

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	170	ENG 170 08/19/2021- Introduction to Literature: Short Story and Novel
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness
Faculty Preparer		Hava Levitt-Phillips
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

Yes

July 2017

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

The standards for success were met on all student learning outcomes (SLOs).

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

Following the most recent assessment of this course, our department had some great conversations about what we're valuing in literature courses, and a subcommittee worked together to develop new rubrics for assessing artifacts within our literature courses. I am using a version of one of those rubrics for this assessment, which I feel better captures the richness of our discipline's value for first- and second-year college students, especially non-majors.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Read and analyze short stories and novels by major authors both classical and contemporary.

- Assessment Plan

- Assessment Tool: A formal analytical essay on one or more of the course readings
- Assessment Date: Fall 2019
- Course section(s)/other population: All
- Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections with a minimum of one full section
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score 73% or higher
- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty will score and analyze the data

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2021	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
64	20

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

I assessed essays from 20 students for this report. Ten of those students were from a virtual classroom section. Ten of them were from an asynchronous distance learning section. I had planned to assess ten more students from one other section in the same term, but unfortunately an error occurred with the Blackboard site for that section, and we no longer have access to the data for those students in a way that would permit me to assess them for this report.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I assessed student essays from both our asynchronous distance learning model and our virtual classroom model.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Twenty essays were read & scored for this assessment report against a departmentally approved rubric. The rubric addresses six key areas of essay development, which align with the SLOs for this course -- Thesis; Close Reading & Analysis; Evidence, Examples, Explanation; Coherence; Framing; MLA Formatting & Surface Polish. This rubric permits evaluation of whether an essay meets the 73% or better standard for success. See attachments.

Instead of scoring the essays on a weighted scale, as I do when grading in class, I showed whether students met each criterion at/above or below the 73% mark with 1s and 0s in my Excel file.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

All essays assessed treated short stories, films, and/or novels assigned in this class.

Happily, all essays assessed met the standard for success for this SLO.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Overall, I'm very pleased with what I'm seeing in the essays assessed for this report in connection with this SLO. All of the essays grappled with short stories, novels, and/or films from their assigned reading lists. The essays demonstrate meaningful engagement with a variety of those assigned readings and thoughtful analysis rooted in textual evidence. Some of the essays assessed treated more than one text and explored compelling connections between them, while others chose to dig deeply into one text.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

There is never any reason NOT to continuously evaluate one's reading list in a literature class. It is always good to be alive to new possibilities that might offer new ways to explore the world through the literary imagination, enriched diversity of perspectives, even more relevant imaginative modes (graphic novels, flash fiction, etc.), and so on. I would be happy if our department were to have the time and energy to refresh our reading list for the DL version of this class.

That being said, I'm fine if we don't make changes at this time. For one thing, individual instructors create their own reading lists for face-to-face and virtual

classroom sections of this course, which keeps us in a dynamic exchange about the values of this discipline, and offers students a solid set of options for what they get to read when registering.

For another, the current reading list for the DL version of the class is really pretty impressive. We offer a list that allows students to consider the development of storytelling practices and cultural interests across a solid span of time in the US. We also offer texts from authors who represent a rich diversity of cultural, racial, ethnic and socio-economic experiences/identities. Writing by men and women is nicely balanced here, which is excellent. We could do better on representation of the diversity of gender experiences/identities that has expanded in the 21st century, and we could do better on representation of lesbian, gay, and bisexual writers.

I will raise these opportunities for greater inclusion with my colleagues in the department and see what we come up with, for sure. If we aren't able to make significant changes by the time the next assessment cycle comes around for this course, though, I won't see that as a failure on our part.

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary in academic essay to demonstrate analysis and comprehension of works of literature.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: A formal analytical essay on one or more of the course readings
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score 73% or higher
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty will score and analyze the data

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2021	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
64	20

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

I assessed essays from 20 students for this report. Ten of those students were from a virtual classroom section. Ten of them were from an asynchronous distance learning section. I had planned to assess ten more students from one other section in the same term, but unfortunately an error occurred with the Blackboard site for that section, and we no longer have access to the data for those students in a way that would permit me to assess them for this report.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I assessed student essays from both our asynchronous distance learning model and our virtual classroom model.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Twenty essays were read & scored for this assessment report against a departmentally approved rubric. The rubric addresses six key areas of essay development, which align with the SLOs for this course -- Thesis; Close Reading & Analysis; Evidence, Examples, Explanation; Coherence; Framing; MLA Formatting & Surface Polish. This rubric permits evaluation of whether an essay meets the 73% or better standard for success. See attachments.

Instead of scoring the essays on a weighted scale, as I do when grading in class, I showed whether students met each criterion at/above or below the 73% mark with 1s & 0s in my Excel file.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Happily, 18 out of 20 (90%) essays assessed met the standard of success for all six rubric criteria, and only two out of 20 failed to meet the standard of success for a criterion relevant to this SLO -- 4, Coherence. The overall standard of success has

been met for this SLO, with more than 75% of students assessed achieving a 73% or better on relevant criteria.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Overall, I'm pleased with how folks did on this SLO, as well. Almost all of the essays I read for this assessment employed at least some literary terminology correctly, with only two of the 20 essays failing to meet the standard of success for one of the rubric criteria relevant to this SLO. Some of the essays made use of a variety of terms in the correct contexts, while others used only one term. Basically, I saw good literary interpretation overall, with some folks using the language of literary criticism fluently, and some folks using it pretty minimally.

For this report, I widened the way I understand this SLO a bit to include the deployment of MLA formatting and surface polish, as these are gestures integral to academic literary reading and analysis. All 20 of the essays assessed met the standard of success for those criteria most relevant to these issues -- Evidence, Examples, Explanation; Framing; and MLA Formatting & Surface Polish.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

I don't see any urgent demand for significant change regarding this SLO. I do note that to the degree that folks are seriously struggling with anything, it's coherence. I will begin conversations with my department to think about what we might do to support students in structuring their writing process in ways that protect time needed for the breaks, review, getting other eyes on drafts, and revision that help us address coherence issues in our writing.

Outcome 3: Demonstrate critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate a work of fiction.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: A formal analytical essay on one or more of the course readings
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric

- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score 73% or higher
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty will score and analyze the data
1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2021	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
64	20

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

I assessed essays from 20 students for this report. Ten of those students were from a virtual classroom section. Ten of them were from an asynchronous distance learning section. I had planned to assess ten more students from one other section in the same term, but unfortunately an error occurred with the Blackboard site for that section, and we no longer have access to the data for those students in a way that would permit me to assess them for this report.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I assessed student essays from both our asynchronous distance learning model and our virtual classroom model.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Twenty essays were read & scored for this assessment report against a departmentally approved rubric. The rubric addresses six key areas of essay development, which align with the SLOs for this course -- Thesis; Close Reading & Analysis; Evidence, Examples, Explanation; Coherence; Framing; MLA Formatting & Surface Polish. This rubric permits evaluation of whether an essay meets the 73% or better standard for success. See attachments.

Instead of scoring the essays on a weighted scale, as I do when grading in class, I showed whether students met each criterion at/above or below the 73% mark with 1s & 0s in my Excel file.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Very happily, as this is the SLO I see as the most important of the three we have for this course, 20 out of 20 essays assessed met the standard for success on three out of four rubric criteria for this SLO -- Thesis; Close Reading & Analysis; and Evidence, Examples, Explanation.

Also pretty happily, 18 of the 20 essays assessed met the standard for success on one out of the four rubric criteria for this SLO -- Coherence.

The standard for success for this SLO was met overall.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Overall, I am very pleased with what I'm seeing in the essays assessed for this SLO. Generally, I see evidence of rich, thoughtful engagement with the readings treated in these essays. Students are making rewarding connections between texts on issues of content, structure, and style. They're also often connecting the work of meaning-making in a literary context with issues that matter to them in their personal lives, as well as the issues that matter in our larger social contexts. Even in the two essays that failed to meet one of the four rubric criteria relevant to this SLO (Coherence) I saw ample evidence of this kind of excellent engagement -- it was just harder to follow.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Again, I don't see much in the way of need for change regarding this EXTREMELY important SLO. I'm very pleased that my colleagues and I are managing to support our students in coming to understand our readings on their own terms, while arriving at their own insights arising from what they bring to the work.

Outcome 1: Read and analyze short stories and novels by major authors both classical and contemporary.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Common final exam questions
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2021
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: 10-20% representative random sample of students completing the assessment instrument
 - How the assessment will be scored: The selected set of common questions for this outcome from the approved department final exam will be matched and scored with a rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score at least 70% on the selected set of questions assessed for this outcome
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Course mentor (coordinator)/department faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2021	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
64	20

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Overall, I'm very pleased with what I'm seeing in the essays assessed for this report in connection with this SLO. All of the essays grappled with short stories, novels, and/or films from their assigned reading lists. The essays demonstrate meaningful engagement with a variety of those assigned readings and thoughtful analysis rooted in textual evidence. Some of the essays assessed treated more than one text and explored compelling connections between them, while others chose to dig deeply into one text.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

There is never any reason NOT to continuously evaluate one's reading list in a literature class. It is always good to be alive to new possibilities that might offer new ways to explore the world through the literary imagination, enriched diversity of perspectives, even more relevant imaginative modes (graphic novels, flash fiction, etc.), and so on. I would be happy if our department were to have the time and energy to refresh our reading list for the DL version of this class.

That being said, I'm fine if we don't make changes at this time. For one thing, individual instructors create their own reading lists for face-to-face and virtual classroom sections of this course, which keeps us in a dynamic exchange about the values of this discipline, and offers students a solid set of options for what they get to read when registering.

For another, the current reading list for the DL version of the class is really pretty impressive. We offer a list that allows students to consider the development of storytelling practices and cultural interests across a solid span of time in the US. We also offer texts from authors who represent a rich diversity of cultural, racial, ethnic and socio-economic experiences/identities. Writing by men and women is nicely balanced here, which is excellent. We could do better on representation of the diversity of gender experiences/identities that has expanded in the 21st

century, and we could do better on representation of lesbian, gay, and bisexual writers.

I will raise these opportunities for greater inclusion with my colleagues in the department and see what we come up with, for sure. If we aren't able to make significant changes by the time the next assessment cycle comes around for this course, though, I won't see that as a failure on our part.

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary in academic essay to demonstrate analysis and comprehension of works of literature.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Common final exam questions
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2021
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: 10-20% representative random sample of students completing the assessment instrument
 - How the assessment will be scored: The selected set of common questions for this outcome from the approved department final exam will be matched and scored with a rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score at least 70% on the selected set of questions assessed for this outcome
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Course mentor (coordinator)/department faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
		2021

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
64	20

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Overall, I'm pleased with how folks did on this SLO, as well. Almost all of the essays I read for this assessment employed at least some literary terminology correctly, with only two of the 20 essays failing to meet the standard of success for one of the rubric criteria relevant to this SLO. Some of the essays made use of a variety of terms in the correct contexts, while others used only one term. Basically, I saw good literary interpretation overall, with some folks using the language of literary criticism fluently, and some folks using it pretty minimally.

For this report, I widened the way I understand this SLO a bit to include the deployment of MLA formatting and surface polish, as these are gestures integral to academic literary reading and analysis. All 20 of the essays assessed met the standard of success for those criteria most relevant to these issues -- Evidence, Examples, Explanation; Framing; and MLA Formatting & Surface Polish.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

I don't see any urgent demand for significant change regarding this SLO. I do note that to the degree that folks are seriously struggling with anything, it's coherence. I will begin conversations with my department to think about what we might do to support students in structuring their writing process in ways that protect time needed for the breaks, review, getting other eyes on drafts, and revision that help us address coherence issues in our writing.

Outcome 3: Demonstrate critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate a work of fiction.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Common final exam questions
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2021
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: 10-20% representative random sample of students completing the assessment instrument
 - How the assessment will be scored: The selected set of common questions for this outcome from the approved department final exam will be matched and scored with a rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score at least 70% on the selected set of questions assessed for this outcome
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Course mentor (coordinator)/department faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2021	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
64	20

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

This tool was not used for this assessment report.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Overall, I am very pleased with what I'm seeing in the essays assessed for this SLO. Generally, I see evidence of rich, thoughtful engagement with the readings treated in these essays. Students are making rewarding connections between texts on issues of content, structure, and style. They're also often connecting the work of meaning-making in a literary context with issues that matter to them in their personal lives, as well as the issues that matter in our larger social contexts. Even in the two essays that failed to meet one of the four rubric criteria relevant to this SLO (Coherence) I saw ample evidence of this kind of excellent engagement -- it was just harder to follow.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Again, I don't see much in the way of need for change regarding this EXTREMELY important SLO. I'm very pleased that my colleagues and I are managing to support our students in coming to understand our readings on their own terms, while arriving at their own insights arising from what they bring to the work.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

I'm very pleased with the departmental conversations we have had about our values for the course, as well as the work we have already done on developing new rubrics that reflect those values more fully. I know I have seen a positive difference in the work my students have been submitting over the intervening

years, and I believe the specificity of the new rubric has contributed to that improvement.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

I continue to be very pleased with the way this course helps students develop discipline as readers of text/makers of meaning. The skills of our discipline are skills that transfer over to success in other areas of study, the workplace, and the social sphere very productively -- evidence-based analysis; mindfulness of one's own values, experience, & biases as they contribute to the meanings we make of the many texts we encounter in life (literary & otherwise); ethical discernment; contributing to group discussions respectfully & productively, especially when that group is peopled by folks with significantly diverse perspectives; and more. My assessment of our students' essays indicates that they are growing in all of these skills.

Because I have been teaching this course both F2F & online since I started teaching here in 2008, I don't find a ton of surprises here.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

I will share the results of this assessment report with the full-time department at our next regular meeting in September of 2021. I will also put together a meeting with my part-time & adjunct colleagues who teach the class this fall.

4.
Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
No changes intended.			

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

6.

III. Attached Files

[ENG170 Assmt Data HLP 2021](#)
[ENG170 Assmt Rubric HLP 2021](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Hava Levitt-Phillips **Date:** 08/19/2021
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 08/20/2021

Dean: Scott Britten **Date:** 08/27/2021
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 02/24/2023

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	170	ENG 170 07/06/2017- Introduction to Literature: Short Story and Novel
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Hava Levitt-Phillips
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Read short stories and novels by major authors both classical and contemporary.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: a formal analytical essay on one or more of the course readings
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2008
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: 20% of students from all sections
 - How the assessment will be scored:
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
71	53

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

I assessed all of the essays from all three sections -- one DL & two face-to-face sections. Students who did not submit essays were not assessed. The number we were able to collect for assessment exceeds the 20% of students enrolled in the class that is called for.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

We assessed all students who completed the essay.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

53 essays were read & scored against a common English rubric approved by the department for assessment of the course. The rubric measures whether students' work demonstrated "a C or better" in a literary analysis essay on 6 out of 8 evaluative criteria. See attachment.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

All essays analyzed readings (short stories and/or novels) from the relevant sections' reading lists.

The department rubric evaluates each essay for demonstration of a "C or better" competency on the following criteria: clear introduction; clear thesis statement; appropriate use of examples from the literature; proper use of literary terminology; evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature; standard written English; standard essay format; logical conclusion.

Out of 53 essays, only one failed to meet the standard on 6 out of 8 criteria (clear intro, clear thesis, use of literary terminology). Out of 50 that did meet the standard on 6 out of 8 criteria, only 10 failed to meet the standard on all 8 criteria. Four essays failed to meet the standard for a "clear thesis," three failed to meet the standard for "proper use of literary terminology," two failed to meet the standard

for a "clear introduction," and just one failed to meet the standard for "evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature."

Overall, these were really solid essays, with many demonstrating excellent rhetorical values and thorough, thoughtful, disciplined analysis of the literature. Many also made insightful connections between the literature and issues in our world today. I'm definitely impressed.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Most of the essays I read for this assessment looked at connections between multiple short stories and/or novels from the relevant section's reading list. Generally, folks did a really great job of showing their familiarity with the texts in question. A few writers decided to focus on just one literary work & offer an extended analysis of it, rather than dip less deeply into two or three. Here, the level of work was generally very good -- graceful integration of evidence from the texts, generous explanation of the significance of evidence in the writer's interpretation, etc.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

I genuinely don't really have any insight about how we might productively change things around this learning outcome. The reading lists for these sections are robust, with historically varied offerings in diverse genres, and authors from a wide variety of social/cultural/ethnic/gender backgrounds are represented.

Outcome 2: Use a literary vocabulary to understand, appreciate and analyze literature, in informal and academic-style writing and in class discussions.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: a formal analytical essay on one or more of the course readings
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2008
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: 20% of students from all sections
 - How the assessment will be scored:
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
71	53

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

I assessed all of the essays from all three sections -- one DL & two face-to-face sections. Students who did not submit essays were not assessed. The number we were able to collect for assessment exceeds the 20% of students enrolled in the class that is called for.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

We assessed all students who completed the essay.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

53 essays were read & scored against a common English rubric approved by the department for assessment of the course. The rubric measures whether students' work demonstrated "a C or better" in a literary analysis essay on 6 out of 8 evaluative criteria. See attachment.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

All essays analyzed readings (short stories and/or novels) from the relevant sections' reading lists.

The department rubric evaluates each essay for demonstration of a "C or better" competency on 8 criteria, one of which is the proper use of literary terminology.

Out of 53 essays, only four failed to meet the standard for "proper use of literary terminology." Within the 49 who met the standard, I saw a lot of variety. Many students integrated literary terminology fully into their analysis of the reading(s) they were attending to, which is impressive. A good number used one or two literary terms to name the kind of analysis they were doing, but used popular language for the bulk of their essays. I see this as a very healthy rate of adoption of professional, field-specific language by first- & second-year college students, most of whom tend not to be majors in our field.

Overall, these were really solid essays, with many demonstrating excellent rhetorical values and thorough, thoughtful, disciplined analysis of the literature. Many also made insightful connections between the literature and issues in our world today. I'm definitely impressed.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Overall, almost all of the essays I read for this assessment employed at least some literary terminology correctly. Some of the essays made use of a variety of terms in the correct contexts, while others used only one term. Basically, I saw good literary interpretation overall, with some folks using the language of literary criticism fluently, and some folks using it pretty minimally.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

I have mixed feelings about the way I see students using literary terminology in these essays. I'm not hugely invested in ensuring whether my first- and second-year college students, most of whom are non-majors, use literary terminology in their analytical work.

It's generally way more important to me that they write what they think and why they think it, as generously & patiently as possible. I want to see them offering evidence from the readings to help me see where their interpretations are coming from. I want to see them making connections between the meaning-making we're doing together and the worlds they live in beyond the classroom.

It's not uncommon for writers who are new to college to have a harder time writing all their ideas out successfully if they're also trying to perform what feels like alien jargon, and then submitting their ideas for evaluation by a teacher. It's a bit like making an English instructor do algebra in front of her boss, but also making her tap dance at the same time. So for me, it's more of a bonus than a baseline achievement that this batch of essays is doing a pretty solid job of using field-specific professional language.

That being said, my discipline & department have excellent reasons why developing a facility with literary terminology can empower students to read in more critical, analytical ways, both in classes & beyond.

I guess I'd say my plan for continuous improvement, or improvement generally, would be to start some new conversations with my department (full-time, adjunct, and part-time colleagues, as relevant to teaching load/interests) about this issue. I think it would be useful for us to revisit the overall question of field-specific terminology, as well as clarifying which areas of the professional language of literary work we feel are most useful for first- & second-year college students, especially non-majors.

Outcome 3: Develop critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation that will enable them to evaluate a work of fiction, but will also facilitate problem-solving in their futures.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: a formal analytical essay on one or more of the course readings
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2008
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: 20% of students from all sections
 - How the assessment will be scored:
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
71	53

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

I assessed all of the essays from all three sections -- one DL & two face-to-face sections. Students who did not submit essays were not assessed. The number we were able to collect for assessment exceeds the 20% of students enrolled in the class that is called for.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

We assessed all students who completed the essay.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

53 essays were read & scored against a common English rubric approved by the department for assessment of the course. The rubric measures whether students' work demonstrated "a C or better" in a literary analysis essay on 6 out of 8 evaluative criteria. See attachment.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

All essays analyzed readings (short stories and/or novels) from the relevant sections' reading lists.

The department rubric evaluates each essay for demonstration of a "C or better" competency on 8 criteria, including a clear introduction; clear thesis statement; appropriate use of examples from the literature; evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature; & a logical conclusion.

Out of 53 essays, five essays failed to meet the standard for a "clear thesis," three failed to meet the standard for a "clear introduction," and just one failed to meet the standard for "evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature."

Generally, I'm very pleased with the evidence I saw in these essays that folks were approaching the readings critically & analytically. Consistently, I saw essays that presented introductions & thesis statements that helped me focus in immediately on what they found important in the reading they'd done. More importantly, I saw most of the student-writers offering detailed, relevant examples & quotes from the stories/novels they were analyzing to show where their ideas were coming from. Many of the student-writers pointed to the limits of their own claims, as well. For me, the fact that many of these essays made explicit connections between the

meaning they were making with the literature and the worlds we all live in demonstrates the connection forward toward employing these critical practices when "problem-solving in their futures."

Overall, these were really solid essays, with many demonstrating excellent rhetorical values and thorough, thoughtful, disciplined analysis of the literature. Many also made insightful connections between the literature and issues in our world today. I'm definitely impressed.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

I'm very pleased with what I saw in the essays I read in regard to critical thinking, observation, and analysis. Generally, I saw folks offering engaging, insightful interpretations of the works they'd read. They mostly offered relevant, focused evidence from the readings to show how they came to think what they thought. In many cases, they used more than one reading to look at an issue in different ways. They also often connected their analysis of readings from the course to larger issues they have confronted personally and/or to larger issues they identify our society grappling with.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Although most of the essays I read did a pretty solid job of offering a thesis statement that helped focus me as a reader on their ideas, I think we can always help students grow in allowing more time for their writing process. If they give themselves time to write big & sloppy and really just to figure out what they think, first, then they can go back after a brief break, and revise to make their ideas even more accessible to their reader/audience. This is the kind of thing our department is already always working on getting better & better at.

Outcome 4: Students will increase their self-reported appreciation of and ability to understand literature.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: a student opinion survey
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: 20% of students from all sections
 - How the assessment will be scored:

- Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:
1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016		
 2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
71	0
 3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The department decided to drop this outcome, because it wasn't academically measurable.
 4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The department decided to drop this outcome, because it wasn't academically measurable.
 5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The department decided to drop this outcome, because it wasn't academically measurable.
 6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No
The department decided to drop this outcome, because it wasn't academically measurable.
 7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The department decided to drop that outcome, because it wasn't academically measurable.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The department decided to drop that outcome, because it wasn't academically measurable.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

I've taught this course in almost every semester since I've been teaching at WCC. Originally, I taught it face-to-face, which is my favorite way to teach anything, but in the past couple years, I've been teaching the DL section. In my capacity as instructor, I definitely see this course serving students' needs.

They grow in their confidence as interpretive practitioners, their ability to engage in collegial dialogue across difference of opinion, cultural background, etc. They tend to grow both as writers and in their confidence as writers, and they make meaningful connections between their prospective fields & the work we do together with stories & novels -- a better eye for detail, for patterns, for interesting absences, and greater creative control over the meanings they make & the ways they're impacted by the texts that enter their lives.

My assessment of the course this time around confirms that experience. These essays show me students who are engaged in close, analytical interpretation not only of the literary works we read together, but also of the social/historical contexts of those works. If anything surprised me, I suppose it was just how strong most of these essays were, and that all of them but one hit the "C or better" mark. Our students always show me what a wonderfully alive, possible world it is, though, so perhaps this shouldn't be such a surprise ;)

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

I'll bring the results of this assessment to my full-time colleagues at our next department meeting (Sept. 2017), and I'll also arrange to meet with my adjunct colleagues who regularly teach the course to share the results & see if they want to collaborate to enrich the course further.

3.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
No changes intended.			

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

No thank you :)

III. Attached Files

[English Dept. Literary Analysis Rubric](#)
[ENG170 Assmt Data F16 HLP](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Hava Levitt-Phillips **Date:** 08/04/2017
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 08/07/2017
Dean: Kristin Good **Date:** 08/14/2017
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 10/24/2017