Core Curriculum Assessment Annual Report

General Information

1. Name / Number of Course / Sequence:
   Core Literature

2. SLO(s) being assessed:
   Student will be able to read analytically and critically

3. Department:
   English

4. Department Representative:
   Craig E. Bertolet

5. AGSC Content Alignment:
   AREA II: Humanities

Assessment Information

6. Assessment Method: [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO – not grading for the course as a whole was conducted.]

   A random sample of student work packets consisting of a student's second essay and a student's final exam was assessed against the SLO 2 and an additional outcome ("Students will be able to critique texts and construct an argument effectively."). The English Department Assessment Committee read 16 essays & exams against these two Outcomes.

7. Findings: [What assessment data did each assessment method produce?]
The Assessment Committee found that 10 of the 16 student packets demonstrated the ability to read analytically & critically; 5 of the 16 were not able to demonstrate the ability to read analytically & critically; and one could not be assessed.

The Assessment Committee found that 8 of the 16 student packets demonstrated the ability to critique texts and construct effective arguments; 7 of 16 student packets could not demonstrate the ability to critique texts and construct effective arguments; and one could not be assessed.

8. How did you or will you use the findings for improvement: [What questions / issues/ concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program takes as a result of this analysis?]

The Assessment Committee recommended revisions of the rubrics in order to improve the pool of assessment data. In addition, by focusing faculty attention on instructional concerns, possibilities, and best practices, the committee hoped to improve our students’ achievement of learning outcomes.

However, concerns were raised on the small sample given the large numbers of Core Literature sections. The faculty also raised concerns on the methodology of the evaluation.

Conversation in the department is now turning on what is the most effective kinds of writing to teach in these courses, especially given that we must move to lecture sections. This change is causing the department to reconsider how it teaches these courses.

9. Additional comments: [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

The English Department is moving to a model of lecture & discussion sections for our Core Literature courses. As a result, we are in the process of reassessing the kinds of writing that can be taught effectively in a lecture environment and how this writing can be measured. We have a small committee of faculty members scheduled to teach lecture courses in Spring 2012 who are designing writing assignments that can achieve SLO 2. We are also working on additional different student outcomes to reflect the learning environment of a lecture course.
10. Core Curriculum General Education Committee Comments:

While clearly thoughtful teaching is occurring in the course, the assessment report generated many concerns. The sample of student work assessed seemed very small (especially for a set of courses with such high total enrollment), the strategies for encouraging faculty to make improvements in addressing the SLOs, and the nature of the rubric content all raised concern among CCGEC reviewers. While the class size and structure is likely to change, the courses will still need to meet the same outcome. The Department should also consider seeking approval to assess for SLO 3 (since it is already assessing for it) and SLO 9 (for World Lit courses).