Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	240	ENG 240 05/15/2017-Children's Literature
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Mary Mullalond
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Read and evaluate children's literature appropriate for preschool youth through age 13.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Formal or informal piece of writing, analyzing a work of children's literature

    o Assessment Date: Winter 2013

    o Course section(s)/other population: All

    o Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections

    o How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score at least one point for each item on the rubric.

    o Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty 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)
	2015, 2013	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
106	38

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 asked me to assess "a random sample of 20% of students from all sections." I sampled 35% of students.

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 day students were assessed from two different instructors. I was unable to collect student work from the part-time instructors teaching the evening section of this course.

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

> A rubric was used to assess this outcome, determining whether students met this outcome (score of 1) or did not meet the outcome (score of 0).

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: <u>Yes</u>
>
> 100% of students met the outcome "Read and evaluate children's literature appropriate for preschool youth through age 13." In other words, the standard of success 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.

> All students clearly read and evaluated children's literature for this assignment.

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 such a basic outcome, it would be challenging for any student NOT to pass it, unless they hadn't done the assignment. All students who completed the assignment had read the appropriate children's literatre and had to evaluate it. The quality of the evaluations were of varying degrees, but the rubric doesn't allow for an analysis of that. This is an outcome that needs to be changed to actually assess something meaningful.

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary to analyze children's literature.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Formal or informal piece of writing, analyzing a work of children's literature

    o Assessment Date: Winter 2013

    o Course section(s)/other population: All

    o Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections

    o How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score at least one point for each item on the rubric.

    o Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty 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)
	2015, 2013	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
106	38

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 asked me to assess "a random sample of 20% of students from all sections." I sampled 35% of students.

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 day students were assessed from two different instructors. I was unable to collect students' work from the part-time instructors teaching the evening section of this course

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

A rubric was used to assess this outcome, determining whether students met this outcome (score of 1) or did not meet the outcome (score of 0).

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

76% of students met this specific outcome. More than the 75% minimum 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.

Overall, just over 3/4 of students were able to successfully use literary terminology in their written work for this particular assignment that was assessed. This means students both understood literary terminiology and were aware that the assignment wanted them to show their understanding.

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.

It's hard to know if the students who failed to meet this outcome failed because they didn't actually know how to use literary terminology, or if they simply failed to show their knowledge of literary terminology in this particular assignment. Finding ways to incorporate more lessons and/or instruction on literary terminology could help improve this outcome, but making sure students clearly understand that they need to USE literary terminology would be more helpful.

Outcome 3: Demonstrate critical thinking skills of observation, explanation, and interpretation to evaluate children's literature.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Formal or informal piece of writing, analyzing a work of children's literature

    o Assessment Date: Winter 2013

    o Course section(s)/other population: All

- o Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students from all sections

- o How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric

- o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students must score at least one point for each item on the rubric.

- o Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty 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)
	2015, 2013	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
106	38

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 asked me to assess "a random sample of 20% of students from all sections." I sampled 35% of students.

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 day students were assessed from two different instructors. I was unable to collect students' work from the part-time instructors teaching the evening section of this course.

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

A rubric was used to assess this outcome, determining whether students met this outcome (score of 1) or did not meet the outcome (score of 0).

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: <u>Yes</u>
89% of students met this specific outcome. More than the 75% minimum 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.

Most students clearly knew how to think critically about the literature they were reading, and demonstrated that in their writing through examples of observation, explanation and interpretation.

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.

11% of students were not able to show they knew how to think critically about the literature they were writing about. I'm not sure if they were only observing, and not explaining or interpreting the literature because the rubric does not allow for that fine of detail of assessment. Changes to the rubric and possibly the outcome itself are needed.

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 assessment told me that students are meeting the bare minimum of achievement as outlined in the learning outcomes for this class. They're reading literature, they're using literary terminology, and they're using critical thinking skills to discuss it in their writing. That's good, but I'm not sure it's enough.

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

I will discuss the action plan and assessment at a Fall department meeting with my colleagues. I'm curious about their thoughts with the way other literature courses are being assessed.

3.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date

Outcome Language	The outcome language needs to be changed to be more specific for this course.	In particular, the first and third outcomes need to be revised so they measure more meaningful and specific learning outcomes for this course.	2017
Assessment Tool	The rubric needs to change to accomodate the new outcome language. I need to consider changing from a pass/no pass model to perhaps a 4 point scale of 4) highest quality 3) adequate quality 2) poor quality 1) no evidence.	Changing the rubric will not only meet the new outcome language but will also allow for finer detail or information about the quality of student work	2017

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

> 5.

III. Attached Files

Rubric & Results

Faculty/Preparer: Mary Mullalond **Date:** 05/15/2017
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 05/19/2017
Dean: Kristin Good **Date:** 05/19/2017
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 10/30/2017