

Course Assessment Report  
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	240	ENG 240 07/29/2021- Children's Literature
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness
Faculty Preparer		Mary Mullalond
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		11/01/2017

**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

05/15/2017

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

The results of the previous assessment report indicated that the learning outcomes and rubric needed substantial revisions to both be assessing relevant learning outcomes and assess them in a meaningful way.

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

Changes were immediately made to the learning outcomes in the master syllabus revisions that were submitted 5/31/2017 for this course. The new learning outcomes relate better to the content of the course and are more relevant. The rubric was also revised, so instead of indicating if a student met (1) or didn't meet (0) a learning outcome, the rubric provides 4 levels of proficiency to better indicate the degree to which students are achieving each learning outcome.

**II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome**

Outcome 1: Identify outstanding authors and illustrators of children's literature.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Project or learning activity

- Assessment Date: Fall 2019
- Course section(s)/other population: All
- Number students to be assessed: All
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 73% or higher
- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental 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)
	2020	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
49	48

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.

One student withdrew from the course after the semester began, which is why only 48 of the 49 students enrolled in this course were assessed.

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.

Both a daytime section and evening section were assessed. Only two sections are offered each semester, so all students in Winter 2020 who took this class were assessed.

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

A rubric along with Blackboard's Goal Performance tool was used to assess this outcome. I aligned specific Blackboard rubric items used to assess student assignments with this particular outcome. Blackboard generated a report for each student, based on this outcome, using the following scale: Needs Improvement 0-54%; Foundational 55-74%; Proficient 75-89%; Distinguished 90-100%.

I matched up the Blackboard Goals Performance Scale with the assessment rubric I developed (see attachment). The scale used by Blackboard was slightly different from what I needed for my assessment. My outcome states that “An overall rubric score of 70% or higher will constitute individual success in this course.”

Unfortunately, Blackboard’s scale, which I could not customize, had a Foundational level from 55-74% and a Proficient level from 75-89%. Because I couldn’t easily see how many of my students had reached at least a 70% score on this outcome, I used the 75% score and higher outcome to assess this course.

I preferred to use the Blackboard Goals tool, even though it didn’t exactly align with my Master Syllabus Outcome assessment, because I was able to assess multiple assignments for this one outcome, providing me with a much richer data set that more accurately measures students’ achievement of each outcome.

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

85% of students (41/48) met the standard of success for Outcome 1: Identify outstanding authors and illustrators of children’s literature.

12.5% of students did not meet the standard of success for this outcome.

This outcome is deemed successful since well over 70% of students scored 75% or higher on the rubric for this outcome.

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

79% of students met the outcome with the highest quality work (earning a 90-100% average on the rubric). Part of the reason for this success is because this outcome was assessed through multiple assignments. The multiple assignments allowed students many opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of the outcome, instead of using just one assignment to assess this mastery.

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 will continue to make sure students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of this learning outcome through assignments and assessment rubrics.

Outcome 2: Evaluate the quality of children's literature based on genre, literary elements, illustrations, and/or writing.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Project or learning activity
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
  - Course section(s)/other population: All
  - Number students to be assessed: All
  - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 73% or higher
  - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental 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)
	2020	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
49	48

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.

One student withdrew from the course after the semester began, which is why only 48 of the 49 students enrolled in this course were assessed.

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.

Both a daytime section and evening section were assessed. Only two sections are offered each semester, so all students in Winter 2020 who took this class were assessed.

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

A rubric along with Blackboard's Goal Performance tool was used to assess this outcome. I aligned specific Blackboard rubric items used to assess student assignments with this particular outcome. Blackboard generated a report for each student, based on this outcome, using the following scale: Needs Improvement 0-54%; Foundational 55-74%; Proficient 75-89%; Distinguished 90-100%.

I matched up the Blackboard Goals Performance Scale with the assessment rubric I developed (see attachment). The scale used by Blackboard was slightly different from what I needed for my assessment. My outcome states that “An overall rubric score of 70% or higher will constitute individual success in this course.” Unfortunately, Blackboard’s scale, which I could not customize, had a Foundational level from 55-74% and a Proficient level from 75-89%. Because I couldn’t easily see how many of my students had reached at least a 70% score on this outcome, I used the 75% score and higher outcome to assess this course.

I preferred to use the Blackboard Goals tool, even though it didn’t exactly align with my Master Syllabus Outcome assessment, because I was able to assess multiple assignments for this one outcome, providing me with a much richer data set that more accurately measures students’ achievement of each outcome.

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

91% of students (44/48) met the standard of success for Outcome 2: Evaluate the quality of children’s literature based on genre, literary elements, illustrations, and/or writing

8% of students did not meet the standard of success for this outcome.

This outcome is deemed successful since well over 70% of students scored 75% or higher on the rubric for this outcome.

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

83% of students met the outcome with the highest quality work (earning a 90-100% average on the rubric). Part of the reason for this success is because this outcome was assessed through multiple assignments. The multiple assignments allowed students many opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of the outcome, instead of using just one assignment to assess this mastery.

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 will continue to make sure students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of this learning outcome through assignments and assessment rubrics.

Outcome 3: Design appropriate learning activities that engage children, from birth to 13-years of age, with children's literature.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Project or learning activity
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
  - Course section(s)/other population: All
  - Number students to be assessed: All
  - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 73% or higher
  - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental 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)
	2020	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
49	48

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.

One student withdrew from the course after the semester began, which is why only 48 of the 49 students enrolled in this course were assessed.

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.

Both a daytime section and evening section were assessed. Only two sections are offered each semester, so all students in Winter 2020 who took this class were assessed.

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

A rubric along with Blackboard's Goal Performance tool was used to assess this outcome. I aligned specific Blackboard rubric items, used to assess student assignments, with this particular outcome. Blackboard generated a report for each student, based on this outcome, using the following scale: Needs Improvement 0-54%; Foundational 55-74%; Proficient 75-89%; Distinguished 90-100%.

I matched up the Blackboard Goals Performance Scale with the assessment rubric I developed (see attachment). The scale used by Blackboard was slightly different from what I needed for my assessment. My outcome states that "An overall rubric score of 70% or higher will constitute individual success in this course."

Unfortunately, Blackboard's scale, which I could not customize, had a Foundational level from 55-74% and a Proficient level from 75-89%. Because I couldn't easily see how many of my students had reached at least a 70% score on this outcome, I used the 75% score and higher outcome to assess this course.

I preferred to use the Blackboard Goals tool, even though it didn't exactly align with my Master Syllabus Outcome assessment, because I was able to assess multiple assignments for this one outcome, providing me with a much richer data set that more accurately measures students' achievement of each outcome.

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

91% of students (44/48) met the standard of success for Outcome 3: Design appropriate learning activities that engage children (0-13 years old) with children's literature

8% of students did not meet the standard of success for this outcome.

This outcome is deemed successful since well over 70% of students scored 75% or higher on the rubric for this outcome.

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

73% of students met the outcome with the highest quality work (earning a 90-100% average on the rubric). Part of the reason for this success is because this outcome was assessed through multiple assignments. The multiple assignments allowed students many opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of the outcome, instead of using just one assignment to assess this mastery.

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 will continue to make sure students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of this learning outcome through assignments and assessment rubrics.

### 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.

The changes to the Learning Outcomes based on the last report made a huge difference. I changed the outcomes to better reflect the key concepts covered in the course. Students met each standard of success, compared to the last assessment where they only met the standard of success for one of the two learning outcomes.

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?

This course is doing well with meeting the needs of students and teaching them the new learning outcomes. Creating more online grading opportunities to assess learning outcomes is helping me better assess students' learning because I can leverage Blackboard's goal tool to assess multiple assignments throughout the semester, instead of just one or two. It also made it possible for me to easily assess a part-time faculty's section of the course, since they use the same Blackboard grading rubrics. Other than giving me access to the course, the part-time faculty member who taught the other section of this course didn't need to do any extra work.

I want to continue refining the rubrics in Blackboard to better capture the learning outcome data. For example, in the Text-Set Project Rubric, one of the criteria is so broad that it aligns with both Learning Outcome 2 & 3. I'd like to create two

different criteria, so they can each align separately with a learning outcome, so I can capture clearer assessment data.

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

I will bring the results of this assessment to a Department meeting in Fall 2021.

- 4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	I'd like to change the standard of success to 75% or higher for each outcome, to align with Blackboard's Goal Performance reports standards.	Currently all 3 outcomes state the standard of success as a rubric score of 70% or higher. I'd like all three outcomes to align with the new Blackboard Goals Performance tool that I'm using to assess my students' learning.	2021
Course Assignments	I need to adjust the criteria of some of the course assignment rubrics so they better align with just a single Learning Outcome.	This change will create stronger assessment data, showing which specific outcomes are being met by a single criteria in the Blackboard grading rubric.	2021

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

6.

### III. Attached Files

[ENG 240 Assessment Rubric](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Mary Mullalond **Date:** 07/29/2021

**Department Chair:** Carrie Krantz **Date:** 07/30/2021

**Dean:** Scott Britten **Date:** 08/10/2021  
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Shawn Deron **Date:** 10/26/2021

**Course Assessment Report**  
**Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	240	ENG 240 05/15/2017-Children's Literature
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Mary Mullalond
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

**I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome**

Outcome 1: Read and evaluate children's literature appropriate for preschool youth through age 13.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Formal or informal piece of writing, analyzing a work of children's literature
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2013
  - Course section(s)/other population: All
  - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections
  - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score at least one point for each item on the rubric.
  - 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)
	2015, 2013	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
106	38

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 master syllabus asked me to assess “a random sample of 20% of students from all sections.” I sampled 35% of students.

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.

Only day students were assessed from two different instructors. I was unable to collect student work from the part-time instructors teaching the evening section of this course.

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

A rubric was used to assess this outcome, determining whether students met this outcome (score of 1) or did not meet the outcome (score of 0).

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

100% of students met the outcome "Read and evaluate children's literature appropriate for preschool youth through age 13." In other words, the standard of success was met for this outcome.

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

All students clearly read and evaluated children's literature for this assignment.

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.

This is such a basic outcome, it would be challenging for any student NOT to pass it, unless they hadn't done the assignment. All students who completed the assignment had read the appropriate children's literature and had to evaluate it. The quality of the evaluations were of varying degrees, but the rubric doesn't allow for an analysis of that. This is an outcome that needs to be changed to actually assess something meaningful.

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary to analyze children's literature.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Formal or informal piece of writing, analyzing a work of children's literature
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2013
  - Course section(s)/other population: All
  - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections
  - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score at least one point for each item on the rubric.
  - 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)
	2015, 2013	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
106	38

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 master syllabus asked me to assess “a random sample of 20% of students from all sections.” I sampled 35% of students.

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.

Only day students were assessed from two different instructors. I was unable to collect students' work from the part-time instructors teaching the evening section of this course

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

A rubric was used to assess this outcome, determining whether students met this outcome (score of 1) or did not meet the outcome (score of 0).

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

76% of students met this specific outcome. More than the 75% minimum met the standard of success for this outcome.

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

Overall, just over 3/4 of students were able to successfully use literary terminology in their written work for this particular assignment that was assessed. This means students both understood literary terminology and were aware that the assignment wanted them to show their understanding.

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.

It's hard to know if the students who failed to meet this outcome failed because they didn't actually know how to use literary terminology, or if they simply failed to show their knowledge of literary terminology in this particular assignment. Finding ways to incorporate more lessons and/or instruction on literary terminology could help improve this outcome, but making sure students clearly understand that they need to USE literary terminology would be more helpful.

Outcome 3: Demonstrate critical thinking skills of observation, explanation, and interpretation to evaluate children's literature.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Formal or informal piece of writing, analyzing a work of children's literature
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2013
  - Course section(s)/other population: All

- Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score at least one point for each item on the rubric.
- 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)
	2015, 2013	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
106	38

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 master syllabus asked me to assess “a random sample of 20% of students from all sections.” I sampled 35% of students.

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.

Only day students were assessed from two different instructors. I was unable to collect students' work from the part-time instructors teaching the evening section of this course.

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

A rubric was used to assess this outcome, determining whether students met this outcome (score of 1) or did not meet the outcome (score of 0).

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: <u>Yes</u>
89% of students met this specific outcome. More than the 75% minimum met the standard of success for this outcome.

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

Most students clearly knew how to think critically about the literature they were reading, and demonstrated that in their writing through examples of observation, explanation and interpretation.
--

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.

11% of students were not able to show they knew how to think critically about the literature they were writing about. I'm not sure if they were only observing, and not explaining or interpreting the literature because the rubric does not allow for that fine of detail of assessment. Changes to the rubric and possibly the outcome itself are needed.
--

**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?

The assessment told me that students are meeting the bare minimum of achievement as outlined in the learning outcomes for this class. They're reading literature, they're using literary terminology, and they're using critical thinking skills to discuss it in their writing. That's good, but I'm not sure it's enough.
---

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

I will discuss the action plan and assessment at a Fall department meeting with my colleagues. I'm curious about their thoughts with the way other literature courses are being assessed.
---

3. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
-----------------	---------------------------	-----------	---------------------

Outcome Language	The outcome language needs to be changed to be more specific for this course.	In particular, the first and third outcomes need to be revised so they measure more meaningful and specific learning outcomes for this course.	2017
Assessment Tool	The rubric needs to change to accommodate the new outcome language. I need to consider changing from a pass/no pass model to perhaps a 4 point scale of 4) highest quality 3) adequate quality 2) poor quality 1) no evidence.	Changing the rubric will not only meet the new outcome language but will also allow for finer detail or information about the quality of student work	2017

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

5.
----

### III. Attached Files

[Rubric & Results](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Mary Mullalond **Date:** 05/15/2017  
**Department Chair:** Carrie Krantz **Date:** 05/19/2017  
**Dean:** Kristin Good **Date:** 05/19/2017  
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Michelle Garey **Date:** 10/30/2017