essay is virtually free of spelling or The essay fulfills the requirements of the "to be" verbs. The wording supports the to make the essay "smoother" and more to convey creativity, and to effectively The author's personality and style are sentences are used. The author uses strong paragraph organization. communicate his/her insights. Excellent (5) enjoyable for the reader. development. personality. The author seems to feel comfortable with his/her topic. The wording is verbs. The wording is appropriately formal for developed ideas, clear and relevant points, and The author refrains from switching verb tense and pronoun person. The pronoun references The writing flows from sentence to sentence. The essay exhibits some part of the author's sentence structures (simple, compound, and overview of the essay. The details and main The author uses correct and specific words. The language of the essay flows naturally. refrains from using fragments and run-ons. The essay contains adequately detailed and punctuation except for a few minor errors. format. It is obvious this author proofread The author makes an attempt to use strong action verbs with little reliance on "to be" assertion about the topic and presents an The author avoids rambling. The author are clear. The author uses correct MLA The author attempts to use a variety of A clear introduction and conclusion are present. The thesis statement makes an points are presented in a logical order. Appropriate topic sentences are used. The author uses correct spelling and original ideas. The essay fulfills the requirements of the assignment. Average (3) nones, natural, and genuine. the assignment. his/her essay. complex). The author makes careless errors (such as ones that spell check will catch). The absent or very weak. The thesis statement Numerous fragments or run-ons are used. wrong wording. The essay relies heavily writing is confusing, contains the wrong The writing is choppy and simple. The author rarely deviates from one kind of punctuation is weak or inaccurate. The author shifts verb tense, shifts pronoun is confusing or unapparent. The details development of the author's ideas. The The essay lacks any sense of audience. The wording is stiff and artificial. The The author uses awkward wording or on weak verbs (such as "to be"). The author seems disinterested in his/her essay contains clichés, slang, vague, and/or too formal/informal language. sentence, the reader has a hard time references. The author does not use The introduction and conclusion are person, or makes unclear pronoun following the author's writing. nformation, or is not complete. (0-1) The essay contains little or no correct MLA format. are out of place. Sentence Fluency Ideas & Content Mechanics & Word Choice Organization Convention Voice

ESSAY EVALUATION RUBRIC

Student Perceptions of Teachings Effectiveness II

Fall 2010 Results

epartment: English ourse: 101	University: Wichita State University College/Division: Humanities	ID Number: 735 Section Number: 16759
ompared with 30887 /.S.U. Classes ou Scored:	Interpretative Profile Based Upon 12 Student Raters	Compared with 7401 Humanities Classes You Scored: Percentile Scale
cale Percentile	Perceived Quality Index	T Creciting Board
6.7 71.0%	[High]	57.6% 6.4
•	——————————————————————————————————————	
7.0 79.0%	Course Design [High]	67.2% 6.7
6.8 75.5%	Rapport with Students [High]	60.5% 6.5
6.9 75.1%	Grading Quality	66.3% 6.7
6.3 62.7%	Course Value	47.8% 6.0
2.8 9.0%	Perceived Course Demands which consists of	7.9% 2.7
2.7 7.9%	Difficulty	8.2% 2.7
3.8 17.9%	Workload	13.3% 3.3
	25% 50% 75%	

SPTE Scale Summary

Perceived Quality Index

Score 4.58 4.83 4.75 4.83 4.42 4.17 4.58 4.67	Scale Percentile 6.7 66.4% 7.5 90.1% 6.7 67.0% 6.9 74.9% 5.8 42.9% 5.8 45.5% 7.0 73.7% 7.4 82.9%	Course Design High High High V Good V Good High High	liem Description The instructor's presentation was well prepared. Overall, the instructor was well organized. The instructor's knowledge appeared high. The instructor was usually in control of the class. The instructor's ability to answer questions was excellent. The instructor conveyed clearly key concepts. The method of presentation was appropriate. The instructor's presentation style aided learning.
	•	Rapport with Students	
\$core 4.50 4.58 4.83 4.42 4.08 3.67 4.42 4.64	Scale Percentile 6.1 50.5% 6.6 62.8% 6.8 72.5% 5.5 36.6% 6.3 58.8% 4.3 22.6% 5.8 42.9% 7.7 87.0%	High High V Good Good V Good High High High High High	Item Description The student felt free to ask questions. The instructor came across as a person and teacher. The instructor treated the students respectfully. The instructor responded fully to questions. The instructor was concerned about the student's progress. The instructor was aware if students had difficulties. The instructor's ability to answer questions was excellent. The instructor gave students adequate feedback.
Score 4.33 4.50 4.33 4.00 4.67	Scale Percentile 5.8 45.6% 6.7 66.7% 6.3 56.5% 3.9 16.2% 8.1 93.1%	Grading Quality V Good High Good High	Item Description The number of evaluations used for grading was sufficient. The instructor used appropriate evaluations for grading. The method of assigning grades was clear. Exam content matched the class presentation. The expected grade matched performance.
Score 3.67 3.58 3.42 3.50 3.50 4.67	Scale Percentile 5.7 42.9% 5.1 33.3% 5.4 34.8% 4.1 17.0% 7.0 71.3% 9.3 98.8%	Course Value V Good V Good V Good V Good V Good V Good V High	Item Description The student found the course valuable. The student expects retention of material to be high. The course stimulated the student's interest. The student's knowledge of the subject increased. The student usually went to class eagerly. The student would recommend this course.

Perceived Course Demands

Score 2.83 2.83 3.17 3.17 2.92 3.33 3.58	Scale Percentile 3.1 11.3% 3.0 9.7% 2.6 6.4% 4.0 20.6% 3.1 11.8% 4.5 30.7% 4.5 26.0%	Difficulty 25% 50% 75%	Item Description The course was very hard. The material presented in this class was difficult. An extensive amount of material was presented. Extensive time was required to prepare for class. The amount of work (workload) was heavy. The instructor covered material at a fast pace. The instructor challenged students intellectually.
Score	Scale Percentile	Workload	Item Description The number of assignments was extensive. The amount of work (workload) was heavy.
2.83	3.4 13.3%	25% 50% 75%	
2.92	3.1 11.8%	▼	

Student Perceptions of Teachings Effectiveness II

Fall 2010 Results

epartment: English ourse: 101	University: ■ Wichita State University College/Division: ▼ Humanities	ID Number: Section Number:	736 16750
ompared with 30887 .S.U. Classes ou Scored:	Interpretative Profile Based Upon 13 Student Raters	Compared wit Humanities Cla You Scored:	
tale Percentile		Percentile	Scale
Jaic 1 ch contains	Perceived Quality Index		7.0
7.2 83.5%		73.8%	7.0
,	$\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{i}_{\mathbf{k}}}$	-	
7.3 86.2%	Course Design	76.7%	7.0
` ,	Rapport with Students		•
7.5 88.8%		79.7%	7.2
7.1 79.7%	Grading Quality	72.2%	6.9
7.0 78.7%	Course Value	66.8%	6.8
,		·J	
	Perceived Course Demands		
4.2 23.8%	# ▼ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	25.8%	4.3
	which consists of		
3.8 18.6%	Difficulty	21.7%	4.0
	Workload	41.9%	5.1
5.3 43.0%		11.770	J. 1
	25% 50% 75%		

SPTE Scale Summary

Perceived Quality Index

	•	·	
\$core 4.54 4.69 4.77 4.85 4.62 4.54 4.54	Scale Percentile 6.5 61.2% 6.9 73.2% 6.8 71.1% 7.0 78.9% 6.8 68.9% 7.4 83.5% 6.8 68.8% 7.2 78.0%	Course Design High High High High High High High Hig	Ifem Description The instructor's presentation was well prepared. Overall, the instructor was well organized. The instructor's knowledge appeared high. The instructor was usually in control of the class. The instructor's ability to answer questions was excellent. The instructor conveyed clearly key concepts. The method of presentation was appropriate. The instructor's presentation style aided learning.
-		Rapport with Students	
\$core 4.54 4.62 4.92 4.38 4.31 4.62 4.75		High High	Item Description The student felt free to ask questions. The instructor came across as a person and teacher. The instructor treated the students respectfully. The instructor responded fully to questions. The instructor was concerned about the student's progress. The instructor was aware if students had difficulties. The instructor's ability to answer questions was excellent. The instructor gave students adequate feedback.
\$ core 4.38 4.54 4.23 4.54 4.54	Scale Percentile 6.0 51.2% 6.9 71.5% 5.9 47.3% 6.7 66.7% 7.5 84.0%	Grading Quality V Good High High High	Item Description The number of evaluations used for grading was sufficient. The instructor used appropriate evaluations for grading. The method of assigning grades was clear. Exam content matched the class presentation. The expected grade matched performance.
		Course Value	
Score 3.62 4.15 3.46 3.85 3.46 4.15	Scale Percentile 5.5 38.6% 8.0 86.1% 5.6 38.3% 5.6 42.1% 6.8 68.1% 7.4 81.3%	V Good High V Good High High High High High	Item Description The student found the course valuable. The student expects retention of material to be high. The course stimulated the student's interest. The student's knowledge of the subject increased. The student usually went to class eagerly. The student would recommend this course.

Perceived Course Demands

Score 2.92 3.38 3.46 3.69 3.31 3.15 4.08	Scale Percentile 3.5 15.0% 5.3 44.2% 3.9 20.6% 6.3 68.0% 4.6 33.6% 3.5 13.3% 6.6 67.5%	Difficulty 25% 50% 75%	Item Description The course was very hard. The material presented in this class was difficult. An extensive amount of material was presented. Extensive time was required to prepare for class. The amount of work (workload) was heavy. The instructor covered material at a fast pace. The instructor challenged students intellectually.
Score 3.15 3.31	Scale Percentile 4.6 30.4% 4.6 33.6%	Workload 25% 50% 75% ▼	Item Description The number of assignments was extensive. The amount of work (workload) was heavy.

Student Perceptions of Teachings Effectiveness !!

Spring 2011 Results

epartment: English ourse: 102	University: ■ Wichita State University College/Division: ▼ Humanities	ID Number: Section Number:	699 25692
ompared with 31770 .S.U. Classes ou Scored:	Interpretative Profile Based Upon 18 Student Raters	Compared wit Humanities Cla You Scored:	asses
cale Percentile	possible de Overlihe Indov	Percentile	Scale
7.4 85.9%	Perceived Quality Index [High] which consists of	77.9%	7.2
7.4 89.0%	Course Design	82.2%	7.2
7.7 91.7%	Rapport with Students [High]	85.9%	7.5
7.4 86.5%	Grading Quality [High]	81.2%	7.3
6.3 64.3%	Course Value	51.2%	6.1
		·	,
4.5 28.9%	Perceived Course Demands which consists of	31.4%	4.5
4.8 33.8%	Difficulty	40.3%	5.0
4.4 26.0%	Workload	22.0%	4.0
	25% 50% 75%		

SPTE Scale Summary

Perceived Quality Index

	•			
Score Scale	e Percentile	Course Design	Item Description	
4.72 7.2	80.2%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The instructor's presentation was well prepared. Overall, the instructor was well organized.	
4.82 7.4 4.78 6.7	86.6% 68.8%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The instructor's knowledge appeared DIGN.	
4.94 7.4	90.6%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The instructor was usually in control of the class. The instructor's ability to answer questions was excellent.	
4.82 7.6 4.47 7.0	89.6% 73.0%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The instructor conveyed clearly key concepts.	ļ
4.56 6.7	67.3%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The method of presentation was appropriate. The instructor's presentation style aided learning.	
4.83 7.9	92.2%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The instructor's presentation series along the	
		Rapport with Students		
Score Scale	e Percentile	Ruppon with students	Item Description	
4.82 7.6	86.5%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The student felt free to ask questions.	
4.83 7.5 4.94 7.2	86.2% 88.2%	High	The instructor came across as a person and teacher. The instructor treated the students respectfully.	
4.83 7.4	86.1%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The instructor responded fully to questions.	
3.83 5.1	36.4%	V Good	The instructor was concerned about the student's progress. The instructor was aware if students had difficulties.	
4.06 5.8 4.82 7.6	46.6% 89.6%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The instructor's ability to answer questions was excellent.	
4.44 6.7	66.6%	High	The instructor gave students adequate feedback.	
Caara Caal	e Percentile	Grading Quality	Item Description	١
Score Scale 4.89 8.3	97.6%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The number of evaluations used for grading was sufficient.	
4.83 8.1	94.8%	High	The instructor used appropriate evaluations for grading. The method of assigning grades was clear.	
4.33 6.1 4.61 6.9	53.9% 72.6%	High	Exam content matched the class presentation.	
4.44 6.9	70.9%	High	The expected grade matched performance.	
	- D	Course Value	Item Description	
Score Scale 3.72 5.6	e Percenfile	V Good	The student found the course valuable.	
3.78 5.8	46.5%	· · · · · · · V Good · · · · ·	The student expects retention of material to be high.	
3.56 5.6 3.78 5.1	39.7% 31.3%	· · · · · · · · V Good · · · · ·	The course stimulated the student's interest. The student's knowledge of the subject increased.	
3.33 5.9	48.1%	· · · · · · · V Good · · · · ·	The student usually went to class eagerly.	
4.56 8.6	96.1%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The student would recommend this course.	
				┙

Perceived Course Demands

Score 3.47 3.41 3.67 3.39 3.22 3.17 3.61	Scale Pe 5.8 5.4 4.9 5.0 4.3 3.6 4.5	56.0% 46.6% 37.2% 40.1% 28.1% 14.8% 26.1%	Difficulty 25% 50% 75%	Item Description The course was very hard. The material presented in this class was difficult. An extensive amount of material was presented. Extensive time was required to prepare for class. The amount of work (workload) was heavy. The instructor covered material at a fast pace. The instructor challenged students intellectually.	
Score 3.17 3.22	Scale Pe 4.7 4.3	ercentile 33.0% 28.1%	Workload 25% 50% 75% ▼	Item Description The number of assignments was extensive. The amount of work (workload) was heavy.	

Student Perceptions of Teachings Effectiveness II

Spring 2011 Results

epartment: English ourse: 102	University: ■ Wichita State University College/Division: ▼ Humanities	ID Number: Section Number:	700 25693
ompared with 31770 '.S.U. Classes ou Scored:	Interpretative Profile Based Upon 16 Student Raters	Compared wit Humanities Cla You Scored:	sses
cale Percentile		Percentile	Scale
8.0 94. 3%	Perceived Quality Index [High] —— which consists of ——	91.6%	7.9
	Course Design		
8.1 96.6%		95.0%	7.9
	Rapport with Students		
8.0 94.9%	[High]	91.5%	7.9
	Grading Quality		
7.7 90.7%	[High]	86.7%	7.6
	Course Value		
7.6 87.6%	[High]	81.8%	7.4
			ż
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Perceived Course Demands		
5.0 37.6%		41.2%	5.0
	which consists of		
ŧ	Difficulty	4.9. 904	E 1
4.9 37.3%	\tag{\partial}	42.2%	5.1
5.1 39.6%	Workload	38.6%	4.9
,	25% 50% 75%		

SPTE Scale Summary

Perceived Quality Index

		-	9	
,		•	Course Design	
Score	Scale	Percentile		Item Description
4.81	7.5	89.6%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · Hìgh	The instructor's presentation was well prepared.
5.00	8.1	98.4%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	Overall, the instructor was well organized.
4 94	7.6	94.7%	····· High	The instructor's knowledge appeared high.
4.94	7.3	89.5%	High	The instructor was usually in control of the class. The instructor's ability to answer questions was excellent.
4.88	7.9	93.4%		The instructor conveyed clearly key concepts.
4.75	$\frac{8.1}{6}$	94.4%		The method of presentation was appropriate.
4.75	7.6	88.1% 90.1%	····· High	The instructor's presentation style aided learning.
4.81	7.7	90.1%	tnäit	The instructor a presentation orgon arounds
_			Rapport with Students	
Score		Percentile		Item Description
4.88	7.8	90.4%	High	The student felt free to ask questions.
4.88	7.7	89.0%	High	The instructor came across as a person and teacher.
5,00	7.5	94.4%	High	The instructor treated the students respectfully. The instructor responded fully to questions.
4.94	7.9	94.6% 53.0%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The instructor was concerned about the student's progress.
4.06 4.50	6.0 7.5	83.7%	High	The instructor was aware if students had difficulties.
4.88	7.9	93.4%	High	The instructor's ability to answer questions was excellent.
4.75	8.0	91.5%	High	The instructor gave students adequate feedback.
7.75	0.0	31.54	* ** Dri !	The moracle gard and
		•		
Caara	Caala	Daraantia	Grading Quality	Item Description
Score 4.56	6.7	Percentile 68.0%	···· High	The number of evaluations used for grading was sufficient.
4.75	7.7	88.8%	High	The instructor used appropriate evaluations for grading.
4.73	8.3	97.4%	High	The method of assigning grades was clear.
4.44	6.0	50.1%	V Good · · · ·	Exam content matched the class presentation.
4.50	7.1	75.6%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The expected grade matched performance.
	,	, , , ,	e de la composición dela composición de la composición de la composición dela composición dela composición dela composición de la composición de la composición dela composición de la composición de la composición dela c	
*			Course Value	
Saara	Socia.	Percentile	Course Value	Item Description
			High	The student found the course valuable.
4.13 4.31	7.3 8.4	76.9% 90.2%	High	The student expects retention of material to be high.
3.81	6.6	62.7%	· · · · · · V Good · · · · ·	The course stimulated the student's interest.
4.19	6.8	68.4%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · High	The student's knowledge of the subject increased.
3.56	6.8	67.4%	···· High	The student usually went to class eagerly.
4.37	7.8	87.7%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The student would recommend this course.
:		Ç, t, a		
		*	•	

Perceived Course Demands

Score 3.25 3.37 3.94 3.44 3.38 4.31	Scale Percentile 4.9 37.7% 5.2 43.0% 6.1 61.2% 5.2 45.0% 5.2 44.6% 4.7 37.1% 7.3 82.0%	Difficulty 25% 50% 75% ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **	Item Description The course was very hard. The material presented in this class was difficult. An extensive amount of material was presented. Extensive time was required to prepare for class. The amount of work (workload) was heavy. The instructor covered material at a fast pace. The instructor challenged students intellectually.	
Score 3.38 3.44	Scale Percentile 5.5 50.0% 5.2 44.6%	Workload 25% 50% 75% ▼	Item Description The number of assignments was extensive. The amount of work (workload) was heavy.	