

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

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	000	ENG 000 11/19/2018- Writing Center
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Thomas Zimmerman
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: Write paragraphs or an essay appropriate to the student's level.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Capstone assignment in each workbook.
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2013
  - Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of 10% of sections.
  - Number students to be assessed: 50% of students enrolled in selected sections with a minimum of 100.
  - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric.
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students must score a "C or better" evaluation on 3 of the 4 evaluative criteria.

- Who will score and analyze the data: English department faculty will blind-score the assignment 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
1809	181

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 chose 181 papers (selected randomly), representing 10% of the total course enrollment.

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 collected papers from on-campus, DL, and MM sections.

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

Seven different writing courses have ENG 000 as a co-requisite. Here are the courses and the specific assessment tools:

ENG 050/051: Summary-and-response paragraphs.

ENG 090/091: Five-paragraph essay.

ENG 100: Five-paragraph cover letter.

ENG 111: Six-paragraph essay with MLA or APA documentation.

(I was not able to collect any papers from ESL 168, the seventh course that has ENG 000 as a co-requisite.)

Here is the rubric of evaluative criteria I used to assess the papers:

1. Adequate thesis statement or topic sentence
2. Adequate support of thesis statement or topic sentence.
3. Correct Standard English grammar.
4. Correct Standard English punctuation and mechanics.

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

181 papers assessed.

148 scored a "C (73%) or better" evaluation on 3 of the 4 evaluative criteria.

33 did not.

$148/181 = 82\%$  success rate.

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

Results per Rubric Item:

Thesis/topic sentence:  $147/181=81\%$

Support:  $136/181=75\%$

Grammar:  $146/181= 81\%$

Punct:  $149/181=82\%$

As the percentages above suggest, students demonstrated good skills in thesis statement/topic sentence formation as well as usage of Standard English grammar and punctuation. Even the rubric item with the lowest

success rate (support of thesis statement/topic sentence) met the standard of success. These results don't surprise me; the Writing Center workbooks (which are written by the English department) provide ample instruction and practice in these skills. I might add that the papers I assessed were not first drafts; they were revised papers (drafting and revision are required with most Writing Center assignments).

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.

Students met the standard of success in every area. However, the English department will continue to find ways to improve student success. In fact, we revise the Writing Center workbooks every spring/summer, using, until now, anecdotal evidence to address what we see as aspects of the books that we can improve. This first-ever formal assessment of the course provides somewhat objective corroboration of what we have believed for many years.

### 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.

As far as I know, this is the first time this course has been formally assessed. However, the course is assessed informally every spring/summer, when we revise the Writing Center workbooks for each corequisite course.

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?

My overall impression is that this course does a good job of meeting the needs of students. I attribute the slightly lower student success rate in the area of support of thesis statement/topic sentence to the difficulty that students have with MLA and APA research-writing techniques. These are sophisticated techniques, and many of our students are practicing them for the first time with their Writing Center assignments. The English department has been aware of this challenge for students for decades. In fact, we revise our MLA and APA instructional materials every spring/summer to try to present the concepts and applications as effectively as possible to students.

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

This information and the action plan will be shared with department faculty at a department meeting.

The action plan is to continue to revise the Writing Center workbooks and other instructional materials every spring/summer, paying special attention to MLA and APA research-writing.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Constant and continued updates of topics and MLA/APA documentation style in the workbook.	The workbook needs to be updated to reflect changes and best practices in teaching writing.	2019

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

6.

### III. Attached Files

[ENG 000 Assessment Scoring Rubric](#)  
[ENG 000 Assessment Results--Fall 2018](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Thomas Zimmerman **Date:** 02/05/2019  
**Department Chair:** Carrie Krantz **Date:** 02/07/2019  
**Dean:** Kristin Good **Date:** 02/18/2019  
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Shawn Deron **Date:** 03/21/2019