

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

| Discipline | Course Number | Title |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Journalism | 217 | JRN 217 09/02/2019- Introduction to Feature Writing |
| Division | Department | Faculty Preparer |
| Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences | English & College Readiness | David Waskin |
| Date of Last Filed Assessment Report | | 09/16/2014 |

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

This course was previously assessed in June 2014.

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

Students did well in meeting or exceeding the standard of success for each outcome. The weakest performance on an individual outcome had to do with quoting an adequate number of sources; students performed exceptionally well on outcomes that dealt with selecting appropriate feature topics as well as employing feature-writing technique to beginnings and endings.

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

One outcome pertaining to distinguishing feature writing from other forms of journalism was removed and given more to the province of our then-new JRN 220: Introduction to Digital Journalism course. This outcome was replaced with one pertaining to writing articles of adequate depth and length for long-form print. Similarly, references to multimedia journalism were removed from the course description so that they might be more properly placed under the metaphoric umbrella of our digital journalism course. These changes were implemented by changes to the master syllabus of each course.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Choose appropriate topics for feature stories.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Eighty percent of students will score 2 out of 2 on this outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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, 2017 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 21 | 10 |

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.

Gathering large sample sizes continues to be a challenge for 200-level journalism courses because these run once per year and typically enroll a relatively low number of students. The courses are also taught, more often than not, by part-time instructors unfamiliar with our assessment process. I have now advised our current part-time instructor that I would like to continue to gather artifacts on an ongoing basis so that, in the future, sample sizes can be larger. For this report, the work of eight students from the Fall 2018 semester were assessed along with the work of two students from the Fall 2017 semester that I was able to retrieve.

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.

Only one section of JRN 217 runs per year; portfolios were gathered from that section.

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

Student portfolios (i.e. a minimum of two stories written throughout the term) were scored using the rubric included with this report. With regard to this outcome, I considered whether the stories were more suited for breaking news, editorials, or columns or whether, as with proper feature stories, their timeliness was less relevant than other elements of newsworthiness. To determine whether a student's work exceeded expectations, I looked for an especially creative or high-level of difficulty in the topic in addition to whether it seemed suitable as a feature. Also, I used a different rubric than the one included with the 2014 assessment report. I did this based on feedback received from the assessment committee in 2016 that it was unacceptable to use a yes/no rubric. I was especially glad to receive this feedback and have accordingly adjusted the rubric for assessing this course according to that feedback.

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

All students either met or exceeded expectations for this outcome. The fact that half exceeded it is especially gratifying given that, again, this rating involved an exceptional display of creativity or difficulty.

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

The areas of strength were in identifying and pursuing topics appropriate for feature stories and, in some cases, going beyond the obvious to the exceptional, as in the case of a story that detailed effects of drug addiction. Moreover, I was impressed by the consistency across portfolios in their selection of topics not only relevant to a college audience but suitable to the feature form in general.

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.

Areas of improvement might include pushing for topics beyond the suitable, or the appropriate, and seeking out the exceptional, or more creative, choice of subject. Students met the standard of success. I would not recommend changing anything in the course at the outcome level with regard to this. I will revise objectives on the master syllabus to this end.

Outcome 2: Identify, locate and use multiple sources of information for feature stories.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Eighty percent of students will score a 2 out of 2 on this outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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, 2017 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 21 | 10 |

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.

Gathering large sample sizes continues to be a challenge for 200-level journalism courses because these run once per year and typically enroll a relatively low number of students. The courses are also taught, more often than not, by part-time instructors unfamiliar with our assessment process. I have now advised our current part-time instructor that I would like to continue to gather artifacts on an ongoing basis so that, in the future, sample sizes can be larger. For this report, the work of eight students from the Fall 2018 semester were assessed along with the work of two students from the Fall 2017 semester that I was able to retrieve.

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.

Only one section of JRN 217 runs per year; portfolios were gathered from that section.

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

As noted on the (new) rubric, a minimum of two “live” sources—that is to say, two people, as opposed to reports or other published work—was used to determine if each student met the expectations for this outcome. Relevance was also considered, generally speaking, one subject matter expert and one person affected by the events detailed in the story is expected. If the stories in the portfolio exceeded this on more than one occasion, the student was rated as exceeding expectations. If the work in the portfolio failed on more than one occasion to meet this standard, it was rated as below expectations.

Remember, I used a different rubric than the one included with the 2014 assessment report. I did this based on feedback received from the assessment committee in 2016 that it was unacceptable to use a yes/no rubric. I was especially glad to receive this feedback and have accordingly adjusted the rubric for assessing this course according to that feedback.

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

Eighty percent of students met or exceeded expectations for this outcome. This is a good result, especially since I consider this to be one of the more challenging aspects of feature writing and of journalism in general. Students are often reluctant to deal with sources face-to-face and, in general, avoid this form of direct communication unless encouraged and motivated to take it on.

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

I was especially gratified by the results for this outcome. I noted in the 2014 report that I would like to see students improve in this regard. They did better this time around, finding more live sources and including more in the stories that made up their portfolios. I look forward to larger data samples in the next report to check their progress again.

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.

I'm hesitant to draw too many conclusions without more data for this particular outcome simply because I know it to be challenging. The group assessed this time did quite well. I'd like to see what results I get in a few years with, I hope, a larger sample size.

Outcome 3: Write stories with beginnings and endings, structured according to common feature writing conventions.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Eighty percent of students will score 2 out of 2 on this outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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, 2017 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 21 | 10 |

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.

Gathering large sample sizes continues to be a challenge for 200-level journalism courses because these run once per year and typically enroll a relatively low number of students. The courses are also taught, more often than not, by part-time instructors unfamiliar with our assessment process. I have now advised our current part-time instructor that I would like to continue to gather artifacts on an ongoing basis so that, in the future, sample sizes can be larger. For this report, the work of

eight students from the Fall 2018 semester were assessed along with the work of two students from the Fall 2017 semester that I was able to retrieve.

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.

Only one section of JRN 217 runs per year; portfolios were gathered from that section.

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

For this outcome, not meeting the expectation is more easily described than meeting it. Commonly, students who fail to meet the expectation will begin their stories with a who-what-when-where lead (appropriate for breaking news but not features), or they will begin their stories with a quote (not industry standard), or they will write a long-winded essay-like introduction. If a student committed one or more of these infractions more than once in their portfolio, I considered the expectation not met. If a student used an especially creative lead to begin their story or an especially effective technique, along with not writing any other leads that failed to meet expectations, I considered they had exceeded expectations. Endings were also taken into account. Stories that conclude in the traditional sense of “wrapping up” or summarizing content are not industry standard and therefore below expectations.

Don't forget, I used a different rubric than the one included with the 2014 assessment report. I did this based on feedback received from the assessment committee in 2016 that it was unacceptable to use a yes/no rubric. I was especially glad to receive this feedback and have accordingly adjusted the rubric for assessing this course according to that feedback.

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

Eighty percent of students met or exceeded expectations for this outcome. This is a good result, though I hope to continue to encourage students to strive for more. Beginnings (and endings) contain the most opportunity for creative expression in feature writing, and I would like to see more students take advantage of this.

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

The standard of success was met; that is to say, eighty percent performed at or above expectations, which strikes me as good in terms of consistency.

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.

Even though eighty percent met at least an expectation-level of competence, I felt in reading the portfolios, there were missed opportunities for students to perform better. As noted, I would like them to strive for more in this regard. I will revise objectives on the master syllabus to this end.

Outcome 4: Write stories of length and depth suitable for magazines or other long-form media.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Eighty percent of students will score 2 out of 2 on this outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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, 2017 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 21 | 10 |

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.

Gathering large sample sizes continues to be a challenge for 200-level journalism courses because these run once per year and typically enroll a relatively low number of students. The courses are also taught, more often than not, by part-time instructors unfamiliar with our assessment process. I have now advised our current part-time instructor that I would like to continue to gather artifacts on an ongoing basis so that, in the future, sample sizes can be larger. For this report, the work of eight students from the Fall 2018 semester were assessed along with the work of two students from the Fall 2017 semester that I was able to retrieve.

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.

Only one section of JRN 217 runs per year; portfolios were gathered from that section.

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

In applying the rubric to this outcome, I considered that exceeding expectations meant exploring a topic from a number of angles (i.e. usually more than two). Another way of thinking about this is to consider whether the writer explored questions in the work that a more-thoughtful-than-average reader might think of when scanning the piece. Failing to meet expectations, conversely, was indicated by a writer who did the opposite, often resulting in a story that was not only brief but shallow or obvious in its import. If a student's portfolio met expectations in all instances and exceeded them with one or more stories, I considered that student to have exceeded the expectations. I applied the same standard in reverse for failing to meet the expectations.

I used a different rubric than the one included with the 2014 assessment report. I did this based on feedback received from the assessment committee in 2016 that it was unacceptable to use a yes/no rubric. I was especially glad to receive this feedback and have accordingly adjusted the rubric for assessing this course according to that feedback.

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

Ninety percent of students met or exceeded expectations for this outcome. This is a good result.

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

In this regard, the students performed exceptionally well; the stories in many portfolios were rife with information and research, possibly a credit to our instructor and/or the students themselves if not the design of the course.

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.

I was pleased with the results of the assessment for this outcome. At this time, I prefer to direct our efforts toward the course refinements noted in discussion of outcomes one and three.

Outcome 5: Write stories without violating media law or tenets of ethical journalism.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: All students will score 2 out of 2 on this outcome.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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, 2017 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 21 | 10 |

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.

Gathering large sample sizes continues to be a challenge for 200-level journalism courses because these run once per year and typically enroll a relatively low number of students. The courses are also taught, more often than not, by part-time instructors unfamiliar with our assessment process. I have now advised our current part-time instructor that I would like to continue to gather artifacts on an ongoing basis so that, in the future, sample sizes can be larger. For this report, the work of eight students from the Fall 2018 semester were assessed along with the work of two students from the Fall 2017 semester that I was able to retrieve.

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.

Only one section of JRN 217 runs per year; portfolios were gathered from that section.

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

If there were no ethical or legal transgressions in any of the student's work, I rated it as meeting expectations. If any part of a student's portfolio happened to deal with subject matter or types of stories in which ethical or legal lapses are common (e.g. crime stories), I would have rated them as exceeding expectations if, in fact, they avoided such lapses. A transgression in any work would have rated below expectations.

I used a different rubric than the one included with the 2014 assessment report. I did this based on feedback received from the assessment committee in 2016 that it was unacceptable to use a yes/no rubric. I was especially glad to receive this feedback and have accordingly adjusted the rubric for assessing this course according to that feedback.

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

There were no ethical or legal lapses in any of the work; all students met the standard of success for this outcome.

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

All students met expectations, so consistency is a strength in student achievement for this outcome. It's gratifying to see that no students committed ethical or legal transgressions in their work, particularly at a time when partisan journalism (and the questionable ethics that accompany it) is largely present in today's media landscape.

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.

I understand that this outcome differs from the others insofar as it asks students to avoid a pitfall rather than actively seek out or include some positive element in their work. Still, our inclusion of law and ethics as elements of this course seems to work to the degree that it should; at this time, I believe no change is necessary.

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.

Those changes that included moving material from the province of this course to the province of another are difficult to capture in a portfolio assessment. What worked well, though, was the inclusion of an outcome pertaining to depth and length of stories. That was new to this assessment and, per the results, it seems to have succeeded.

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?

I think the course is performing well. Most of all, I recognize the challenge of gathering an adequate sample size from a small-enrollment course that runs once a year. Briefly put, it takes time, especially amid instructor turnover and varying practices among those instructors, to gather the needed artifacts. I hope to continue the ongoing collection of portfolios (every year) from our current part-time instructor and any possible successors.

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

This report will be shared with the department chair and dean as a matter of course. I will communicate the need for ongoing collection of portfolios with our other instructors and maintain a repository of these portfolios as best I can.

4.

Intended Change(s)

| Intended Change | Description of the change | Rationale | Implementation Date |
|------------------------|--|---|---------------------|
| Objectives | Changes will be made to objectives to reflect more emphasis on creative beginning and endings and creative topics. | The rationale for these changes is to continue to encourage student improvement as detailed in the analysis of the two corresponding outcomes. | 2020 |
| Other: Data collection | I have now advised our current part-time instructor that I would like to continue to gather artifacts on an ongoing basis so that, in the future, sample sizes can be larger. She will send the artifacts to me at the end of each semester the course runs. | Gathering large sample sizes continues to be a challenge for 200-level journalism courses because these run once per year and typically enroll a relatively low number of students. The courses are also taught, more often than not, by part-time instructors. | 2019 |

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

6.

III. Attached Files

[JRN 217 revised rubric](#)

[JRN217data](#)

Faculty/Preparer:

David Waskin **Date:** 09/02/2019

Department Chair:

Carrie Krantz **Date:** 09/04/2019

Dean: Scott Britten **Date:** 09/25/2019
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 11/08/2019

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

| Discipline | Course Number | Title |
|---|-----------------|---|
| Journalism | 217 | JRN 217 06/11/2014- Introduction to Feature Writing |
| Division | Department | Faculty Preparer |
| Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences | English/Writing | David Waskin |
| Date of Last Filed Assessment Report | | |

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify and evaluate appropriate topics for feature stories.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2011
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Seventy percent of students receive an average score of 2 or higher on outcome being assessed.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2013 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 11 | 12 |

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.

Portfolios for twelve students were provided by course instructor; perhaps one withdrew after completing enough material to constitute a portfolio.

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 runs only one section per year, and we assess all students enrolled, so all populations are included.

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

A portfolio of at least two completed written works for each student was examined and scored with a "1," indicating the outcome had not been demonstrated or a "2," indicating the outcome had been demonstrated. Positive demonstration for this outcome means the student chose a topic or type of story to write that lends itself to feature format, such as a profile, as opposed to one that does not, such as a school board meeting.

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

For this outcome, 83 percent of students scored 2, indicating the standard of success had been achieved.

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

Students performed quite well on this outcome. Columns, personality profiles, business or company profiles, and human interest stories are all acceptable choices for feature stories. No students made inappropriate choices.

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 two students who did not successfully demonstrate this outcome were missing pieces of work in their portfolios. It wasn't so much a case of poor choices of topic, perhaps, as other variables that interfered with their success (i.e. just not doing the work). Overall I am satisfied with the way the course addresses this outcome.

Outcome 2: Identify, locate and employ multiple sources of information for feature stories.

- Assessment Plan

- Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
- Assessment Date: Winter 2011
- Course section(s)/other population: all
- Number students to be assessed: all
- How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric.
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Seventy percent of students assessed must score average of 2 or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2013 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 11 | 12 |

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.

Portfolios for twelve students were provided by course instructor; perhaps one withdrew after completing enough material to constitute a portfolio.

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 runs only one section per year, and we assess all students enrolled, so all populations are included.

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

A portfolio of at least two completed written works for each student was examined and scored with a "1," indicating the outcome had not been demonstrated or a "2," indicating the outcome had been demonstrated.

Positive demonstration for this outcome means the student clearly used more than one source of information in his/her feature writing, at least one (though ideally more) of which is a person, quoted in the story, with whom they have interacted.

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

For this outcome, 58 percent of students scored 2. Generally speaking, those that failed to meet the successful standard quoted only one source in their stories. This is understandable (though not acceptable) as interacting with sources is often the most daunting aspect of journalism for students.

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

Interviewing sources is among the most daunting tasks for beginning journalists, and a number of students in the course successfully negotiated this challenge to incorporate more than one live, quoted source in their stories. Others quoted perhaps one person but used information from a variety of other viable sources (e.g. print, digital) that were also acceptable.

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.

This is the most obvious and important area for improvement in the course. Students must be challenged and encouraged to provide additional sources to their work and not shy from interviews as many are inclined to do.

Outcome 3: Write stories with beginnings and endings, structured according to common feature writing conventions.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2011
 - Course section(s)/other population: all

- o Number students to be assessed: all
- o How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric.
- o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Seventy percent of students assessed must average 2 or higher for each outcome assessed.
- o Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2013 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 11 | 12 |

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.

Portfolios for twelve students were provided by course instructor; perhaps one withdrew after completing enough material to constitute a portfolio.

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 runs only one section per year, and we assess all students enrolled, so all populations are included.

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

A portfolio of at least two completed written works for each student was examined and scored with a "1," indicating the outcome had not been demonstrated or a "2," indicating the outcome had been demonstrated.

Beginnings, in this context, are defined in opposition to the "hard lead" format used for breaking news (i.e. the who, what, when, where format). Endings are defined in opposition to a hard news format in which the writing simply stops.

A positive demonstration means the student used one of several more appropriate feature forms to begin and end their story.

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

For this outcome, 83 percent of students scored 2, indicating the standard of success had been achieved.

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

This was perhaps the most impressive performance by outcome for the course. While some other outcomes yielded equal or higher success results, this one is more challenging and therefore the results more pleasing to me. Writing stories with creative, engaging leads and concluding them with stronger "kickers" requires skill and effort; the students demonstrated both.

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.

I hope the success in this outcome will continue; the textbook for this course, I believe, is particularly strong in these areas and I plan to keep using it.

Outcome 4: Recognize and identify differences in writing feature stories for various media outlets.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Seventy percent of students assessed must receive an average score of 2 or higher for outcome assessed.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2013 | | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 11 | 12 |

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.

Portfolios for twelve students were provided by course instructor; perhaps one withdrew after completing enough material to constitute a portfolio.

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 runs only one section per year, and we assess all students enrolled, so all populations are included.

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

N/A.

This outcome no longer applies to this course. It, or one similar to it, more properly belongs in JRN 220: Introduction to Digital Journalism. The master syllabi for both courses will be amended to reflect this change. (This course, JRN 217, predates the creation of JRN 220 and at the time of its conception we were trying to incorporate some elements of digital journalism.)

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
N/A.

This outcome no longer applies to this course. It, or one similar to it, more properly belongs in JRN 220: Introduction to Digital Journalism. The master

syllabi for both courses will be amended to reflect this change. (This course, JRN 217, predates the creation of JRN 220 and at the time of its conception we were trying to incorporate some elements of digital journalism.)

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

I did not assess for this outcome after hitting upon two realizations. One was that although it was well intended, this outcome, as written, may be somewhat ill-conceived for assessment by portfolio and rubric. The other, perhaps more important, is that JRN 217 was written with this outcome prior to our creation of JRN 220: Introduction to Digital Journalism. At the time I was trying to address an emerging aspect of journalism without the presence of that course. Now that we have JRN 220, this outcome or one similar will be moved to its syllabus and removed from this course.

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.

N/A.

Outcome 5: Evaluate the legal and ethical viability of their own writing and of feature stories in other media outlets.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio review
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2011
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored: Attached rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: Seventy percent of students assessed must receive an average score of 2 or higher for the outcome assessed.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Writing faculty and/or staff with journalism experience will score the portfolios.

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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| 2013 | | |
|------|--|--|

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 11 | 12 |

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.

Portfolios for twelve students were provided by course instructor; perhaps one withdrew after completing enough material to constitute a portfolio.

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 runs only one section per year, and we assess all students enrolled, so all populations are included.

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

A portfolio of at least two completed written works for each student was examined and scored with a "1," indicating the outcome had not been demonstrated or a "2," indicating the outcome had been demonstrated.

In this case, a positive demonstration meant that student work contained no material that appeared to be a potential violation of libel, copyright, or privacy laws and contained no material that appeared to violate any tenet of the Society for Professional Journalists code of ethics.

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

All students assessed scored a positive demonstration of this outcome. To be more accurate, though, the outcome will be reworded.

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

I am pleased that 100 percent of students succeeded in this outcome, as we do not want any to commit legal or ethical violations even in their work as students. It is

an obvious strength that none did.

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.

We will continue to include elements of this outcome in all of our journalism courses as we presently do. I will make the wording more precise to what we are measuring, however (i.e. that the students commit no legal or ethical violations in their work).

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?

This course is meeting the needs of students well, though the assessment brought to light a few ways in which it can be improved. I will detail these in the action plan.

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

I will share the information in the action plan with departmental faculty via e-mail this summer, prior to Fall semester when the course is offered again.

3. Intended Change(s)

| Intended Change | Description of the change | Rationale | Implementation Date |
|------------------|---|--|---------------------|
| Outcome Language | Outcome 4 will be removed from this master syllabus and replaced with an outcome that mentions writing stories of a length and depth suitable for magazine or other long-form media. Because we can (and should) remove the elements of digital | Rationale noted above and in previous discussion of assessment results. Elements of digital journalism in this course more properly belong in the Introduction to Digital Journalism course. | 2014 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|------|
| | <p>journalism, we will have more room to emphasize in-depth writing, sourcing, and reporting in feature form.</p> <p>Outcome 5 will be reworded to reflect that students will write stories that violate no laws or ethical tenets.</p> <p>I will also consider removing mention of online reporting/convergence from the course description. While these should be topics in all journalism courses, they need not be emphasized in this one any longer by inclusion in the description.</p> | | |
| Objectives | <p>Objectives nine and ten will be removed. An objective pertaining to long form journalism and more in-depth writing/reporting will be added.</p> | <p>The objective pertaining to digital journalism should be moved from this course to another, making room for more focus on traditional feature writing.</p> | 14 |
| Course Assignments | <p>I will discuss with departmental faculty making sure that course assignments require an adequate number of sources to meet the rubric/criteria for</p> | <p>Making sure a certain number of sources is required for a story is an obvious way to encourage the students to include them; adding the requirement of a</p> | 2014 |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | outcome 2. I would like also to add the requirement that at least one feature assignment be at least 1,000 words in length. | longer assignment does this as well and shifts some of the course emphasis from digital journalism to long form feature writing. | |
|--|--|--|--|

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

The assessment rubric originally intended for this course, with a rating of 1-3 for each outcome, proved impractical for several of the outcomes as they were written. To complete the assessment I used a 1-2/no-yes rating that seemed less arbitrary when applied to the outcomes. (The rubric I used is attached to the report.)

III. Attached Files

Assessment Data JRN 217
JRN 217 Assessment Rubric

Faculty/Preparer: David Waskin **Date:** 06/11/2014
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 07/17/2014
Dean: Dena Blair **Date:** 07/28/2014
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 09/15/2014