Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	211	ENG 211 03/21/2019-American Literature I - Before 1900
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: Read works by authors writing in the U.S. in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries.

- 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%
    - How the assessment will be scored:
    - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

       o   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)
2018		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
20	13

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.

All students 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 the section indicated were assessed. The section assessed was offered face-to-face on campus in the Fall semester.

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. All 13 students wrote about U.S. literature from the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. 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
U.S. Authors from the 17th, 18th, and 19th century are well represented throughout the student work. The average score for this outcome is 2, 100%, because each student wrote about an American author from the specified centuries. The standard of success (70% of students will score a 1 or higher) was met for this outcome.

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

> Students were clearly able to choose appropriate authors for their formal, analytic literary essay. However, since this course was last assessed, the departmental literature rubric has been revised. In the revised rubric, the first Student Learning Outcome is that students are able to "identify major genres, themes, and techniques in selected literary works." Even though the current Master Syllabus for English 211 does not yet have that as the first learning outcome, each of the 13 essays was assessed for the revised outcome as well as the current outcome. From the departmentally-developed rubric, a collective average of 1.46 indicates that students are able to identify genres, themes, and techniques in selected literary work(s). Only one of the student essays failed to show that they were able to identify genres, themes, and techniques. Twelve were able to meet this outcome, and seven students exceeded the requirement. 54% of students were able to exceed the requirement, and 92% of students met it.

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 outcome 1 is that students read authors writing in the U.S. in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. Moving forward, the language on the Master Syllabus for this course should change to better align with the departmental Literature Rubric. Additionally, the information from that rubric (included in the Data chart) indicates that there is room for more classroom discussion of genres, themes, and literary techniques.

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary to analyze U.S. literature 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%
    - 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)
2018		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
20	13

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.

All students 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 the section were assessed. The section assessed was offered face-to-face on campus.

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. All 13 students wrote about U.S. literature from the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. 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 13 essays, only two failed to use a literary vocabulary to analyze the piece(s) chosen. Of the remaining 11 essays, 7 exceed the criteria of using multiple instances of literary vocabulary to analyze the piece(s) chosen by the student. From the departmentally-developed rubric a collective average of 1.38 indicates that students are able to use a literary vocabulary to analyze literature. As

> 11/13 (85%) students scored a 1 or higher, the standard of success (70% of students will score 1 or higher) 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, it seems this class was used to a literary vocabulary in their analytic discussions and written work. 54% of students exceeded the requirement, and 85% of students met 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.

> The 15% of students who failed to meet the requirement do indicate room for improvement. This outcome has the lowest average score of the current three student outcomes. Familiarizing students with a robust literary vocabulary early in the semester and then reinforcing that vocabulary throughout the term could help improve the students' mastery.

Outcome 3: Apply critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate U.S. literature.

- Assessment Plan
    - o Assessment Tool: Once in a 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.
    - o Assessment Date: Winter 2009
    - o Course section(s)/other population: all
    - o Number students to be assessed: sample of 20%
    - o How the assessment will be scored:
    - o Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
    - o 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)
2018		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
20	13

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.

All students 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 the section indicated were assessed. The section was offered 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 13 essays, only 1 failed to apply the critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate U.S. literature. From the departmentally-developed rubric, a collective average of 1.69 indicates that students are able to achieve this learning outcome. Only 7.6 % of students failed to meet this requirement. 92% of students were able to apply the critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate the work they chose for their essay. The standard of success (70% of students will score a 1 or higher) was met.

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

77 % of students exceeded the requirement. These students are proficient in applying the critical thinking skills of observation, evaluation and interpretation to the literary works they chose to write about.

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 criteria of at least 70% meeting the requirement has been met, there is always room for improvement. Classroom instruction on how observation, explanation and interpretation differ could help more students meet or exceed this requirement.

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.

> NA

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?

> Overall, I was pleased with the outcome of this process. I was surprised to see that the student outcome 1 was so divergent from the departmentally-developed rubric and will address that in the next master syllabus update.
>
> In brief, the average score for this class was 4.5 points out of 6.

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

> First, I will be sure to send a completed copy of this report to the instructor who taught this class, in addition to the members of my department. The second item on my action plan will be to revise the first student outcome so that it aligns with our departmental literature rubric. Having an outcome as simple as "students read authors writing in the U.S. in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries" is not substantive. In my own sections of this class in the future, I will certainly spend more time on literary analytic terminology at the beginning of the course than I generally have. I think there would also be value in discussing the differences between observation, evaluation and interpretation, as well as discussing which approach might be most useful in a given instance.

4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date

		The current first student outcome is not substantive, and evaluating all the literature courses with a shared rubric will provide us with better information about how students are meeting their learning outcomes.	2019
Outcome Language	The first student outcome on the master syllabus will be changed to align with the other literature courses our department offers.		
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Reinforcing vocabulary throughout the semester (Outcome 2)	This language corresponds to the departmentally-approved rubric, and correlates to the data indicating there is room for improvement with this outcome.	2019
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Additional instruction on how observation, explanation and interpretation differ	This language corresponds to the departmentally-developed rubric and correlates to the data indicating there is room for improvement with this outcome.	2019
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Classroom discussion of genres, themes, and literary techniques (Outcome 1)	This language corresponds to the departmentally-approved rubric.	2019

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

Overall, I was struck by the fine work these students produced. I'm glad to know that the quality work of these English 211 students generally meets or exceeds the requirement. On the other hand, the enrollment of this course, and several of our other elective literature courses, has been drastically reduced by the current MTA agreement. I wish we had larger enrollment and more students still participating at the end of the semester so that we had a larger sample size to assess (though I acknowledge we cannot always affect how many students complete our courses). I

do realize that enrollment is down in several areas in the college, but Humanities electives seem particularly hard hit.

III. Attached Files

English 211 Assessment Data

Faculty/Preparer:	Maryam Barrie	**Date:** 09/12/2019
Department Chair:	Carrie Krantz	**Date:** 09/27/2019
Dean:	Scott Britten	**Date:** 09/30/2019
Assessment Committee Chair:	Shawn Deron	**Date:** 11/08/2019