

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	100	ENG 100 07/22/2019- Introduction to Technical and Workplace Writing
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness	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 2006

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

All standards of success were met for the outcome assessed.

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

No changes were identified.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Plan and write effective workplace documents.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Letter or Email Writing Center Assignment evaluated using standard checklist.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2008
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: 50
 - 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)
	2019	2018

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
94	58

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.

Three of the five sections offered in these semesters were assessed, to try to meet the assessment plan call for 50 students to be 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.

This course is only offered online. Here, we are assessing one 12-week SS section, one 15-week W section, and one 12-week W section.

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

I looked at the Rubric Evaluation Report for each section's results.

The standard of success for this artifact is multipart: clarity of subject line, appropriateness of salutation, clear and complete message, mechanical correctness that makes content accessible to the reader, appropriateness of closing, and formatted according to specifications.

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

Of the 58 students assessed, 47 met or exceeded the standard of success (75% of students scoring 75% or higher). The other 11 students failed to submit this

assignment. This comes out to 81% of students assessed meeting the standard of success.

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

Rubrics were used inconsistently by instructors evaluating this assignment. In my experience teaching this course at least once a year, which is reflected in my Rubric Evaluation Report for section DW1-SS2018 (attached), my students tend to do very well on it, across the board. They tend to do particularly well on message and tone, which are the most important elements of writing effective workplace emails.

Here, they're demonstrating thoughtfulness about their audience's needs, and as a result, they're making writerly choices that are likely to help them get their audiences to take the action their email is designed to elicit. This is the dream for all writers, or at least all workplace writers, from my perspective.

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, rubrics were used inconsistently by instructors evaluating this assignment. In my experience, which is reflected in my Rubric Evaluation Report (attached), when students struggle with this assignment, it's in the areas of polish or accidentally leaving out a required field -- i.e. a subject line or full name for a signature.

Both of these elements of writing successful workplace emails are important, of course. I'm not hugely concerned about them on this assignment, however, as this comes very early in the semester. Ideally, we should see growth in these areas as students work through the rest of the course.

I'm interested in looking for additional opportunities for proofreading practice in the course, as well as perhaps some content designed to help students experience the different ethos that is projected by different levels of polish. I will discuss these possibilities with relevant members of my department.

Outcome 2: Prepare job search documents.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Cover Letter or Resume Writing Center Assignment evaluated using standard checklist.

- Assessment Date: Fall 2009
- Course section(s)/other population: all
- Number students to be assessed: 50
- 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)
	2019	2018

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
94	58

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.

Three of the five sections offered in these semesters were assessed, to try to meet the assessment plan call for 50 students to be 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.

This course is only offered online. Here, we are assessing one 12-week SS section, one 15-week W section, and one 12-week W section.

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

I looked at the Rubric Evaluation Report for each section's results.

The standard of success for this artifact is multipart: attractive and accessibly formatted according to specifications, content presented clearly and concisely in the prescribed order, language deployed appropriately within the conventions of the document, and extremely high level of mechanical correctness.

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

Of the 58 students assessed, 44 met or exceeded the standard of success. One student scored a 7/10, and the remaining 13 students failed to submit this assignment. This comes out to 76% of student assessed meeting the standard for success.

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

Rubrics were used inconsistently by instructors evaluating this assignment. In my experience teaching this course at least once a year, which is reflected in my Rubric Evaluation Report for section DW1-SS2018 (attached), students really invest in the job search documents unit. As a result, they tend to submit strong first drafts, commit to self-evaluation and instructor feedback, and produce very strong final drafts.

Generally, folks make aesthetically pleasing documents that guide the reader's eye smoothly through the evidence they're presenting. They present relevant experience and certifications/credentials for the specific position they're seeking. I also see them generally commit to really nailing polish on these.

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.

Rubrics were used inconsistently by instructors evaluating this assignment. In my experience teaching this course at least once a year, which is reflected in my Rubric Evaluation Report for section DW1-SS2018 (attached), the most common problem area for students is correctness.

I would point out that I grade correctness **RIGOROUSLY** in this assignment, because I feel such an obligation to see that they are as prepared as possible to be successful, if they should use the résumé they develop with us for a real job search. So they may be marked down for correctness here, but only have one or two minor errors, which may be missed by an exhausted HR manager. It is possible we might refine the rubric for correctness here. I will discuss this with relevant members of my department.

I do see a couple of these every term with more significant problems. I'm not sure what accounts for the issues in these cases. I tend to assume this is because those students simply didn't have the time to prioritize our assignment that week, and were content to earn the smaller credit award & move on. I look forward to being able to think about these concerns more fully the next time we assess this course,

when we will hopefully be able to look at sections with more consistent use of the rubrics.

Outcome 3: Research and write short reports.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Unit 3 portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2010
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: 50
 - 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)
	2019	2018

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
94	58

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.

Three of the five sections offered in these semesters were assessed, to try to meet the assessment plan call for 50 students to be 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.

This course is only offered online. Here, we are assessing one 12-week SS section, one 15-week W section, and one 12-week W section.

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

I looked at the Rubric Evaluation Report for each section's results.

The standard of success for this artifact is multipart: clear and focused thesis, substantial and relevant support/evidence that is skillfully presented, organization of ideas that guides audience attention effectively through the document, skillful deployment of appropriate diction and sentence structures, and mechanical correctness that makes content accessible to the reader.

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

Of the 58 students assessed, 39 met or exceeded the standard of success (75% of students scoring 75% or higher). The other 19 students failed to submit this assignment. This comes out to 67% of students assessed meeting the standard of success.

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

Rubrics were used inconsistently by instructors evaluating this assignment. In my experience teaching this course at least once a year, which is reflected in my Rubric Evaluation Report for section DW1-SS2018 (attached), students really rise into this assignment. The Short Report, like all other significant assignments in this course, is taught as an extended writing process. From brainstorming topics, to evaluating and engaging with resources, to working out the details of APA formatting, all the way to drafting, peer reviewing, and crafting, our students are scaffolded through this complex project.

The draft we use for assessment purposes here is the final one. Students revise this after doing two preliminary drafts, committing to peer review, and restructuring their content into a presentation with PowerPoint slides. Thus, by the time they prepare this final draft, they are equipped to ensure that their documents are organized and accessible for their audiences, that they have chosen and explained highly relevant evidence from outside sources, and that they have created generally highly audience-oriented texts. They tend to be a pleasure to read.

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, rubrics were used inconsistently by instructors evaluating this assignment. In my experience teaching this course at least once a year, which is reflected in my Rubric Evaluation Report for section DW1-SS2018 (attached), the primary

problem folks are still running into in this final assignment of the course is correctness. Proofreading is actually just a lot harder than people tend to realize, and I'm looking forward to talking with relevant members of my department about how we might enhance our offerings designed to help students develop a more effective cluster of practices for themselves.

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 previous assessment report didn't identify any changes to address.

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?

In my experience teaching this course, I have found that when folks commit and do the work, they tend to grow and succeed. Generally, failure in this course comes from not doing the work, whether on an assignment or overall. I see this pattern borne out in the results of this assessment.

Thus, it seems to me that we are meeting our students' needs pretty well, and that continuing to improve our outreach to students as soon as they drop off in terms of submitting work will hopefully increase their persistence and completion. Overall, I really like teaching this course, for whatever that's worth, and I want to tip my hat to Lisa Veasey and Mary Mullanond for their excellent work putting it together as an online course. Their labor makes my job a delight, and our students are well supported by it.

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

As I indicated in an earlier portion of this report, I'm interested in looking for additional opportunities to support the development of proofreading practice in the course.

I will discuss these possibilities with relevant members of my department, and I will share the results of this assessment with my department, generally, at the next convenient meeting or electronically.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Other: Assessment population	Going forward, we need to assess all sections available.	To ensure the assessment captures the whole population of students in this course.	2020
Other: Rubric use	Promote consistent use of rubrics across sections.	The rubrics were used inconsistently by instructors evaluating each assignment in this assessment. Consistent use will increase the accuracy of future assessments.	2020
Other: Rubric elements	Collaborate to review some rubric elements with department colleagues.	To ensure all rubric elements are relevant and applicable to each assessment tool.	2020
Other: Faculty collaboration	Collaborate with colleagues to evaluate need for additional proofreading practice.	To explore additional opportunities to support the development of proofreading practice in the course.	2020

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

6.

III. Attached Files

- [Rubric Evaluation Report EmailENG100DW1SS18](#)
- [Resume Rubric Evaluation Report ENG100DW1SS2018](#)
- [ShortReport Rubric Evaluation Report ENG100DW1SS20](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Hava Levitt-Phillips **Date:** 07/26/2019
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 07/29/2019
Dean: Scott Britten **Date:** 09/24/2019

Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron

Date: 12/17/2019

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

I. Background Information

1. Course assessed:
 Course Discipline Code and Number: ENG 100
 Course Title: Written Communication
 Division/Department Codes: HSS English/Writing

2. Semester assessment was conducted (check one):
 Fall 2006
 Winter 20__
 Spring/Summer 20__

3. Assessment tool(s) used: check all that apply.
 Portfolio
 Standardized test
 Other external certification/licensure exam (specify):
 Survey
 Prompt
 Departmental exam
 Capstone experience (specify):
 Other (specify): Resume and Cover Letter from Unit 2 Portfolio

4. Have these tools been used before?
 Yes
 No

If yes, have the tools been altered since its last administration? If so, briefly describe changes made.

5. Indicate the number of students assessed/total number of students enrolled in the course.

14/14

6. Describe how students were selected for the assessment.

All students enrolled in ENG 100 during Fall 2006 semester were assessed.

II. Results

1. Briefly describe the changes that were implemented in the course as a result of the previous assessment.

N/A

2. State each outcome (verbatim) from the master syllabus for the course that was assessed.

Outcome 2 of 3. **Prepare Job Search Documents**

3. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected during the course assessment, demonstrating the extent to which students are achieving each of the learning outcomes listed above. *Please attach a summary of the data collected.*

Eighty-five percent of students assessed scored 80% or higher on the artifacts collected. Please see attached Assessment Data (3 Sheets).

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

4. For each outcome assessed, indicate the standard of success used, and the percentage of students who achieved that level of success. *Please attach the rubric/scoring guide used for the assessment.*

According to the ENG 100 master course syllabus/assessment plan: "Seventy-five percent of students assessed must receive a score of 11.25/15 (75%) or better on analyzed artifacts"

5. Describe the areas of strength and weakness in students' achievement of the learning outcomes shown in assessment results.

Strengths: Overall, 85% of students earned a score of 80% or higher on the artifacts collected. (See Data Sheet 1.) Students earned an average score of 7.36/8 (92%) on the cover letter artifact. This exceeded the standard of success by 17 percentage points. Students earned an average score of 5.8/7 (83%) on the resume artifact, which exceeded the standard of success by 8 percentage points. (See Data Sheet 2.)

Weaknesses: As stated above in the sections above, student achievement exceeded the standard of success in both cover letter and resume writing. Detailed data analysis shows a slight weakness in the resume area, which may require further examination. (See Data Sheet 3.)

III. Changes influenced by assessment results

1. If weaknesses were found (see above) or students did not meet expectations, describe the action that will be taken to address these weaknesses.

Though the overall scoring for both artifacts exceeded our standard of success, the students' performance in resume writing was weaker than their performance on cover letter writing. The E/W department will continue to monitor student achievement in this area.

2. Identify intended changes that will be instituted based on results of this assessment activity (check all that apply). Please describe changes and give rationale for change.

a. Outcomes/Assessments on the Master Syllabus
Change/rationale:

b. Objectives/Evaluation on the Master Syllabus
Change/rationale:

c. Course pre-requisites on the Master Syllabus
Change/rationale:

d. 1st Day Handouts
Change/rationale:

e. Course assignments
Change/rationale:

f. Course materials (check all that apply)
 Textbook
 Handouts
 Other:

g. Instructional methods
Change/rationale:

h. Individual lessons & activities
Change/rationale:

3. What is the timeline for implementing these actions?

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

IV. Future plans

- 1. Describe the extent to which the assessment tools used were effective in measuring student achievement of learning outcomes for this course.

Assessing a portion of a student portfolio worked well, but the scoring rubric should be more generic to accommodate different instructors' assignments.

- 2. If the assessment tools were not effective, describe the changes that will be made for future assessments.

The grading rubric may be modified slightly.

- 3. Which outcomes from the master syllabus have been addressed in this report?

All _____ Selected: Outcome 2 of 3

If "All", provide the report date for the next full review: _____.

If "Selected", provide the report date for remaining outcomes: Outcome 3 will be assessed in Fall 2007.

Submitted by:

Name: Lisa Veasey [Signature] Date: 1.5.07
Print/Signature

Department Chair: [Signature] Date: 1.8.07
Print/Signature

Dean: [Signature] Date: JAN 10 2007
Print/Signature

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Background Information

1. Course assessed:
 Course Discipline Code and Number: ENG 100
 Course Title: Written Communication
 Division/Department Codes: HSS/ENG

2. Semester assessment was conducted (check one):
 Fall 2025
 Winter 20__
 Spring/Summer 20__

3. Assessment tool(s) used: check all that apply.
 Portfolio
 Standardized test
 Other external certification/licensure exam (specify):
 Survey
 Prompt
 Departmental exam
 Capstone experience (specify):
 Other (specify):

4. Have these tools been used before?
 Yes
 No

 If yes, have the tools been altered since its last administration? If so, briefly describe changes made.
 N/A

5. Indicate the number of students assessed/total number of students enrolled in the course.
 Portfolio artifacts were collected from 20 students. Thirty-three students were enrolled in two sections of ENG 100 at the time of assessment.

6. Describe how students were selected for the assessment.
 All students in ENG 100, Section 1 were assessed.

Results

1. Briefly describe the changes that were implemented in the course as a result of the previous assessment.
 N/A

2. State each outcome from the master syllabus that was assessed.
 The following outcome from the master syllabus was assessed: Plan and Write Effective Letters and Memos.

3. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected during the course assessment, demonstrating the extent to which students are achieving each of the learning outcomes listed above. Please attach a summary of the data collected.
 Eighty percent of students assessed scored 80% or higher on the artifacts collected.

4. For each outcome assessed, indicate the standard of success used, and the percentage of students who achieved that level of success.
 The master syllabus states that "Seventy-five percent of students assessed must receive a score of 11.25/15 (75%) or better on analyzed artifacts."

5. Describe the areas of strength and weakness in students' achievement of the learning outcomes shown in assessment results.

Please return completed form to the Office of Curriculum & Assessment, SC 247.

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Strengths: Overall, 80% of students earned a score of 80% or higher on the artifacts collected. (See Data Sheet 1.) Students earned an average score of 4.25/5 (85%) on both the prewriting artifact and the memo artifact. This exceeded the standard measure of success by 10 percentage points. Students earned an average score of 3.9 (78%) on the letter artifact, which also exceeded the standard measure of success, but by only three percentage points. (See Data Sheet 2.)

Weaknesses: As stated above in the sections above, student achievement exceeded the standard measure of success overall and in the three specific areas (prewriting, letter writing, and memo writing). Detailed data analysis shows a weakness in spelling, grammar, and punctuation in the letter area. Only 11 out of 20 students assessed (55%) were able to produce a letter that was error free. (See Data Sheet 3.)

Changes influenced by assessment results

1. If weaknesses were found (see above) or students did not meet expectations, describe the action that will be taken to address these weaknesses, along with a timeline for these actions.
Though the overall scoring for all artifacts exceeded our standard of success, errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation lowered the average score for the letter artifact. The E/W department will continue to monitor student achievement in this area.

2. Identify any other intended changes that will be instituted based on results of this assessment activity (check all that apply). Please describe changes and give rationale for change.

Master syllabus
Change/rationale:

Curriculum
Change/rationale:

Course syllabus
Change/rationale:

Course assignments
Change/rationale:

Course materials (check all that apply)
 Textbook
 Handouts
 Other:
Change/rationale:

Instructional methods
Change/rationale:

Other:
Change/rationale:

Future plans

1. Describe the extent to which the assessment tools used were effective in measuring student achievement of learning outcomes for this course.
Assessing a portion of a student portfolio worked well, but the scoring rubric should be more generic to accommodate different instructors' assignments.
2. If the assessment tools were not effective, describe the changes that will be made for future assessments.
The grading rubric will be modified.

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Submitted by:

Name: Rita Veagy

Date: 7.25.06

Department Chair: [Signature]

Date: 7/31/06

Dean: [Signature]

Date: AUG 01 2006