Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	181	ENG 181 06/12/2023-African-American Literature
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness
Faculty Preparer		Hava Levitt-Phillips
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		12/12/2017

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 Fall 2016

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

Students met the standard of success on two of the existing student learning outcomes (SLOs) and did not meet the standard of success on one of them.

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

Changes proposed included making one of the existing SLOs into an objective opening room for a new SLO, changing the language regarding how the assessment rubric is deployed, and encouraging faculty to emphasize the importance of literary terminology and formal essay structure. The SLOs and objectives were updated. The standard for success was updated.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Use literary vocabulary in an academic essay to analyze African American literature.

- Assessment Plan

- o Assessment Tool: The department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings

- o Assessment Date: Fall 2019

- o Course section(s)/other population: All

- o Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section

- o How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally-developed rubric will be used to score a literary analysis essay using 8 evaluative criteria

- o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students will score a 73% or higher

- o Who will score and analyze the data: English Department 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)
2022	2023, 2022	2023, 2022

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
218	40

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.

Our assessment plan indicates an assessment of a sample size of 20% of the students. 20% of 193 (enrolled students on our records) would have been 38.6. I rounded up to 40, because that made it easier for me to choose random students. Unfortunately, 11 of the 40 in my sample did not complete the artifact used for assessment. At the suggestion of the VPI, I added 11 randomly selected students who had completed the artifact, in order to ensure that this report represents 20% of the students who took courses at that time and completed this artifact.

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 report only assesses students in the distance learning (DL) modality. At this time, our plan calls for using a formal literary analysis essay as the artifact for assessment. Because our department privileges instructor autonomy, instructors

teaching the face-to-face (F2F) and virtual sections of this course chose not to assign that exact artifact. I plan to discuss changing the artifact with my department in order to find a consistent assessment tool used across all sections, and updating the master syllabus when we're all ready for that change.

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

We use a departmentally-developed rubric to assess a literary analysis essay. It includes 8 evaluative criteria. The criteria used to assess this outcome was "Proper use of literary terminology."

These criteria are scored using a checklist of two options: 73% or better OR lower than 73%.

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>
39/40 students (97.5%) met the standard of success.

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

Almost all students who completed this artifact met the standard of success for this outcome, which indicates to me that we're doing pretty good on this. At the same time, 11 people selected in the original random sample for this assessment report did not complete the assignment at all, so that undermines the reliability of these results for me. Even though I went back and added 11 students who did complete the assignment, I'm not super enthusiastic here.

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 don't think we need to put effort into this outcome, specifically. I do think we need to continue to think deeply about how to help the large number of students who are struggling in the aftermath of the pandemic and the political disruptions of the same time period. These students need extra welcome, love, encouragement, and support to turn to and sustain effort in their academic work.

Outcome 2: Apply critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate African American literature.

- Assessment Plan

  - Assessment Tool: The department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings

  - Assessment Date: Fall 2019

  - Course section(s)/other population: All

  - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section

  - How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally-developed rubric will be used to score a literary analysis essay using 8 evaluative criteria

  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students will score a 73% or higher

  - Who will score and analyze the data: English Department 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)
2022	2023, 2022	2023, 2022

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
218	40

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.

Our assessment plan indicates an assessment of a sample size of 20% of the students. 20% of 193 (enrolled students on our records) would have been 38.6. I rounded up to 40, because that made it easier for me to choose random students. Unfortunately, 11 of the 40 in my sample did not complete the artifact used for assessment. At the suggestion of the VPI, I added 11 randomly selected students who had completed the artifact, in order to ensure that this report represents 20% of the students who took courses at that time and completed this artifact.

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 report only assesses students in the DL modality. At this time, our plan calls for using a formal literary analysis essay as the artifact for assessment. Because our department privileges instructor autonomy, instructors teaching the F2F and virtual sections of this course chose not to assign that exact artifact. I plan to discuss changing the artifact with my department in order to find a consistent assessment tool used across all sections and updating the master syllabus when we're all ready for that change.

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

We use a departmentally-developed rubric to assess a literary analysis essay. It includes 8 evaluative criteria. The criteria used to assess this outcome was "Evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature".

These criteria are scored using a checklist of two options: 73% or better OR lower than 73%.

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
40/40 students (100%) met the standard of success.

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

Everyone who completed this artifact met the standard of success for this outcome, which indicates to me that we're doing pretty good on this. At the same time, 11 people included in the random sample for this assessment report initially did not complete the assignment at all, so that undermines the reliability of these results for me. Even with the addition of the 11 students who did complete the artifact, I'm still not super pleased here.

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 don't think we need to put effort into this outcome, specifically. I do think we need to continue to think deeply about how to help the large number of students who are struggling in the aftermath of the pandemic and the political disruptions of the same time period. These students need extra welcome, love, encouragement, and support to turn to and sustain effort in their academic work.

Outcome 3: Demonstrate ability to write a literary analysis essay of African American literature using standard essay format and standard written English.

- Assessment Plan

  - Assessment Tool: The department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings

  - Assessment Date: Fall 2019

  - Course section(s)/other population: All

  - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section

  - How the assessment will be scored: A departmentally-developed rubric will be used to score a literary analysis essay using 8 evaluative criteria.

  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students will score a 73% or higher

  - Who will score and analyze the data: English Department 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)
2022	2023, 2022	2023, 2022

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
218	40

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.

Our assessment plan indicates an assessment of a sample size of 20% of the students. 20% of 193 (enrolled students on our records) would have been 38.6. I rounded up to 40, because that made it easier for me to choose random students. Unfortunately, 11 of the 40 in my sample did not complete the artifact used for assessment. At the suggestion of the VPI, I added 11 randomly selected students who had completed the artifact, in order to ensure that this report represents 20% of the students who took courses at that time and completed this artifact.

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 report only assesses students in the DL modality. At this time, our plan calls for using a formal literary analysis essay as the artifact for assessment. Because our department privileges instructor autonomy, instructors teaching the F2F and virtual sections of this course chose not to assign that exact artifact. I plan to discuss changing the artifact with my department in order to find a consistent assessment tool used across all sections and updating the master syllabus when we're all ready for that change.

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

We use a departmentally-developed rubric to assess a literary analysis essay. It includes 8 evaluative criteria, all of which were used collectively to assess this outcome:

o Clear introduction
o Clear thesis statement
o Appropriate use of examples from the literature
o Proper use of literary terminology
o Evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature

o Deployment of standard written English
o Performance of standard essay format
o Logical conclusion

These criteria are scored using a checklist of two options: 73% or better OR lower than 73%.

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

I included 40 students in my assessment, but 11 of them did not complete the assessment artifact, which means that I only had results for 29 people, technically. At the suggestion of the VPI, I added 11 students who had completed the artifact, so 40 artifacts were assessed in total. Of those students, all but two of them met the standard of success for this outcome and tool. 38/40 students (95%) met the standard of success.

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

> All but two of the students who completed this artifact met the standard of success for this outcome, which indicates to me that we're doing pretty good on this. At the same time, 11 people included in the random sample for this assessment report did not complete the assignment at all, so that undermines the reliability of these results for me. Even though I went back and added 11 students who did complete the assignment, I'm not super enthusiastic here.

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 really need to think deeply as a department about the artifact we're using for assessment for this course. In addition to the 11 of 40 students initially selected for the random sample for this report who failed to complete the assignment at all, I saw plenty of other empty boxes in this column in the Blackboard course shells to which I had access.
>
> While I believe that students in a college-level literature course should absolutely be doing literary analysis all the time, I am not convinced that we should use a traditional essay as the vehicle for this work/assessment. I am looking forward to changing this in the master syllabus for this course and working with my department colleagues to think more fully about how to best support our students in developing the key skills of this discipline in other ways.

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.

> The previous instructor removed the outcome about students engaging with works by African American authors, which seems great to me. As she noted in her report, that's the whole class, so there's not a lot of point in asking this question. Plus, while the artifact we've been using would take on a single text by an African American author/creator, and maybe a second, it can't assess who the authors are for the whole reading list. This made room for an additional SLO that is more relevant to the primary work of the course.

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 want to note that this assessment report covers the time period in which students were emerging from the most restrictive/traumatic part of the pandemic, a time during which colleagues across campus have reported students struggling significantly both in academic performance on work attempted, and in basic engagement/participation in classes altogether. I'm looking forward to assessing this course again in three years, when hopefully our students will be experiencing greater stability and thus be capable of greater academic success.

I teach this class every Fall and Winter as a F2F or virtual class, depending on the pandemic. I find my sections to be consistently full of delightful, smart, thoughtful students who embrace the challenges of the course and grow like crazy. I'm teaching the DL version of the class for the first time this summer, and I'm finding it super interesting.

Mary Mullalond built the DL shell we're currently using, so it's obviously very cool. That being said, we're planning to overhaul it this coming year or the next, as she originally created it about a decade ago. While the approach in the DL is different from the way I teach the class live, I'm happy with it -- the reading list is rigorous but not pointlessly so, the writing is healthfully demanding, and Mary has built in multiple ways for class colleagues to connect with more than one small group, as well as with the whole group in the Discussion Boards.

This assessment process didn't so much surprise me as it confirmed my concerns about using a short-form literary analysis essay as the only assessment artifact. An extremely high number of students failed to complete this assignment in the semesters I assessed, both within the sample used for this report and the larger total. That right there is concerning to me, since the essay is worth a good-sized chunk of the class's points. If students are scared off by an essay, I think we can support alternate artifacts within the course and for assessment purposes that will keep students engaged, while requiring them to do rich interpretive work with the course texts.

Like all our literature courses, this class is almost always chock full of non-majors. We are not preparing people generally to enter higher level literary study, nor careers that will center on such work. Instead, we are arming students across the curriculum with reading/interpretive practices that are essential to healthful, robust civic, economic, and professional participation in the larger American society. Additionally, this specific literature course offers students an opportunity to grapple with very complex social issues in collaboration with colleagues who represent the full diversity of our campus. A traditional literary essay, while a super valuable experience to create, does not support these outcomes any more effectively than Discussion Board writing, video presentations, multimedia projects, infographics, etc.

We don't teach how to write a literary analysis essay in this class, or in our other literature classes, generally, so that right there complicates the use of it for our assessment artifact, for me. Also, an assignment like this tends to raise the kinds of anxiety that gets in the way of student engagement, even when students aren't recovering from a time of massive social disruption. I wonder if we would have seen this many students failing to complete/submit this high-stakes assignment if we were to use a more organic genre, one that permitted more student choice, or a collection of smaller, lower-stakes assignments.

Additionally, since our department believes that instructor autonomy is key to the most alive, dynamic teaching and learning, I am eager to figure out how to preserve the greatest freedom in terms of assignment design for individual instructors, while also sorting out consistency in assessment.

We'll see how it goes.

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

I really want to change the assessment artifact right now, and update the rubric accordingly, but I really can't do that unilaterally. Our department values collaboration and transparency among members, so I'm going to need to give folks time to hear me, consider my perspective, and inform my decisions with their input.

Thus, I will share my findings, concerns, etc. with my department at our next full-time faculty meeting during inservice. In the fall semester, I will invite my FT and PT colleagues who teach this class into conversations about how to resolve my concerns about the assessment artifact. I hope to be able to make these changes before the next time I assess the course, so we can move forward with an updated approach.

4.
Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Assessment Tool	Developing and implementing consistent assessment tools.	I plan to discuss with my department consistent assessment tools to be used across all sections, and will be updating the master syllabus again once we come to an	2024

		agreement. Literary analysis essays don't provide an accurate assessment of student learning (for outcome 3 especially), and students across the board have a difficult time even finishing the assignment. Hopefully, we as a department will come to an agreement soon on what tool to move forward with. We will of course also be looking at our scoring tools, and plan to use something that will better assess learning and provide students with better feedback. In addition, we are planning to overhaul the course shell over the next year or so.	

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

6.

III. Attached Files

[ENG 181 Assessment Data](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Hava Levitt-Phillips **Date:** 08/16/2023
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 08/17/2023
Dean: Victor Vega **Date:** 08/30/2023

Assessment Committee Chair: Jessica Hale   **Date:** 01/15/2024

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	181	ENG 181 08/21/2017- African-American Literature
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Kimberly Jones
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Read works by major authors of African descent in the Americas.

- Assessment Plan

    o   Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.

    o   Assessment Date: Winter 2010

    o   Course section(s)/other population: all

    o   Number students to be assessed: sample of 20% of students

    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)
2016		2016

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
131	42

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.

Our assessment plan indicates an assessment of a sample size of 20% of the students. 20% of 131 would have been 26 students. This report represents 32% of the students who took courses at that time.

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.

16 students were DL and 26 students were on campus.

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

We use a departmentally-developed rubric to assess a literary analysis essay. It includes 8 evaluative criteria:

- o Clear introduction
- o Clear thesis statement
- o Appropriate use of examples from the literature
- o Proper use of literary terminology
- o Evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature
- o Standard written English
- o Standard essay format
- o Logical conclusion

These criteria are scored using a checklist of two options: "C" or better OR "C-" or better.

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

This tool does not assess the author of the texts discussed in the literary analysis essay. However, since all texts used in the courses were written by African

Americans and students were only able to use those specific texts, this standard is met.

Ultimately, we plan to remove this as an outcome for the future Master Syllabus revision. It will be moved into the objective category.

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

All students read works written by major authors of African descent, so this outcome was met in 100% of students assessed. This means we are meeting our goals here.

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.

There is no need for improvement here.

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary to analyze African-American literature in an academic essay.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.

    o Assessment Date: Winter 2010

    o Course section(s)/other population: all

    o Number students to be assessed: sample of 20% of students

    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)
2016		2016

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed

131	42

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.

> Our assessment plan indicates an assessment of a sample size of 20% of the students. 20% of 131 would have been 26 students. This report represents 32% of the students who took courses at that time.

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.

> 16 students were DL and 26 students were on campus.

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

> We use a departmentally-developed rubric to assess a literary analysis essay. It includes 8 evaluative criteria:
>
> o Clear introduction
>
> o Clear thesis statement
>
> o Appropriate use of examples from the literature
>
> o Proper use of literary terminology
>
> o Evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature
>
> o Standard written English
>
> o Standard essay format
>
> o Logical conclusion
>
> These criteria are scored using a checklist of two options: "C" or better OR "C-" or better.

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>
>
> The assessment plan indicates that 75% of students will score a "C" or better on the essay. However, this is an unclear/immeasurable goal, given the tool we use to

assess the essays. The tool wasn't designed to include an overall grade, so it would be better stated as "75% of students will score a "C" or better on 6 of the 8 evaluative criteria." (We plan to adjust the Master Syllabus to reflect this.)

Using this standard, 83% of the 42 students assessed met the goal. In Spring/Summer, 100% met the goal. There were only 7 students to assess, but 6 out of 7 received 8/8 on the rubric. In Fall, 28 out of 35 students met the goal. Those that did not meet the goal ranged in scores of 4/8 (3) and 5/8 (4). None were below 4/8. The areas where students received "C-" or less as a score were:

Intro (3)

Examples (4)

Observation, Evaulation, and Interpretative (3)

Format (5)

Conclusion (2)

Literary Terminology (5)

Thesis (5)

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

When reviewing the data, it shows that the proper use of literary terminology is an area that 31% of students did not score "C" or better, or it was not applicable, meaning they did not use literary terminology at all.

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.

With 69% of students using literary terminology in their essay, the 75% benchmark has not been met. We plan to share the rubric with those teaching the course to ensure that we focus on including this standard in our essay assignments. It may be that faculty are not emphasizing formal usage of literary terminology in essay guidelines, so students may have the skill to discuss it but do not because they are not specifically asked to do so.

Outcome 3: Apply critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate African-American literature.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.

    o Assessment Date: Winter 2010

    o Course section(s)/other population: all

    o Number students to be assessed: sample of 20% of students

    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)
2016		2016

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
131	42

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.

Our assessment plan indicates an assessment of a sample size of 20% of the students. 20% of 131 would have been 26 students. This report represents 32% of the students who took courses at that time.

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.

16 students were DL and 26 students were on campus.

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

We use a departmentally-developed rubric to assess a literary analysis essay. It includes 8 evaluative criteria:

- o Clear introduction

- o Clear thesis statement

- o Appropriate use of examples from the literature

- o Proper use of literary terminology

- o Evidence of observation, explanation, and interpretation of the literature

- o Standard written English

- o Standard essay format

- o Logical conclusion

These criteria are scored using a checklist of two options: "C" or better OR "C-" or better.

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 plan indicates that 75% of students will score a "C" or better on the essay. However, this is an unclear/immeasurable goal, given the tool we use to assess the essays. The tool wasn't designed to include an overall grade, so it would be better stated as "75% of students will score a "C" or better on 6 of the 8 evaluative criteria." (We plan to adjust the Master Syllabus to reflect this.)

Using this standard, 83% of the 42 students assessed met the goal. In Spring/Summer, 7 students (100%) met the goal. There were only 7 students to assess, but 6 out of 7 received 8/8 on the rubric. In Fall, 28 out of 35 students met the goal. Those that did not meet the goal ranged in scores of 4/8 (3) and 5/8 (4). None were below 4/8. The areas where students received "C-" or less as a score were:

Intro (3)

Examples (4)

Observation, Evaulation, and Interpretative (3)

Format (5)

Conclusion (2)

Literary Terminology (5)

Thesis (5)

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

Only 17% of students did not receive a "C" or better in this category. In addition, 97% of the students are able to effectively show their ability to observe, evaluate, and interpret literature. They all provided specific examples to support them.

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 are doing well in this area and need no improvement here.

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?

It surprised me to see how many students are not using formal literary terminology. It is imperative that we bridge the gap here. Students should not leave a literature course not demonstrating this skill.

Additionally, several of the essays (66%) did not follow standard essay format. Most (61%) were missing proper in-text citation and lists of sources. Only 5% didn't use proper paragraph separation. These are also important skills that students should master by the end of a literature course. Incorporating more specific guidelines on citation and essay structure into our assignments in literature courses can help.

Finally, reviewing the Master Syllabus (MS) in conjunction with the assessment tool revealed that the MS needs some revision. We need to move an assessment outcome into the objective area. We also need to clarify our assessment goals by changing what we identify as success: 75% of students will receive a "C" or better in 6 of the 8 evaluative criteria. This is what we indicate on the rubric, but it is not clarified on the MS. In addition, we need to add an outcome related to essay

format in the assessment plan of the MS. We indicated evaluative criteria area on the rubric that are not indicated in our assessment plan. These two should align.

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

We will discuss these issues at our next department meeting. Instructors of ENG 181 will share course essay assignment sheets and make changes to ensure they align with departmental goals regarding literary terminology and essay format.

3.
Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Students will demonstrate their ability to write a literary essay using standard essay format and standard written English.	We score this on our literary analysis rubric, but don't indicate it in our current assessment plan.	2018
Objectives	We will move the outcome "Read works by major authors of African descent in the Americas" to the objectives category.	We don't assess it on the rubric. In addition, it seems redundant. It's an African American literature course. What else would they read???	2017
Course Assignments	Faculty will be encouraged to include statements requiring their students to use formal academic essay format and include specific usage of literary terminology in their formal essays.	Many students are not meeting this evaluative criteria. It may be due to miscommunication in assignment details.	2018

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

5.

III. Attached Files

Literary Analysis Rubric
Summary of Data

Faculty/Preparer:	Kimberly Jones	**Date:** 08/21/2017
Department Chair:	Carrie Krantz	**Date:** 08/22/2017
Dean:	Kristin Good	**Date:** 08/24/2017
Assessment Committee Chair:	Michelle Garey	**Date:** 12/10/2017

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

I. Background Information
1. Course assessed:
   Course Discipline Code and Number: Eng 181
   Course Title: African American Literature
   Division/Department Codes: HSS
   ENGD

2. Semester assessment was conducted (check one):
   ☐ Fall 20__
   ☒ Winter 2008__
   ☐ 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):

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/total number of students enrolled in the course.
   68 Assessed   112 registered   95 received grades

6. Describe how students were selected for the assessment.
   All students in all sections were asked to complete the survey on one day in the final month of the semester.

II. Results
1. Briefly describe the changes that were implemented in the course as a result of the previous assessment.

   N/A

2. State each outcome (verbatim) from the master syllabus for the course that was assessed.
   Outcome #3 "Students will increase their self-reported appreciation of and ability to understand literature."
3. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected during the course assessment, demonstrating the extent to which students are achieving each of the learning outcomes listed above. *Please attach a summary of the data collected.*
   7 of the 9 questions received a positive response (Agree or Strongly Agree) greater than 75% of the students surveyed.

4. For each outcome assessed, indicate the standard of success used, and the percentage of students who achieved that level of success. *Please attach the rubric/scoring guide used for the assessment.*
   The standard of success, as stated in the syllabus is 75% positive response.

5. Describe the areas of strength and weakness in students' achievement of the learning outcomes shown in assessment results.

Please return completed form to the Office of Curriculum & Assessment, SC 247.   **1 of 3**
Approved by the Assessment Committee 10/10/06

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Strengths: The strongest positive response was 94% who self reported that they had "an understanding of the challenges of the human condition and the ways that human beings respond to these challenges" (question #8).

Weaknesses: The weakest response was for question #9, only 64% of the students had a positive response to the question "I regularly read for pleasure."

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.

   Since this is a self-reported assessment, it is difficult to plan actions that will alter students' perceptions.
   Certainly these results will be discussed in the department with an eye to paying more attention to the two questions (#4 and #9) that got below 75% positive response. It should be noted that the positive response was above 60% for each question.

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:

   b. ☐ Objectives/Evaluation on the Master Syllabus
      Change/rationale:

   c. ☐ Course pre-requisites on the Master Syllabus
      Change/rationale:

   d. ☐ 1st Day Handouts
      Change/rationale:

   e. ☐ Course assignments
      Change/rationale:

   f. ☐ Course materials (check all that apply)
         ☐ Textbook
         ☐ Handouts
         ☐ Other:

   g. ☐ Instructional methods
      Change/rationale:

   h. ☐ Individual lessons & activities
      Change/rationale:

3. What is the timeline for implementing these actions?

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.

   This tool was effective in showing us students' perceptions of literature. In addition it told us how many students take more than one literature course.

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

   N/A

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

   All _____   Selected **X, #3**

   If "All", provide the report date for the next full review: _____.

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

If "Selected", provide the report date for remaining outcomes: _2008-09 – Outcome #1, 2009-10 – Outcome #2, 2010-11-Outcome #3 (This is a 3 year cycle._____.

Submitted by:

Name: __Ruth A. Hatcher_____   Date: 6/23/2008
      Print/Signature

Department Chair: _____   Date: 7/7/08
      Print/Signature

Dean: _____   Date: JUL 0 8 2008
      Print/Signature

logged 7/9/08 sjv

Please return completed form to the Office of Curriculum & Assessment, SC 247.   **3 of 3**
Approved by the Assessment Committee 10/10/06