

**Course Assessment Report  
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	270	ENG 270 02/12/2021- Creative Writing I
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness	Maryam Barrie
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: Demonstrate an understanding of literary genres through original writing.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Holistic assessment of student portfolios.
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2020
  - Course section(s)/other population: Course sections
  - Number students to be assessed: Students in 1/3 of running sections.
  - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric.
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of portfolios will demonstrate outcome.

- Who will score and analyze the data: Department 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
45	27

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 requires "Students in 1/3 of running sections". Rather than simply assess 15 portfolios, I chose to include all submitted portfolios from ENG 270/271 section 01, and all students completing the course in ENG 270/271 D01. Both DL sections and the N1 section, used the DL course shell which does NOT require a portfolio, but which does include instruction in multiple genres.

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.

The Master Syllabus requires "Students in 1/3 of running sections". Rather than simply assess 15 portfolios, I chose to include all submitted portfolios from ENG 270/271 section 01, and all students completing the course in ENG 270/271 D01. Both DL sections and the N1 section, used the DL course shell which does NOT require a portfolio, but which does include instruction in multiple genres.

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 create original writing in multiple genres over the course of the semester. Students in section 01 were NOT required to include multiple genres in their portfolio, due to poor departmental communication. Students in section D01 were required to write in multiple genres. Student work 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. Early on, I realized that an amendment to the rubric was required, and when students created average quality work in multiple genres, a score of 1.5 was given for this 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

The assessment results are complicated by the few students taking the course a second time, as ENG 271. Those students are indicated on the Assessment Data chart. In section 01, 5 of the 9 students scored 2 for this outcome. Two scored 1.5, and two scored only a 1. The average for this section was 1.67. In section D01, three of the students scored 2, with fourteen scoring 1.5. There were no students who scored 1 for this outcome, though there was a 0 score for this outcome when the genre of the student work could not be determined. The average for this section was 1.65. The standard of success for this outcome was that 70% of portfolios would demonstrate the outcome. Using 70% as the standard, which works out to be 1.4, 24/27 portfolios (88.9%) scored 1.4 or higher, so 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.

It appears that students in both sections, for the most part, wrote in multiple genres, with understanding of the parameters of the genres represented. A complicating factor is language in the current Master Syllabus language states that particular sections may focus on one genre.

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 requiring students to compose original writing in multiple genres is sound pedagogy, some minor amendment may be required so that students creating excellent quality original writing may still meet the Learning Outcome, even if their work is composed in a single genre.

Outcome 2: Demonstrate an understanding of literary technique through original writing.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Holistic assessment of student portfolios.
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2020
  - Course section(s)/other population: Course sections
  - Number students to be assessed: Students in 1/3 of running sections.

- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric.
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of portfolios will demonstrate outcome.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Department 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
45	27

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 requires "Students in 1/3 of running sections". Rather than simply assess 15 portfolios, I chose to include all submitted portfolios from ENG 270/271 section 01, and all students completing the course in ENG 270/271 D01. Both DL sections and the N1 section used the DL course shell which does NOT require a portfolio, but which does include instruction in multiple genres.

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.

The Master Syllabus requires "Students in 1/3 of running sections". Rather than simply assess 15 portfolios, I chose to include all submitted portfolios from ENG 270/271 section 01, and all students completing the course in ENG 270/271 D01. Both DL sections and the N1 section, used the DL course shell which does NOT require a portfolio, but which does include instruction in multiple genres.

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

The Eng 270/271 Assessment Rubric addressed the Learning Outcome of "demonstrate an understanding of literary technique" in a variety of ways. The Rubric distinguishes between literary technique (features that a piece of writing can include) and literary devices (actions writers take to create meaning). In addition, the Rubric includes three distinct categories related to Course Objective 2 for this course, which is "Uses the elements of good writing". For purposes of

this assessment, the three categories are: follows established grammatical conventions, demonstrates proofreading, and the portfolio pieces show organization of writing around a central idea. Student work 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

The assessment results are complicated by the few students taking the course a second time, as ENG 271. Those students are designated on the Eng 270/271 Assessment Data chart.

In Eng 270/271 section 01, seven students scored a 2 for "demonstrates an understanding of literary technique", while only two students scored a 1. Six students scored a 2 for "demonstrates skill with literary devices", while three scored a 1. For the three categories of "Use the elements of good writing", seven students scored a 2 for "follows grammatical conventions", with two scoring a 1; five students scored a 2 for "proofreading", with four scoring 1; and seven students scored a 2 for "organizes the work around a central idea", with two students scoring 1. The standard of success for each category of 1.4 was exceeded in all categories. The standard of success of 70% for total scoring of the rubric was 8.4 (out of 12 possible points). 20/27 portfolios (74.1%) scored 8.4 or higher. The average of this group's Rubric totals was 10.22. This group exceeded the standard of success.

In Eng 270/271 section D01, three students scored a 2 for "demonstrates an understanding of literary technique", while fifteen students scored a 1. Three students scored a 2 for "demonstrates skill with literary devices", while fifteen scored a 1. For the three categories of "Use the elements of good writing", fourteen students scored a 2 for "follows grammatical convention", with four scoring a 1; fifteen students scored a 2 for "proofreading", with three scoring 1; and three students scored a 2 for "organizes the work around a central idea", with one student scoring 0, and the remaining fifteen scoring 1. The standard of success for each category (1.4) was exceeded for four categories, with the categories of "uses literary technique" (1.05) and "demonstrates skill with literary devices" (1.11) under the standard of success. The standard of success of 70% for total scoring of the rubric was 8.4 (out of 12 possible points). The average of this group's Rubric totals was 8.44. This group met the standard of success.

The standard of success for each category is 1.4. Combining the average of each group yields these results: "demonstrates an understanding of literary technique" 1.42, "demonstrates skill with literary devices" 1.39, "follows grammatical conventions" 1.71, "proofreading" 1.56, and "organized around a central idea" 1.45. The combined averages of the two groups is 9.3 (out of 12 total points), with the standard of success being 8.4. The standard of success was met, though there is room for improvement.

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

The student writing in the face-to-face section was very strong and exceeded the standard. The DL section (again, the current DL Master does not require a portfolio) performed well in "using the elements of good writing", with high scores for meeting grammatical conventions and proofreading.

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 students in the DL section barely met the standard of success in demonstrating understanding of literary technique, which suggests that the DL Master of the course should be updated to address literary technique. The one category which did NOT meet the standard of success was demonstrating skill with literary devices - the average for both groups in this category on the rubric was 1.39, which does not meet the standard of success of 1.4. The average for the face-to-face section exceeds the standard of success (1.67). This points out further evidence that the DL Master of the course should be updated to better address literary devices. Lastly, the work in the DL section did not meet the standard of success in organizing the work around a central idea, but this is related to the fact that the DL Master does not require either a portfolio, or that work submitted be organized around a central idea. Moving forward, the assessment tool should either be changed, the rubric should be changed or a portfolio assignment should be added to the DL course Master. Following a Zoom discussion with all the Creative Writing teachers for Fall 2020 and Tom Zimmerman, the overwhelming position was that the assessment tool be changed. This will have to be addressed in the next revision of the English 270/271 Master Syllabus.

### **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.

To the best of my knowledge, there was no previous assessment of English 270/271.

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 face-to-face instruction exceeded the standard of success, which suggests that this section meet the needs of its students well. Only two students were taking that section as English 271, so either this group had very strong writers in the first place, or the instruction was excellent, or both. The DL students were asked to create original work in multiple genres, but multiple factors suggest the DL Master should be updated. While students in the DL section met the standards of success in three categories of the rubric, they did NOT meet the standard of success in the other three categories of the rubric. While the current DL Master was cutting edge and does do many things well (particularly in requiring students to write in multiple genres, and to have experience with writing workshops with peers to get feedback on their rough drafts) there is a need for instruction in literary technique and literary devices. Instruction on both of these would likely increase the quality of students' original writing.

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

I will share the report with the Fall 2020 Creative Writing instructors, the Winter 2021 Creative Writing instructors, and the English & College Readiness department.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Assessment Tool	The date from the assessment, and discussion with the Fall 2020 instructors suggests that the Assessment Tool should not be a portfolio. I will work with past and current Creative Writing teachers to determine what an appropriate Assessment Tool moving forward	The current DL Master did NOT include an assignment that led students to compile a portfolio. The DL Master of the course should comply with whatever the Master Syllabus determines the assessment tool to be.	2021

	would be, and ensure that whatever is decided, the DL Master for Creative Writing will include the necessary features.		
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Course materials providing instruction in literary technique (qualities texts have) and literary devices (actions writers make) will be added to the DL Master of English 270/271.	Students in the DL section assessed did not meet the standard of success, so change is required.	2022
Other: Rubrics	The rubrics will be updated.	The rubrics need to be updated to allow for accurate evaluation of students' work.	2021

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

6.
----

### III. Attached Files

[Creative Writing Rubric](#)  
[English 270/271 Assessment Data](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Maryam Barrie **Date:** 02/24/2021  
**Department Chair:** Carrie Krantz **Date:** 02/24/2021  
**Dean:** Scott Britten **Date:** 03/03/2021  
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Shawn Deron **Date:** 03/31/2021