| Discipline | Course Number | Title |
|---|---|---|
| English | 271 | ENG 271 05/12/2022-Creative Writing II |
| College | Division | Department |
| Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences | Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences | English & College Readiness |
| Faculty Preparer | | 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: Demonstrate a greater understanding of literary genres through original writing.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Holistic assessment of student portfolios.
    - Assessment Date: Winter 2020
    - Course section(s)/other population: Course sections.
    - Number students to be assessed: Students in 1/3 of running sections.
    - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric.

o   Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of portfolios will demonstrate outcome.

o   Who will score and analyze the data: Department faculty.

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) |
|---|---|---|
| 2021 | 2022, 2021 | 2021 |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|---|---|
| 49 | 22 |

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.

Only 28 students completed the course they registered for. While the Master Syllabus indicates that a random sampling of 1/3 of all registered students will suffice, I choose to collect data over the course of the academic year because the number of students enrolled in English 271 is unpredictable. My Fall and Winter 21 sections of Creative Writing contained NO English 271 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.

I coordinated with four English department part-timers and collected data from their English 271 students and my own. Nine sections were sampled. Included in these results are: from the Winter 21 semester, English 271 students enrolled in ENG 271 02 and ENG 271 D02; from the Spring/Summer 21 semester sections ENG 271 DN1 and ENG 271 DW1; from the Fall 21 semester sections ENG 271 01, ENG 271 DY1, and ENG 271 N1; and from the Winter 22 semester, sections ENG 271 D01 and ENG 271 D02.

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 create original writing in multiple genres over the course of the semester. Seven out of the nine sections surveyed were taught in the DL format. In the DL Master, English 271 students are allowed to choose between repeating the course with the English 271 readings and multi-genre assignments OR to work throughout the semester in a single preferred genre.  Seven out of the nine sections surveyed were taught in the DL format. Students who made this

choice are indicated by "NA" in the English 271 Assessment Data chart for this outcome. This outcome was NOT included in the success tolls for those students. Out of the 28 students surveyed, only six chose to work in a single genre. These six were not evaluated for this outcome.

Student work was scored by a faculty member who did not teach the course using a departmentally-developed rubric ( I had the part-timer, Sandra Schultz, who regularly teaches the DL sections read my students' work). 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. With some students, I realized that an amendment to the rubric was required, and when students created average quality work in multiple genres, a score of 1.5 was given for this outcome. This applied to only 2 students out of the 22.

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

Out of 28 students evaluated, all but one student met the standard of success. Six students chose to work in a single genre, and were not evaluated for this outcome. They are noted by NA in the Data Chart. The overall success rate for this column was 1.95, which works out to 98%. 21 out of 22 students met the standard of success (95%). This exceeds the goal of a 70% standard of success.

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

Out of 22 students, only one scored a 1 or 50% for this item on the Rubric. Two students scored 1.5 or 75%, barely exceeding the standard of success of 1.4 or 70%. Six out of the 28 students chose to work in a single genre in the distance learning sections, which is an option for the ENG 271 students who are taking the class for a second time. This choice is recorded on the Eng 271 Assessment Data chart as NA. Two students scored 1.5 out of 2. The remaining 19 students scored 2 or 100%. That means that students are reliably being asked to compose in a variety of genres whether they are taking a face-to-face or a distance learning section. The DL Master for ENG 270/271 has assignments in multiple genres in the first half of the semester. This may be reflected in the strength of these numbers.

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.

Offering the DL ENG 271 students the option to either complete the same assignments, with the readings specific to ENG 271, or to work on a longer piece in a single genre is sound pedagogy, but one small amendment to those choices may be in order. I'm thinking of updating the DL Master instructions for the ENG 271 students at the beginning of the semester so they include a request to submit work in at least two genres over the course of the semester. I've attached a copy of the current Welcome Letter sent out to ENG 271 students.

When I apprise the other faculty who teach Creative Writing of the results of this assement, I will be urging them to ensure that ENG 271 student writers experiment in more than one genre over the course of the semester.

Outcome 2: Demonstrate a greater understanding of literary technique through original writing.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Holistic assessment of student portfolios.
    - Assessment Date: Winter 2020
    - Course section(s)/other population: Course sections.
    - Number students to be assessed: Students in 1/3 of running sections.
    - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric.
    - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of portfolios will demonstrate outcome.
    - Who will score and analyze the data: Department faculty.

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) |
|---|---|---|
| 2021 | 2022, 2021 | 2021 |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|---|---|
| 49 | 28 |

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.

Only 28 students completed the course work for Creative Writing II. While the Master Syllabus indicates that a random sampling of 1/3 of all registered students will suffice, I choose to collect data over the course of the academic year because the number of students enrolled in English 271 is unpredictable. My Fall and Winter 21 sections of Creative Writing contained NO English 271 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.

I coordinated with four English department part-timers and collected data from their English 271 students and my own. Nine sections were sampled. Included in these results are: from the Winter 21 semester, English 271 students enrolled in ENG 271 02 and ENG 271 D02; from the Spring/Summer 21 semester sections ENG 271 DN1 and ENG 271 DW1; from the Fall 21 semester sections ENG 271 01, ENG 271 DY1, and ENG 271 N1; and from the Winter 22 semester, sections ENG 271 D01 and ENG 271 D02.

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

Student work 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. With some students, I realized that an amendment to the rubric was required, and when students created average quality work in multiple genres, a score of 1.5 was given for this outcome.

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 Eng 270/271 Assessment Rubric addressed the Learning Outcome of "Demonstrate an understanding of literary technique" in a variety of ways. First, the Rubric distinguishes between literary technique (features that a piece of writing can include) and literary devices (actions writers take to create meaning). In addition, the Rubric includes three distinct categories related to Course Objective 2 for this course, which is "Uses the elements of good writing". For purposes of this assessment, the three categories are: follows established grammatical conventions, demonstrates proofreading, and the writing shows organization around a central idea. The results for each of the five remaining items on the Rubric are addressed below.

2. "Demonstrate understanding of literary techniques such as theme, setting, character development, plot, tone, and/or other literary techniques through original writing" - All nine sections surveyed met the standard of success. The lowest scoring section averaged 1.63, or 82% which meets the standard of success of 1.4 or 70%. The average of all nine sections was 1.82 or 91%, with 27 out of 28 students meeting the standard of success (96%).

3. "Demonstrate skill with literary devices such as metaphor, symbols, irony, rhythm, and imagery, and/or other literary devices" - One section barely met the standard of success, with a score of 1.5 or 75%. The average of all nine sections was 1.75 or 88% which meets the standard of success. 24 out of 28 students met the standard of success (86%).

4. "Use the elements of good writing, such as: established grammatical conventions (unless for a specific intent) in their creative writing" - Two of the sections barely met the standard of success, scoring only 1.5 or 75%. The seven remaining sections all exceeded the standard of success, bringing the average for all nine sections for this item to 1.77 or 89%. 25 out of 28 students met the standard of success (89%).

5. "Use the elements of good writing such as: proofreading" – This item has the least number of overall students meeting the standard of success. Three sections barely met the standard of success, with an average of 1.5 or 75%. The remaining six sections all exceeded the standard of success, bringing the average for this item to 1.77 or 89%. 22 out of 28 students met the standard of success (79%).

6. "Use the elements of good writing, such as: organization of the piece appropriate to its central idea, introduction and conclusion appropriate to its central idea"- One section scored 1.88 or 94%, with the remaining 8 sections scoring 2 or 100%. All 9 sections averaged 1.99 or 99.5%, with each of the 28 students meeting 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.

The Assessment Data Sheet indicates that all Creative Writing sections are meeting the standard of success for the five categories related to this Learning Outcome. Students are able to demonstrate skill with literary techniques and devices, and are able to organize their writing around a central idea with skill.

The student writing in the Winter 2022 DL sections was very strong and exceeded the standard. The overall scores for the other seven sections all meet or exceed 8.4 or 70%, which suggests that the face-to-face and DL sections are meeting the standard of success, with DL scores improving after the Spring/Summer 21 amendments to the DL Master for English 270/271. The average for all 28 completing students was 26.32/28 students, 95%.

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 primary areas of concern are the four lowest scores (1.5 or 75%) in three of the five categories related to this Learning Outcome. I'll address each of these individually.
>
> 3. "Demonstrate understanding of literary techniques such as theme, setting, character development, plot, tone, and/or other literary techniques through original writing": While 8 of the sections exceeded the standard of success, one section barely met the standard of success with an average group score of 1.5, or 75%. Of the 2 students in this section, only 1 met the standard of success. The overall score for this category on the Rubric was 1.75 or 88%. Of the 28 students, 24 met the standard of success (86%).
>
> 4. "Use the elements of good writing, such as: established grammatical conventions (unless for a specific intent) in their creative writing": This is a problem in all modes of instruction, and one change I will consider is to amend the Rubrics for the writing assignments so that adhering to grammatical conventions affects students' grades more seriously. I will also urge students who are struggling with grammar to take their rough drafts to the Writing Center so that they can get one-on-one help. One section barely met the standard of success with an average group score of 1.5, or 75%. Again, of the 2 students in this section, only one met the standard of success. The overall score for this category on the Rubric was 1.77 or 89%. Of the 28 students, 25 met the standard of success (89%).
>
> 5. "Use the elements of good writing such as: proofreading": This is a problem in all writing classes, and it is not specific to Creative Writing. If anything, students in Creative Writing may assume that carefully proofreading is less important than it would be in Composition or Literature courses. I could consider changing the Rubric to have proofreading count more heavily towards students' grades, but it would probably be more effective to urge students for whom this is a serious concern to take their rough drafts to the Writing Center for one-on-one help. All writers benefit from having a trusted reader closely read their work. All of us have a hard time seeing the space between what we intended to write and what actually landed on the page. Two sections barely met the standard of success with an average group score of 1.5, or 75%. While the average score for all groups was 1.77 or 89%, only 22 of the 28 (79%) students met this standard of success. This was the lowest scoring category. I'd love to believe we can do better.

**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.

To the best of my knowledge, there was no previous assessment of ENG 271, though last year's assessment of ENG 270, which students take the first time they register for Creative Writing, did lead to significant changes in the DL Master for that course. Those changes do seem to have improved the DL sections of the course, if the failing students are removed from the equation.

Those changes involved adding several Learning Units to the course. They are:

1. Unit 2: Where Do Writing Ideas Come From? This unit describes the brainstorming and pre-writing process, and the Learning Unit ends in a discussion board where students exchange their responses to the readings and videos embedded into this Unit that detail the process most writers go through to create quality work.

2. Unit 3: What is Figurative Language? This unit introduces seven videos introducting students to literacy devices and techniques used by skilled writers. The unit concludes with a quiz that provides students with a check of understanding about the videos and article embedded in this unit.

3. Unit 10: Plan for Revision. This unit introduces students to the editing, proofreading and revision that skilled writers do with their writing. The unit concludes with students composing a report on how they will use the feedback they recieved from classmates in the Class Wide Workshop and from the instructor. There is also a quiz where students can do a check of their understanding of the videos and articles embedded in this unit.

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 think English 271 is meeting the needs of the students who are taking Creative Writing for the second (or third, or fourth) time. The additions to the DL Master seem to have improved student scores for all but two of the six categories on the Creative Writing Rubric (attached). Moving forward, I will communicate to all faculty teaching this course about the need to: utilize the faculty drop feature for non-participating students and to ensure that students get more practice reading their own work to check for grammar and proofreading errors. I'm going to add a link to the Virtual Writing Center to the DL Master, and urge students to take at least one piece of writing to the Virtual or Face-to-Face Writing Center during the semester to get help. Practice with trusting a reader to read your rough draft is something that benefits all writers, and I want to ensure that our Creative Writing students get more practice with finding their own error.

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

| |
|---|
| I will share the report with the other faculty teaching Creative Writing and the entire English & College Readiness department. |

4.

Intended Change(s)

| Intended Change | Description of the change | Rationale | Implementation Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| Other: Urge visits to the Writing Center | I'll be adding a link to the Virtual Writing Center to the DL Master of Creative Writing.<br><br>I'll consider revising the assignment rubrics for the Creative Writing assignments so that grammar and proofreading carry more weight towards students' grades. | Urging students to use the Writing Center (Virtual or Face-to-Face) at least once during the semester will give students practice being more observant readers of their own work.<br><br>Before revising the Rubrics, I'll check with the other Creative Writing Faculty to get their input. | 2022 |

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

| |
|---|
| 6. |

## III. Attached Files

ENG 271 Assessment Data
Welcome Letter to English 271 students
Creative Writing Assessment Rubric

**Faculty/Preparer:** Maryam Barrie **Date:** 05/15/2022
**Department Chair:** Carrie Krantz **Date:** 05/17/2022
**Dean:** Scott Britten **Date:** 05/19/2022
**Assessment Committee Chair:** Shawn Deron **Date:** 12/23/2022