

Program: \_\_BA in English\_\_

Date: \_\_31 May 2012\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Donna M. Souder \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department and return it to Erin Frew, [erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu](mailto:erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu) as an email attachment before June 1, 2012. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>. Thank you.

**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?	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please attach a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many 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 <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
Conducts, Evaluates, and Integrates Academic Research	AY 2010-2011 (last assessment cycle)	Evaluation of incoming majors in English 201 & graduating seniors in English 493 (final student papers were used for assessment)	All ENG 201 Students (Sp 2012) and all ENG 493 graduating seniors (Summer 2011 and Sp 2012)	All students are expected to perform at a C level, or above, in all required courses in the ENG major and minor. This would equal	ENG 201 students (32 evaluated from 2 courses from spring 2012) = 2.6 ENG 493 (15 students evaluated from 2 courses) =	Students who successfully completed ENG 201 scored higher than expected in assessment of the SLO. Nevertheless, students in ENG 493 scored below expectations and .2 below last year's results on same	ENG 201 norming and curriculum development will continue as planned and implemented in AY 2010-2011.  ENG 493 may require more attention. Some consideration of summer/fall/spring offerings and availability of TT faculty will be

				<p>a score of 2 or above.</p> <p>Our expectation is that 75% of the ENG 493 students should score higher (3-4 average) in designated SLO.</p>	2.9	<p>SLO. Students enrolled in the summer course scored much lower than their spring cohort (summer = 2.7; spring = 3.10). It is the belief of the assessment team that, in terms of this particular SLO, students simply had less time/access for completing in-depth research expected of graduating seniors. Other variables could, of course, be at play (lecturer teaching in summer vs. TT faculty teaching in spring; difference in assignments, etc)</p>	<p>necessary in AY 2012-2013.</p> <p>Inter-departmental discussion of SLOs and approaches to consistency in 493 is also a necessary next step</p>

Comments:

**B. 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?	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?
In this cycle, we chose to focus on SLO #2, rather than assessing <i>all</i> SLOs (as we had done during AY 2010-2011). This allowed us to more carefully evaluate student success in this area: “Conducts, Evaluates, and Integrates Academic Research”	AY 2010-2011 (though it was assessed with ALL SLOs, so less attention to detail was possible)	<p>1.We will assess English 201 students both semesters.</p> <p>2.Conduct norming sessions for both 201 and 493.</p> <p>3.Involve students more in the assessment process—initially, solicit input and then move on to more involved participation.</p>	Because we had changes to leadership in the department (Dr. Katherine Frank left CSU-Pueblo, and had submitted this report on the department’s behalf), we were unaware that these specific recommendations had been made. As a result, 1 and 2 were not possible without previous notice, but norming sessions did occur in ENG 201 courses, as we continued to work towards increased alignment and curriculum	Implementing norming sessions has been successful. We experienced fewer drops from the course, we’ve seen increased consistency in grading, and students are reporting an increased satisfaction with the ways in which the ENG 201 course prepares them to be successful ENG majors and minors.

			consistency in this core ENG major/minor course. Instructors worked together in order to build assignments, rubrics, and long-term plans that worked in conjunction with our BA Curriculum Map.	

Comments:

From a purely subjective point of view, assessors all reported the dramatic difference in reading ENG 201 work and ENG 493 papers. It is clear to all of us that students experience an extreme amount of growth from sophomore to senior year, so our ongoing mission as a department must be in seeking more avenues in which we might gather quantitative data that is both meaningful and reflective of the overall development of necessary student skills.

## Assessment Rubric

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Scorer: \_\_\_\_\_

Rate each essay in each category on a scale of 0 to 4, 4 being the highest. The rubrics are explained on the reverse.

	0	1	2	3	4
Demonstrates Knowledge of Significant Traditions and Historical and Cultural Contexts of Literature					
Conducts, Evaluates, and Integrates Academic Research					
Understands and Applies Techniques of Critical Theory					
Analyzes Literature and Synthesizes Ideas with Clarity and Accuracy					
Uses a Range of English Syntactic Structures Effectively					
Constructs an Original and Convincing Argument Using a Range of Rhetorical Techniques					
Develops general communication and learning skills and understands the value of ongoing critical reading, thinking, and writing.					

Notes:

## English Senior Research Essay Evaluation Standards for Program Assessment

### 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.
- 0. The paper reveals little or no familiarity with any literary, historical, or 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.
- 0. The paper fails to incorporate relevant academic research entirely.

### Understands and 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.
- 0. The paper reveals little or no understanding of critical theory.

### Analyzes Literature and Synthesizes Ideas with Clarity and Accuracy.

- The paper reflects proficiency in writing about literature and in analyzing and synthesizing ideas. 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. The paper contains significant errors in writing about literature or in analyzing and synthesizing ideas.
- 0. The paper does not manifest college-level skills in writing about literature or in analyzing and synthesizing ideas.

### Uses a Range of English Syntactic Structures Effectively

- 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.
- 0. The paper does not manifest college-level skills in English syntax.

### Constructs an Original and Convincing Argument Using a Range of Rhetorical Techniques.

- 4. The paper conducts an original and convincing argument, employing a range of appropriate rhetorical techniques in a professional manner. The paper conducts an original and convincing argument, employing a range of appropriate rhetorical techniques at satisfactory levels for a college senior.
- 2. The paper is weakened by lack of originality or persuasiveness in its argument or by inadequate or inappropriate use of rhetorical techniques. The paper manifests significant flaws in argumentation.
- 0. The paper does not manifest college-level skills in argumentation.