

## Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2015-2016

Program: \_B.A. In English\_\_\_\_\_

Date: June 1, 2016

Completed by: Cynthia Taylor\_\_\_\_\_

### Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment):

Doug Eskew, Dorothy Heedt, Constance Little, Alysse McCanna, Juan Morales, Ted Taylor.

Please describe the 2015-2016 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2016-2017 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2015-2016 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2015-2016. 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? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	B. When was this SLO last assessed ? <b>Please indicate the semester and year.</b>	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? <b>Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.</b>	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 <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
1.Demonstrate knowledge of significant traditions, historical and cultural contexts, and	Summer 2013	Evaluation of incoming majors in ENG 201 and graduating seniors in ENG 493 (final	Fall 15 and Spring 16 ENG 201 students (37 students). Summer and Fall 15 and Spring 16 ENG	We expect 75% of the ENG 201 students to score a 2 or higher on a 4 point scale. We expect 75% of	100% of the ENG 201 students scored 2 or higher. 83.3% of the ENG 493	The ENG 201 and ENG 493 students outperformed our expectations on this SLO.	This assessment does not indicate a need for changes to the program.

current issues in literature and language studies.		papers were used for assessment).	493 students (30 students).	the ENG 493 students to score 2.5 or higher.	students scored 2.5 or higher.		
2. Conduct, analyze, evaluate, and integrate academic research.	Summer 2012	Evaluation of incoming majors in ENG 201 and graduating seniors in ENG 493 (final papers were used for assessment).	Fall 15 and Spring 16 ENG 201 students (37 students). Summer and Fall 15 and Spring 16 ENG 493 students (30 students)		100% of the ENG 201 students scored 2 or higher. 86.7% of the ENG 493 students scored 2.5 or higher.	The ENG 201 and ENG 493 students outperformed our expectations on this SLO.	This assessment does not indicate a need for changes to the program.

Comments:

The fact that 100% of the students in ENG 201 scored a 2 or higher on both SLOs evaluated in this cycle indicates that the English Program faculty members need to discuss raising our expectations. This was also the recommendation we received following the evaluation of last year's English Program Assessment Report. We will discuss this in our first meeting of the fall semester, when we discuss the results of all of the assessment instruments.

**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?
		In semesters when multiple sections of ENG 201 are offered, have a norming session for all ENG 201 instructors to ensure consistent ratings, or have instructors use the rubric to rate the final essays in the other instructor's section.	We did not offer multiple sections of ENG 201 in the fall or spring.	In the future, if we offer multiple sections of ENG 201 in one semester, we will try this.
		Since none of the ENG 201 and 493 evaluators use the 0 category, eliminate this ranking on the assessment rubric.	Yes.	No discernable change.
		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.	
		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 a six-week summer 2015 session.	The average rating per section on SLO 1: 3.2 (Summer), 3.1 (Fall), 3.3 (Spring); SLO 2: 2.9 (Summer), 3.2 (Fall), 3.1 (Spring). Average scores of the students who took the senior seminar in the summer 2015 6-week session were in the same range as the students who took the course in the fall and spring semesters on both SLOs assessed in this assessment cycle, suggesting that we can continue to offer senior seminars in 6-week summer sessions for students who need it to graduate.

#### Comments:

To get the most objective assessments possible, each senior seminar essay was read by two readers and when their rankings differed, scores were averaged. Experienced lecturers performed the assessments to avoid potential bias on the part of ranked faculty, who take turns teaching the seminar.

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, 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. Based on student evaluations of Careers for English majors, the course is a success. Due to the loss of a tenure-track faculty line, we were not able to offer ENG 221 and 222, and we won't be able to do that for the foreseeable future. The results of last year's advising questionnaire suggested the need for more consistency in advising. This year the chair made an effort to assign English majors transitioning from First Year Advisors to appropriate advisors and to distribute the advising load more equally among faculty. Additionally, all English faculty attended DARs training. Using DARs instead of graduation planning sheets this year revealed a need to make some changes in the way we describe English Program graduation requirements in the catalog, in order to reduce the number of DARs exceptions/substitutions we submit to enable students to graduate.

## 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 Significant 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 Techniques				

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 argumentation.