Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2013-2014   **Due: June 2, 2014**

Program:_B.A. In English_____   **Date:** May 20, 2014

Completed by: Cynthia Taylor_____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): Iver Arnegard, Gillian Collie, Daniel Darvay, Dorothy Heedt, Juan Morales, Jason Sahpara, Shawn Vidmar

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, 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, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. 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? 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?
Applies Techniques of Critical Theory	Summer 2011	Evaluation of incoming majors in ENG	Fall 13 and Spring 14 ENG 201	We expect 75% of the ENG 201	89% of the ENG 201 students	The ENG 201 students outperformed our	This assessment does not indicate a need for changes to the program,

		201 and graduating seniors in ENG 493 (final papers were used for assessment).	students (45 students). Summer and Fall 13 and Spring 14 ENG 493 students (34 students).	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.	scored 2 or higher. 76% of the ENG 493 students scored 2.5 or higher.	expectations on this SLO. The average rating per section ranged from a 2.06 to 3.17.The ENG 493 students met our expectations on this SLO.	but in order to use ENG 201 assessments as a baseline for assessing SLOs, we should discuss assessment protocol. (See comments below.)

Comments: The range in rating scores over 4 sections of ENG 201 indicates the need for a norming session in the fall and spring, before 201 instructors use the rubric to rate final 201 papers. Additionally, since none of the ENG 201 and 493 evaluators used the 0 category, we should discuss eliminating this ranking on the assessment rubric. This suggestion is also in line with assessment best practices.

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 student performance on all SLOs, schedule ranked faculty as well as lecturers to teach ENG	Yes. During this assessment cycle, two sections of ENG 201 were taught by ranked faculty and two were	The average rating per 201 section for this SLO ranged from 2.06 and 2.29 for sections taught by ranked faculty, to 2.56 and 3.17 for sections taught by a

		201.	taught by lecturers. Instructors shared syllabi and assignments.	lecturer. This could be due to higher expectons of ranked faculty, or more experience teaching the course on the part of the lecturer. English Program faculty should discuss norming sessions for those teaching the course and two readers for each 201 final essay. The ENG 201 aggregate score (2.38) is higher than the aggregate score for the SLO we assessed last year (2.25). We will continue to schedule ranked faculty to teach ENG 201 when possible.
		To improve performance of students taking ENG 493 in the summer, avoid scheduling this course in a 4-week session and schedule ranked faculty.	Yes. ENG 493 was taught by a ranked faculty member in the 12-week summer 2013 session.	The average rating per section on this SLO was 3.4 (Summer), 2.62 (Fall) and 2.26 (Spring). This indicates that the change was very successful. This summer we are offering 493 in a 6-week session and will report the results in the next assessment report.

Comments:

In addition to assessing SLOs annually, the English Program distributes a questionnaire to graduating seniors. Based on previous questionnaires, we made two changes to the English curriculum last year, which were submitted to and approved by CAP Board: a one-credit course, Careers for English Majors, is now required for all English majors; ENG 221 and 222, Masterpieces of World Literature I and II, can now be used to satisfy the required historical survey sequence. The results of this year's questionnaire suggest the need for an advisor training session for less experienced faculty in the program.