

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

| Discipline | Course Number | Title |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| English | 160 | ENG 160 07/22/2019- Introduction to Literature: Poetry and Drama |
| Division | Department | Faculty Preparer |
| Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences | English & College Readiness | Bill Abernethy |
| 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?

No

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

3.

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

5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Read works by major authors in poetry and drama.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: Sample of 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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | 2018 | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 18 | 16 |

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.

Not all students turned in the paper that was 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.

All students who submitted the final essay were included. The sample is small since this course is rarely offered. One section was offered by a part-time instructor in Winter Semester 2019, but despite repeated attempts to recover artifacts from this instructor, there was no response.

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

On a departmentally-developed rubric, the outcome was scored on a 0--2 scale. Four (4) identifications of genre, theme, and literary technique were required to satisfactorily meet the outcome. **Please note that Outcome #1 has been changed.** ENG 160 has never been assessed; the last master syllabus revision was in 2009. Outcome #1 on that syllabus is not assessable; on the department rubric for all lit courses, developed after the 2009 syllabus revision, Outcome #1 (as assessed in this report) reads, "Identify major genres, themes, and techniques in selected literary work(s)."

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> |
| All of the students (16/16, 100%) were able to identify the genre, the major themes, and the literary techniques used in the work(s) they chose to write about. There were, of course, varying levels of sophistication, especially in the analysis of essential themes. |

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

| |
|--|
| As usual with lower-division lit courses, some of the analysis of theme was subjective and not sufficiently based on textual evidence. |
|--|

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.

| |
|---|
| More emphasis should be placed on the use of concrete examples from the text(s) to support literary analysis. |
|---|

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary to analyze poetry and dramatic literature in an academic essay.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: Sample of 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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | 2018 | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 18 | 16 |

- 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.

Not all students turned in the paper that was assessed.

- 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.

All students who submitted the final paper were included. The sample is small since this course is rarely offered. One section was offered by a part-time instructor in Winter Semester 2019, but despite repeated attempts to recover artifacts from this instructor, there was no response.

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

On a departmentally-developed rubric, the outcome was scored on a 0--2 scale. Four correct applications of literary vocabulary were required to meet the standard of success.

- 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 but one of the students (15/16 students, 94%) met the standard of success. Nine students exceeded the minimum by correctly using at least five literary terms correctly in their analysis.

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

Analysis of both genres, but especially the analysis of poetry, requires mastery of literary vocabulary/terminology. Those students who wrote on drama readily demonstrated successful use of the vocabulary of that genre. Those who wrote on poetry had a more difficult time with that vocabulary.

- 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.

If students are to successfully analyze older poetry, more attention needs to be paid to the vocabulary of figurative language, meter, and the other formal devices of this poetry.

Outcome 3: Apply critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate poetry and dramatic literature.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: Sample of 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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | 2018 | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 18 | 16 |

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.

Not all students turned in the paper that was 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.

All students who submitted the final essay were included. The sample is small since this course is rarely offered. One section was offered by a part-time

instructor in Winter Semester 2019, but despite repeated attempts to recover artifacts from this instructor, there was no response.

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

On a departmentally-developed rubric, the outcome was scored on a 0--2 scale. At least four instances of explanation or interpretation, rather than simple plot retelling, were required to meet the standard of success.

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

No students simply retold the plot of the works analyzed. Only one student failed to meet the standard of success; I am happy to say that all the rest of the students (15/16, 94%) assessed exceeded the standard by including five or more instances of interpretation or explanation.

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

Nearly all the students understood that simply understanding the surface meaning of the text was insufficient to meet the standard of critical evaluation of that (or any other) literary 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.

Sometimes critical evaluation was (as noted in Outcome #2, above) not based as solidly on direct textual evidence. As one of my Prussian professors once beat into my head, "Wir Philologen machen immer mit Text, Text, Text!" ("We philologists"--of which literary critics are a subset--"work with the text, the text, the text!" Students need to realize that literary criticism, while not an exact science, is more than just opinion.

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.

There was no previous report.

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?

The course is meeting the needs of that small number of students interested in poetry and drama. More time should be spent on the vocabulary of criticism.

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

Will be shared at departmental meeting.

4. Intended Change(s)

| Intended Change | Description of the change | Rationale | Implementation Date |
|--------------------|---|--|---------------------|
| Course Assignments | Emphasis should be place on the use of concrete examples from the test to support literary analysis | Improve student skills at analyzing themes based on textual evidence | 2020 |

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

6.

III. Attached Files

[160 Rubric](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Bill Abernethy **Date:** 07/30/2019
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 07/31/2019
Dean: Kimberly Jones **Date:** 08/12/2019
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 11/11/2019