

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

I. Background Information

1. Course assessed: Reading Comprehension II
 Course Discipline Code and Number: REA 071
 Course Title: Reading Comprehension II
 Division/Department Codes: Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences
2. Semester assessment was conducted (check one):
☒ Fall 2011
☒ Winter 2012
☐ Spring/Summer 20__
3. Assessment tool(s) used: check all that apply.
☐ Portfolio
 Standardized test
☐ Other external certification/licensure exam (specify):
☐ Survey
☐ Prompt
☐ Departmental exam
☐ Capstone experience (specify):
☒ Other (specify): ConnectRead computer diagnostic assessment, pre/post
4. Have these tools been used before?
☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, have the tools been altered since its last administration? If so, briefly describe changes made.

5. Indicate the number of students assessed and the total number of students enrolled in the course.

Fall 2011: **187 students enrolled in all sections of REA 070/071**
 144 students took the Pre-test
 68 students took both the Pre- and Post-tests – 36% were assessed

Winter 2012: **120 students enrolled in all sections of REA 070/071**
 81 students took the Pre test
 79 students took both the Pre and Posttests – 66% were assessed

6. If all students were not assessed, describe how students were selected for the assessment. (*Include your sampling method and rationale.*)

The assessment plan indicated that all students in all sections will be assessed; only the students that took both the pre- and post-assessment are included in the report. The first semester this tool was used, Fall 2011, did not fare well with the plan to assess all students—only 36% of the total students were assessed using both the pre- and post-test. Winter 2012 procedure was effectively put into place and the number of students assessed improved – 66% of the total were assessed both pre/post. The following factors interfered with obtaining a higher percentage of assessment:

- Some students did not have the access card during the first week. Winter 2012, delayed pre-testing to remedy this issue.
- Students who withdrew from the course did not take the post – test.
- Fall 2011, instructors were not diligent in administering the post-test, improved Winter 2012.

II. Results

1. Briefly describe the changes that were implemented in the course as a result of the previous assessment.
 Prior to Fall 2011, there was no consistency in the use of assessment tools within the Reading Department. With the merging of the Reading Department and Academic Skills in Fall of 2010, the disconnect on using a valid tool across all REA 070/071 was further lost resulting in no data to actually analyze to determine the effectiveness of teaching strategies. Spring of 2011, a decision was made to use ConnectRead as the possible tool and collect data to determine the effectiveness of using a computer-

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

based program with an expected 70% of the total students increasing their proficiency in reading skills. The use of the ConnectRead program as an assessment tool to measure student improvement in the use of reading strategies did not provide enough information to assess the application of the skills taught in this course. Therefore, the tool will be changed for Fall 2012.

2. List each outcome that was assessed for this report exactly as it is stated on the course master syllabus. *(You can copy and paste these from CurricUNET's WR report.)*

Outcome 1: Comprehend increasingly difficult text.

Outcome 2: Expand reading vocabulary.

Outcome 3: Actively engage in effective reading strategies.

3. For each outcome that was assessed, indicate the standard of success exactly as it is stated on the course master syllabus. *(You can copy and paste these from CurricUNET's WR report.)*

Outcome 1: COMPASS reading test, textbook exams, Pre/Post testing using the Nelson Denny Reading Assessment (Comprehension)

Outcome 2: COMPASS reading test, textbook exams, Pre/Post testing using the Nelson Denny Reading Assessment (Vocabulary)

Outcome 3: COMPASS reading test, textbook exams, Pre/Post testing using the Nelson Denny Reading Assessment (Total)

4. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected during the course assessment. Indicate the extent to which students are achieving each of the learning outcomes listed above and state whether the standard of success was met for each outcome. *In a separate document, include a summary of the data collected and any rubrics or scoring guides used for the assessment.*

Spring of 2011, a decision was made to use ConnectRead as the possible tool and collect data to determine the effectiveness of using a computer based program with an expected 70% of the total students increasing their proficiency in reading skills.

Outcome 1: Three components of the reading process, topic/main idea, supporting details, and patterns, were assessed pre/post using the ConnectRead computer diagnostic program. The format of the tool presents three questions for each component; therefore one incorrect answer yields a 67%.

Topic/Main Idea:	Fall 2011, 42% improved	Winter 2012, 23% improved
------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

Supporting Details:	Fall 2011, 38% improved	Winter 2012, 33% improved
---------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

Patterns of Organization:	Fall 2011, 38% improved	Winter 2012, 30% improved
---------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

According to the data, students are not improving at the expected rate of at least 70%.

Outcome 2: Two components of the reading process focusing on vocabulary, context clues and word parts, were assessed pre/post using the ConnectRead computer diagnostic program. The format of the tool presents three questions for each component; therefore one incorrect answer yields a 67%.

Context Clues:	Fall 2011, 26% improved	Winter 2012 41% improved
----------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

Word Parts	Fall 2011, 35% improved	Winter 2012 39% improved
------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

According to the data, students are not improving at the expected rate of at least 70%.

Outcome 3: Five components of the reading process, topic/main idea, supporting details, patterns context clues and word parts, were assessed pre/post using the ConnectRead computer diagnostic program. The format of the tool presents three questions for each component; therefore one incorrect answer yields a 67%. No averages were provided by the diagnostic assessment.

5. Describe the areas of strength and weakness in students' achievement of the learning outcomes shown in the assessment results. *(This should be an interpretation of the assessment results described above and a thoughtful analysis of student performance.)*

Strengths:

The strength of this tool was only the ease of administering and collecting the data for both pre/post.

Weaknesses:

- This tool only provides three questions per component of the reading process which is not adequate to assess the acquired skills of students.

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

- Students were not comfortable using a computer; skills are not proficient in computer basics.
- Students did not have an incentive to perform to the best of their ability because no “points” were assigned to taking the assessment, data does not reflect the level of student success in REA 070/071.

III. Changes influenced by assessment results

1. If weaknesses were found (see above) or students did not meet expectations, describe the action that will be taken to address these weaknesses. *(If students met all expectations, describe your plan for continuous improvement.)*

To align this course with ACS 107 and ACS 108, a final project will be introduced as the means of assessing the application of reading skills. ACS 107 and ACS 108 have implemented a final project that effectively reflects the acquired skills in each of those courses.

This new assessment tool for Fall 2012 will reflect the students’ ability to apply the reading strategies taught in the course and be analyzed using a grading rubric.

2. Identify intended changes that will be instituted based on results of this assessment activity (check all that apply). Please describe changes and give rationale for change.

- a. ☒ Outcomes/Assessments on the Master Syllabus

Change/rationale: This course will have a new assessment tool, final project, for Fall 2012 that will reflect the students’ ability to apply the reading strategies taught in the course, a final project utilizing a grading rubric.

- b. ☐ Objectives/Evaluation on the Master Syllabus

Change/rationale:

- c. ☒ Course pre-requisites on the Master Syllabus

Change/rationale: Include ENG 034 as a prerequisite for ESL students who want to take a reading course; per discussion with Sue Glowski

- d. ☒ 1st Day Handouts

Change/rationale: Will be updated to reflect the culminating final project.

- e. ☐ Course assignments

Change/rationale:

- f. ☐ Course materials (check all that apply)

☐ Textbook

☐ Handouts

☐ Other:

- g. ☒ Instructional methods

Change/rationale: Will be updated to reflect the culminating final project.

- h. ☐ Individual lessons & activities

Change/rationale:

3. What is the timeline for implementing these actions?

Fall 2012

IV. Future plans

1. Describe the extent to which the assessment tools used were effective in measuring student achievement of learning outcomes for this course.

2. If the assessment tools were not effective, describe the changes that will be made for future assessments.

To reflect the application of reading strategies instead of single specific skills, a final culminating project will be implemented that will include the use of all the components of the reading process.

3. Which outcomes from the master syllabus have been addressed in this report?

All X Selected

If “All”, provide the report date for the next full review: Fall 2015

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

If "Selected", provide the report date for remaining outcomes: _____.

Submitted by:

Print: Bonnie Arnett Signature Bonnie Arnett Date: 5/23/12
Faculty/Preparer

Print: Bonnie Arnett Signature Bonnie Arnett Date: 5/23/12
Department Chair

Print: _____ Signature [Signature] Date: MAY 24 2012
Dean/Administrator