Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2018-2019

Program:___English Program___ **(Due: May 1, 2019) Date report completed:** ___May 24, 2019_____

Completed by:_____Professor Juan Morales_____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): ____Courses taught by Dr. Madison Furrh, Dr. Katherine Brown, Dr. Chris Piccici, & Dr. Cynthia Taylor. Assessment Completed by Professors Dorothy Heedt, Constance Little, and Jason Sa-phara_____.

> Please describe the 2018-2019 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2018. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html. Thank you.

Brief statement of Program mission and goals:

During the 2018-19 academic year, the English Program has been undergoing a Five-Year Program Review, which will be influential in our updates of our assessment practices. Based on the recommendations of our Program Reviewer, Dr. Carol Erwin of Eastern New Mexico University, we will be updating our curriculum map to add more clarity to how our classes address our department's SLOs. This will help us clarify when students are introduced to an SLO and when they are meant to complete it while they work through our program.

In January, the English Curriculum Program Committee started meeting and also held a retreat. We started making proposed changes to the English major in several key areas:

• Courses Offerings-We have identified over twenty courses to place on reserve, courses to revamp and revitalize, courses to add, and courses important to student assessment.

• SLOs-The Committee has drafted new SLOs.

• New Graduation Requirements-These new categories will strengthen our department's values and improve recruitment, job placement, and student success.

• Values Statement-The values statement will reflect our program's vision, showcase our student success, and assist us with recruitment, promotion, and visibility.

Going forward in support of assessment activities: 1) we will confirm we are assessing the correct classes in our program (ENG 114, ENG 201, ENG 414, & ENG 493); 2) Determine if final notebooks and portfolios are still the best assessment practices for student success and to close the loop; 3) Determine if our SLOs have measurable outcomes, and if new SLOs are measuarable; 4) Better integrate assessment into our Curriculum Map.

Our curriculum changes will be completed during this and the fall semester, so they can be presented to CAPBoard in Fall 2019. However, the assessment review of goals 1-3 should occur in time to incorporate it into this year's assessment cycle, which will be completed in May 2019.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? **Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.**	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?

#2-Conducts, Evaluates, and Integrates Academic Research	Summer 2018	Evaluation of incoming majors and minors in ENG 201 and graduating seniors in ENG 493 (final papers were used for assessment).	Fall 18 and Spring 19 ENG 201 students (35 students). Fall 18 and Spring 19 ENG 493 students (20 students).	We expect 75% of the ENG 201 students to score a 2 or higher on a 4 point scale. We expect 75% of the ENG 493 students to score 2.5 or higher.	All ENG 201 students scored a 2 or higher. The average student score was 13.4 out of 16. All ENG 493 students scored 2.5 or higher. The average score was 13.6 out of 16.	The ENG 201 and ENG 493 students outperformed our expectations on this SLO. This suggests we need to revise and update our ENG 201 assessment to further challenge our students and course performances.	The department recently completed at five-year program review and will be updating our SLOs, curriculum map, course offerings, and assessment procedures with the goal of incorporating new assessment goals for the 2019-20 AY.
#4-Analyzes Literature and Synthesizes Ideas with Clarity and Accuracy	Summer 2018	Evaluation of incoming majors in ENG 201 and graduating seniors in ENG 493 (final papers were used for assessment).	Fall 18 and Spring 19 ENG 201 students (35 students). Fall 18 and Spring 19 ENG 493 students (20 students).	We expect 75% of the ENG 201 students to score a 2 or higher on a 4 point scale. We expect 75% of the ENG 493 students to score 2.5 or higher.	All ENG 201 students scored a 2 or higher. The average student score was 13.4 out of 16. All ENG 493 students scored 2.5 or higher. The average score was 13.6 out of 16.	The ENG 201 and ENG 493 students outperformed our expectations on this SLO. This suggests we need to revise and update our ENG 201 assessment to further challenge our students and course performances.	The department recently completed at five-year program review and will be updating our SLO, curriculum map, course offerings, and assessment procedures with the goal of incorporating new assessment goals for the 2019-20 AY.

Comments:

Assessment indicates we outperformed our goals for ENG 201 and 493 students, which shows success in the classroom for students entering and exiting the program. However, these results indicate we should raise our expectations. Additionally, the assessment process will be updated this coming year based on new department SLOs to better serve changes to the major and our program, based on the results of our five-year program review process. We will also be updating our curriculum map, which is not strongly linked to the assessment process. If the curriculum map were better connected to the assessment process, it would allow us to better serve our students and lead to thorough curriculum changes.

II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
		To improve assessment process, SLOs will be reduced from 6 to 4. Updated SLOs will also reflect more dimensions of the English major and minor.	Five-Year Review processed completed in 2018-19, and it will allow us to finalize new SLOs in time for assessment for the 2019-20 AY.	

		Curriculum Map should be updated to assess student performance entering, in the middle of, and completing the English major. Also, it should be updated to better connect to assessment process.	The Curriculum Map will be updated and connected to assessment during the 2019-20 AY.	
		To improve student performance on all SLOs, schedule ranked faculty as well as lecturers to teach ENG 201.	Yes, ranked faculty taught ENG 201 in the fall and spring.	Successfully implemented.
		To simplify assessment process, it is recommended that professor collects final papers and assesses papers based on 1-2 SLOs while grading them. Afterward, assessment forms will be submitted to the Department Chair, who completes the assessment report.	To be completed in 2019-20 assessment process and to replace three readers who assessed all 201 and 493 papers for this assessment cycle.	

Comments:

Assessment process has been successful in the last few years that exceeded goals and expectations. This indicates our department should increase performance goals. Additional, it is an appropriate time to revise our department assessment based on our five-year program review. This includes incorporating updated SLOs (dropped from 6 to 4), revised curriculum map (per recommendation of External Reviewer), and streamlining the assessment process, which will now be done by the professor while grading final papers in each class.

Additional updates include revising the English Major, Minor, and overall course categories to better connect our major to innovations and trends in the major as well as better connect to university's Vision 2028 goals.

Assessment Rubric

Student:_____   Scorer:_____

Rate each essay in each category on a scale of 1 to 4, 4 being the highest. The rubrics are explained on the reverse.

	1	2	3	4
Demonstrates Knowledge of Signifi-cant Traditions and Historical and Cultural Contexts of Literature				
*Conducts, Evaluates, and Integrates Academic Research				
Applies Techniques of Critical Theory				
*Analyzes Literature and Synthesizes Ideas with Clarity and Accuracy				
Uses a Range of English Syntactic Structures Effectively				
Constructs a Convincing Argument Using a Range of Rhetorical Tech-niques				

Notes:

Assessment Rubric Guidelines

Demonstrates Knowledge of Significant Traditions and Historical and Cultural Contexts of Literature.

4. The paper reflects and makes effective use of accurate knowledge about relevant literary, historical, and cultural contexts.
3. The paper makes no significant errors regarding such contexts.
2. The paper is weakened by lack of knowledge and understanding of relevant contexts.
1. The paper contains significant errors regarding literary, historical, and cultural contexts.

Conducts, Evaluates, and Integrates Academic Research.

4. The paper incorporates relevant academic research in a correct and professional manner.
3. The paper incorporates relevant academic research in a satisfactory manner.
2. The paper is weakened by inadequate or unskillful use of academic research.
1. The paper makes significant errors in using academic research.

Applies Techniques of Critical Theory.

4. The paper reflects and makes appropriate use of an understanding of critical theory.
3. The paper makes no significant errors in using critical theory.
2. The paper is weakened by inadequate knowledge or use of critical theory.
1. The paper contains significant errors regarding critical theory or its use.

Analyzes Literature and Synthesizes Ideas with Clarity and Accuracy.

4. The paper reflects proficiency in writing about literature and in analyzing and synthesizing ideas.
3. The paper reflects acceptable competency in writing about literature and in analyzing and synthesizing ideas.
2. The paper is weakened by inadequate skill in writing about literature or in analyzing and synthesizing ideas.
1. The paper contains significant errors in writing about literature or in analyzing and synthesizing ideas.

Uses a Range of English Syntactic Structures Effectively.

4. The paper manifests a sophisticated level of Language awareness, as reflected in the sophisticated use of effective syntactic structures.
3. The paper manifests a satisfactory level of language awareness, as reflected in the acceptable use of effective syntactic structures.
2. The paper is weakened by inadequate mastery of English syntactic structures.
1. The paper makes significant errors in syntax.

Constructs a Convincing Argument Using a Range of Rhetorical Techniques.

4. The paper conducts a convincing argument, employing a range of appropriate rhetorical techniques in a professional manner.
3. The paper conducts a convincing argument, employing a range of appropriate rhetorical techniques at satisfactory levels for a college senior.
2. The paper is weakened by lack of persuasiveness in its argument or by inadequate or inappropriate use of rhetorical techniques.
1. The paper manifests significant flaws in argume