

**Colorado State University-Pueblo Undergraduate & Graduate Program Assessment Report for AY 2012-2013** Due: June 1, 2012

**Program:** BA in English

**Date:** 24 May 2013

**Completed by:** Scott Gage and Madison Furrh

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, 2013. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>. Thank you.

**A. 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?             |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Demonstrates knowledge of significant traditions and historical and cultural contexts of                                       | This SLO was last assessed in AY 2010-2011. | Evaluation of incoming majors in English 201 & graduating seniors in English 493                                   | All ENG 201 students (Fall 2012 and Spring 2013) and all ENG 493 graduating | Our expectation is that 75% of students in will score a 2.5 or above. Not meeting | ENG 201 aggregate score (44 essays evaluated from 3 courses) = | Students enrolled in ENG 493 fulfilled departmental expectations for | ENG 493 norming and curriculum development will continue as planned and implemented in AY 2013-2014. |

|            |  |   |  |   |  |   |  |
|------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| literature |  | (final student papers were used for assessment) | seniors (Summer 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013 | that benchmark will trigger a revision of the English curriculum to address the deficiency. | <p>2.25</p> <p>Percentage of ENG 201 students performing at 2.5 or higher: 43%</p> <p>ENG 493 aggregate score (42 essays evaluated from 3 courses) = 3.09</p> <p>Percentage of ENG 493 students performing at 2.5 or higher: 76%</p> | <p>performance as outlined in the program's assessment plan. Students enrolled in ENG 201, however, performed below departmental expectations. While we expect student performance in ENG 201 to be less proficient than in ENG 493, the number of students in ENG 201 not meeting expectations suggests a need to strengthen the curriculum for the SLO that was assessed.</p> | <p>ENG 201 requires significant attention with regard to this SLO. First, per ongoing programmatic conversations about ENG 201, curriculum should be redesigned with a greater emphasis on significant traditions and historical and cultural contexts of literature. Second, faculty at all levels should participate in a curriculum development workshop focused on incorporating this SLO into the syllabi, outcomes, and assignments of the course. Third, pending availability, TT faculty should be considered for rotation into the ENG 201 teaching schedule.</p> |
|------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|

**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 for the new recommendations?  |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>As directed, we followed the assessment method used last year and focused on one SLO. We specifically focused this year on SLO #1:<br/>           “Demonstrates knowledge of significant traditions and historical and cultural contexts of literature.” We did so to allow us to more carefully evaluate student success in this area.</p> | <p>This SLO was last assessed in AY 2010-2011.</p> | <p>Recommendations from the previous assessment focused on ENG 493 and included the following:</p> <p>1) “Some consideration of summer/fall/spring offerings and availability of TT faculty will be necessary AY 2012-2013”</p> <p>2) “Inter-departmental discussions of SLOs and approaches to consistency in ENG 493 is also a necessary next step”</p> | <p>1) The recommendations for TT availability in ENG 493 were acted upon as the English program is now offering a twelve-week section of ENG 493 during the summer taught by a tenure track faculty member. This change addresses two of the major concerns raised in last year’s assessment report. We will evaluate the effectiveness of these changes in the AY 2013-2104 assessment report.</p> <p>2) The TT English faculty held inter-departmental discussions of SLOs in bi-weekly program meetings. The English program also addressed concerns about consistency by scheduling TT faculty to teach all</p> | <p>1) The English program does not yet have data indicating the results of offering a twelve-week summer session of ENG 493 taught by TT faculty. The program will have this data in the AY 2013-2014 assessment report.</p> <p>2) As a result of bi-weekly program meetings, the TT faculty have revised SLOs for the English program.</p> |

|  |  |  |                     |  |
|--|--|--|---------------------|--|
|  |  |  | sections of ENG 493 |  |
|--|--|--|---------------------|--|

## 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.

