

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

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	214	ENG 214 03/14/2017- Literature of the Non- Western World
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Maryam Barrie
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

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

Outcome 1: Read works by major authors from Africa, Asia, the Middle East and the sub-continent of India.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Once in a 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
  - 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)
	2017, 2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
41	32

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.

After attrition, all remaining, participating students who submitted the essay in these three sections 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.

All students from these three sections were assessed. Of the three sections assessed, one was offered face-to-face at an alternative site, and two were offered on campus in the face-to-face mode.

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

Students were asked to write a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings. Included in the Assessment Data report you will see the region(s) covered in each student's work. Throughout the student essays, nineteen discussed work from the Middle East, sixteen covered a piece from India, and five wrote about a folktale from the Native American tradition. The other regions represented in the student work were (in descending order) China, Persia, Africa, Malaysia, Japan, Australia, Spain, and Greece. In addition, the essay was scored by a faculty member who did not teach the course using a departmentally-developed rubric. Note that outcome 1, as currently stated, was not assessed and was replaced with the following: *Identify major genres, themes and techniques in selected literary work(s)*. This revised outcome, which is used in many of our literature courses, better reflects the substance and true nature of this course. The master syllabus will be updated to reflect this change. For each outcome, students can earn between 0 and 2 points with 2 exceeding the requirement, 1 meeting the requirement, and 0 signifying that the student did not meet the requirement.

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

Works from Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and the sub-continent of India are well represented through the student work, showing that the standard of success for outcome 1, as currently written, has been met. In addition, data from the departmentally developed rubric measuring students' ability to identify genres, themes, and techniques in selected literary work(s) shows that this additional requirement, which is reflected in the revised language for outcome 1 as well as

the attached rubric, has also been met. Of the 32 essays, only 3 failed to identify major genres, themes, and techniques in the piece(s) they chose to work with. Of the remaining 28 essays, 8 (25%) met the standard, and 21(66%) exceeded the standard. Using the departmentally developed rubric, the collective average of 1.6 (80%) indicates that students were able to identify major genres, themes, and techniques in the literary work(s) they chose to write about, and thus, the standard of success was met.

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

Works from Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and the sub-continent of India have been read and analyzed by the majority of these students. The two instructors responsible for these three sections have familiarized students with significant literature from these areas. As previously mentioned, the current student outcome for this course is not substantive in that simply reading content from the specified regions meets the requirement and will be revised on the master syllabus.

The revised student outcome, as mentioned above and also reflected on the departmentally developed rubric, does demonstrate that this is a significant area of student achievement as only 3 of the 32 essays failed to accurately identify genres, themes and literary techniques in their analysis. 29 out of 32 students (91%) were able to meet this requirement, and 21 of 32 of these students (66%) actually exceeded expectations.

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 current student outcome 1 has been met, though there are a few outliers, as Spain, Greece, Australia and Native America are generally considered as the Western World. The anomalous pieces of literature were contained in the required textbook, and were always compared to literature from the specified regions.

Moving forward, the language on the Master Syllabus for this course should change to better align with the departmental Literature SLOs (student learning outcomes). Additionally, the information from that rubric (indicated in the Assessment Data report) indicates that there is room for more classroom discussion of genres, themes, and literary techniques.

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary to analyze literature of the non-western world in an academic essay.

- Assessment Plan

- Assessment Tool: Once in a 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
- 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, 2017	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
41	32

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.

After attrition, all remaining and participating students from these three sections who submitted the essay 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.

All students from these three sections were assessed. Of the sections assessed, one was offered face-to-face at an alternative site, and two were offered on campus in the face-to-face mode.

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

Students were asked to write a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings. The essay was scored by a faculty member who did not teach the course using a departmentally-developed rubric. For each outcome, students can earn between 0 and 2 points with 2 exceeding the requirement, 1 meeting the requirement, and 0 signifying that the student did not meet the requirement.

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 32 essays, only 1 student failed to use literary vocabulary to analyze the piece(s) chosen. Of the remaining 32 essays, 25 (78%) exceeded the criteria. Based on the departmentally developed rubric, a collective average of 1.74 was earned, which indicates that students were able to use a literary vocabulary in their analysis and thus, the standard of success was met.

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

While there is always room for improvement, 97% of these students met the requirement of being able to use literary vocabulary in their analysis of a literary work, 78% of which exceeded the requirement.

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.

Familiarizing students with a robust literary vocabulary early in the semester and then reinforcing that vocabulary through the term could help the 21% of students who were not yet exceeding the requirement set in student outcome 2 to gain more mastery of these terms and their usefulness.

Outcome 3: Apply critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate literature of the non-western world.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Once in a 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
  - 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)
	2017, 2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
41	32

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.

After attrition, all remaining students from these three sections who submitted the essay 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.

All remaining and participating students from indicated sections were assessed. Of the three sections assessed, one was offered face-to-face at an alternative site, and two were offered on campus in the face-to-face mode.

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

Students were asked to write a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings. The essay was scored by a faculty member who did not teach the course using a departmentally-developed rubric (the rubric appears as an attached file). For each outcome, students can earn between 0 and 2 points with 2 exceeding the requirement, 1 meeting the requirement, and 0 signifying that the student did not meet the requirement.

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 32 essays, only 3 failed to apply the critical thinking skills of observation, explanation, and interpretation to evaluate literature. Using the departmentally developed rubric, a collective average of 1.6 indicates that students are able to successfully achieve this learning outcome. 91% of these students were able to

apply the critical thinking skills of observation, explanation, and interpretation to evaluate the work they chose to examine for their essay.

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

66% of students exceeded the requirement. 91% were able to meet or exceed the standard for success. Most of these students are proficient in applying the critical thinking skills of observation, evaluation, and interpretation to the literary works they chose for their essays.

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.

While the standard has been met, this outcome has the lowest average score of the current three student outcomes. Classroom instruction on how observation, interpretation, and explanation differ, and when each could be applied, could help even more students show proficiency with this outcome.

## 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 goals being assessed in all three outcomes for English 214, Literature of the Non-Western World have been met. In brief, using the departmentally developed rubric, the average score for the work of Group 1 was 5.25 points out of 6. In addition, the section instructor's evaluation of each paper is recorded on the English 214 Assessment Data report. There are two anomalies between the instructor's assessment and my own evaluation visible in that report. The first is with the work of student A. The second instance of diversion is with student B.

For Group 2, the average score was 5.5 points out of 6. The section instructor's evaluation for the least successful work in this group was 90%.

Group 3, from Winter 2016, had an average score of 4.65 points out of 6. Anecdotally, the teacher for Group 1 and Group 3, Dr. Myers-Dickinson, shared with me that her group this year (Group 1) is unusually cohesive and unusually skilled. As we all know, some groups have a mysterious excellence; with other terms, no matter what we try, the magic never happens. The differences between Group 1 and Group 3 are seen in the Assessment Data Report. A score of 4 on the

departmental rubric would have meant the course objectives had been met, and the average of this group more than met that goal.

Attached you will find the English 214 Assessment data report for these 3 groups.

The goals being assessed in all three outcomes for English 214, Literature of the Non-Western World, have been met. In brief, using the departmentally developed rubric, the average score for the work of Group 1 for all three student learning outcomes was 5.25 points out of 6. In addition, the section instructor's evaluation of each paper is recorded on the English 214 Assessment Data report. There are two anomalies between the instructor's assessment and my own evaluation visible in that report. The first is with the work of student A. The second instance of diversion is with student B. This indicates a very strong level of consistency between instructor evaluation and the formal assessment process.

For Group 2, the average score was 5.5 points out of 6, when averaging all three student learning outcomes.

Group 3, from Winter 2016, had an average score of 4.65 points out of 6. Anecdotally, the teacher for Group 1 and Group 3, shared with me that her group this year (Group 1) is unusually cohesive and unusually skilled. As we all know, some groups have a mysterious excellence; with other terms, no matter what we try, the magic never happens. The differences between Group 1 and Group 3 are seen in the Assessment Data Report. A score of 4 on the departmental rubric would have meant the course objectives had been met, and the average of this group more than met that goal.

Attached you will find the English 214 Assessment data report for these 3 groups.

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

I will be sure to send a completed copy of this report to the two instructors who taught these classes, in addition to the full time members of my department.

At least two revisions ought to be done with the English 214 master syllabus. The first is that Assessment plan particulars of that document are incomplete and not in alignment with the other literature courses. The second has been mentioned previously - the first student outcome needs to change to be in alignment with the departmentally developed Literature Rubric and to be more substantive.

3. Intended Change(s)

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

Outcome Language	The current first student outcome is not substantive and is not in alignment with the other literature courses.	Expecting students to be able to identify genres, themes, and literary techniques is a more robust requirement than simply reading major authors from the indicated regions.	2017
Assessment Tool	The current language in the master syllabus regarding the particulars of the Assessment plan are incomplete. They need to be specified.	The current language is vague and unclear. Once the changes are made, this course will be aligned with the other literature courses.	2017

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

5.
----

### III. Attached Files

[English 214 Assessment Data](#)  
[Literature Rubric](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Maryam Barrie **Date:** 05/25/2017  
**Department Chair:** Carrie Krantz **Date:** 05/30/2017  
**Dean:** Kristin Good **Date:** 05/30/2017  
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Michelle Garey **Date:** 08/31/2017