Arapahoe Community College

2013-2014 Literature Assessment Plan Data

Learning Outcome
Communication - Written

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
Students will demonstrate their ability to produce a thesis-driven, organized, college-level essays.

Students complete at least two essays throughout the semester. Using a 5-point rubric for writing skills/written communication, faculty compare the first essays to the last essays. *Note, these scores reflect writing skills, not content.*

This method indicates increased student competence in writing thesis-driven essays. This skill is measured yearly.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
103

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
75% of students should score a 3.5 (“Proficient”) or better on a scale of 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Poor).

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
75% was chosen as the benchmark because historically, success rates in Liberal Arts transfer classes have been approximately 70%. 3.5 was chosen as the score because this would equate to a solid “C” paper (75%).

**Measure 2 Type:**

Please select

**Measure 2 Description:**

**Measure 2 Sample Size:**

**Measure 2 Benchmark**

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

**Outcomes Met/not met**

Met benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:**

![Graph showing essay average scores](image)

Measure 1 Results:

1st Essay Avg. Score (3.27)  Last Essay Avg. Score (3.78)

**Measure 2 Results:**
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The students surpassed the benchmark, averaging higher than 3.5 on the last essay, with almost 80% earning a solid “C” or higher on their last essay.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

The percentage of students who scored “Proficient” or better on the first essay was consistent with the scores from last year, as was the percentage of the students scoring “Proficient” on the last essay though, encouraging, slightly higher.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

The multiple methods are revealing, showing that there is a real split between those who are writing well initially. 47% of the students did not score a 3.5 on the first essay, but the average score for that essay was 3.27, almost a the benchmark. What this suggests is that the level of writing expertise that students have when entering our classes is quite varied.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

Student performance was strong in that over 75% of the students were “Proficient” by the last essay. However, the average scores at the end of the class could, we think, be higher.

Thus, we will continue to stress writing, because as we have seen in our classes, though students may meet the prerequisite scores for college-level reading and writing skills, many students have not yet taken College Composition. In addition, some students in the classes may have passed out of developmental ENG classes with grades of C, hardly guaranteeing them success in the college classroom that emphasizes writing. Making all of our exams more writing-focused is a strategy we have discussed and which is gaining increasing favor among faculty.

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Learning Outcome

Responsibility and Accountability

Measure 1 Type:

Direct
Data tracking

Measure 1 Description:
Correlating student attendance with final grade in the course.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
98

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
We expect that students who do not attend at least 80% of the classes will have difficulty passing the course.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
80% was chosen as the benchmark because this equates to 3 weeks of classes in a 15-week semester. If students are not in class to learn the material or to participate in group activities and other in-class work, they will not be exposed to the material on which they are assessed in exams and out-of-class assignments.

Measure 2 Type:
Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miss 0-1</th>
<th>Miss 2-3</th>
<th>Miss 4-5</th>
<th>Miss 6+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B, or C</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The threshold for success seems to be 6 classes.
- 85% of the students who missed 6 or more classes did not pass the class.
- 15% of the students who did miss 6 or more classes did earn a passing grade
- 100% of the students who attended every class or missed only one class earned a passing grade.

Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
We surpassed the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
This data is very consistent with last year's data.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

Though obviously not surprised that missing class and failing a class are closely related, we were concerned that 15% of the students who missed at least 6 class sessions (or three weeks of class), still managed to pass the class (up a toick from the previous year). This is a continual reminder for us to make sure that we are being productive in class and that we assess what we cover in class, not just what is in the books we use.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

---

Learning Outcome

Critical Reading Skills

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Rubric-graded report
Measure 1 Description:
Students complete at least two essays throughout the semester. Using a 5-point rubric, faculty compared the students’ abilities to read critically from an early writing assignment to a later writing assignment.

The ability to read fiction, poetry and drama on more than just a literal, plot-summary level is essential in a college-level literature class. This determines their ability to read literature metaphorically, allegorically, historically, biographically, etc.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
98

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
75% of students should be able to score a “3” (“Proficient”) or better on a scale of 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Poor).

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
75% was chosen as the benchmark because historically, Literature retention has been 65-70%, but with the prerequisites that have been put in place for all Literature classes, we hope to see a higher percentage of students succeeded than we did when there were no prerequisites.

Measure 2 Type:
Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
Outcomes Met/not met

Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

- The average score for skills in Critical Reading on the first essay was 3.12/5.0
- The average score for skills in Critical Reading on the last essay was 3.64/5.0

Measure 2 Results:

- 61.1% scored a 3 or more in Critical Reading skills on the first essay.
- 84.4% scored a 3 or more in Critical Reading skills on the last essay.
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

We exceeded the benchmark for Critical Reading skills, with roughly 84% of students earning a 3+ on Critical Reading skills.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

This dropped a bit from the previous year, when 89% of the students scored a 3 or more in Critical Reading skills on their last essay. The average scores also dropped a tick.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

The numbers suggest that while more students are gaining proficiency in the concepts we are introducing, they are still having difficulty applying those concepts clearly or consistently in their writing.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

We would not, based on these findings, significantly alter curriculum. Clearly, more students are going beyond surface-level understanding as they progress in the class. The reason the averages scores themselves may not have increased as much is because of the content in the first vs. last writing assignment. Most LIT 115 classes work with 3 genres over the course of the semester: fiction, poetry and drama. Thus, students are often writing about different genres in the two assignments.

Some LIT 115 faculty are moving from a genre-focused approach to a critical theory-focused approach. This may affect future scores, hopefully positively.

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:
Learning Outcome

Knowledge of Literary Terminology

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
Students demonstrate their knowledge and application of literary genres, concepts, and terminology in written

Students complete at least two essays throughout the semester. Using a 5-point rubric, faculty compared the students’ abilities to apply literary terminology and concepts in an early writing assignment, and then comparing that skill as applied in a later writing assignment. The ability to be comfortable applying terms like symbolism, metaphor, theme, character, imagery, tone, etc. is essential in a college-level literature class. This determines their ability to read literature metaphorically, allegorically, historically, biographically, etc.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
98

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
75% of students should be able to score a “3” (“Proficient”) or better on a scale of 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Poor).

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

75% was chosen as the benchmark because historically, Humanities retention has been 65-70%, but with the prerequisites that have been put in place for all Humanities classes, we hope to see a higher percentage of students succeeded than we did when there were no prerequisites.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Missed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
The average score for Literary Terms on the first essay was 2.45.
The average score for Literary Terms on the last essay was 2.98.

Measure 2 Results:

Almost 33% of the students scored a 3+ on their application of literary terminology in the first essay.
Almost 61% of the students scored a 3+ on their application of literary terms in the last essay.

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the
benchmark?
We fell short of the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
Unfortunately, this is consistent (and slightly lower) than last year's data.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
Both measurements show that while students can and are able to read critically in their analyses, they are not demonstrating a reliable understanding of specific literary terms when doing so. The scores on average improve, but the number of students meeting the benchmark by the last assignment is low.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Missed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
We would not, based on these findings, significantly alter curriculum, but ought to consider spending more time in class and/or giving short quizzes to reinforce these concepts.

We also had an instructor teaching the class for the first time, and did not return to teaching. Next year, we have some new full-time faculty coming into our department and classes, which should make a very positive impact in all of our Literature classes.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action
Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)