

Program: B.A. In English

Date: May 12, 2017

Completed by: Cynthia Taylor

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): Daniel Darvay, Madison Furrh, Dorothy Heedt, Constance Little, Ted Taylor.

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 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/imp rovements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
3. Applies techniques of literary theory..	Summer 2014	Evaluation of incoming majors in ENG 201 and graduating seniors in ENG 493 (final papers were used for assessment).	Fall 16 and Spring 17 ENG 201 students (39 students). Summer and Fall 16 and Spring 17 ENG 493 students (15 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.	92% of the ENG 201 students scored 2 or higher. 100% 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.
4. Analyzes literature and synthesizes ideas with clarity and accuracy.	Summer 2015	Evaluation of incoming majors in ENG 201 and graduating seniors in ENG 493 (final papers were used for assessment).	Fall 16 and Spring 17 ENG 201 students (39 students). Summer and Fall 16 and Spring 17 ENG 493 students (15 students)		95% of the ENG 201 students scored 2 or higher. 93% 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:

High scores for ENG 201 and 493 students suggest that the English Program faculty should revisit the possibility of 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.	ENG 493 was taught by a seasoned lecturer in a six-week summer 2016 session.	The average rating per section on SLO 3: 3.5 (Summer), 3.1 (Fall), 3.6 (Spring); SLO 4: 3.5 (Summer), 3.0 (Fall), 3.6 (Spring). Average scores of the students who took the senior seminar in the summer 2016 6-week session were higher than the students who took the course in the fall and almost as high as the students who took the course in the spring 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. This year's senior questionnaire indicates that some faculty advisors should attend DARS training so that they can advise more effectively and avoid delaying a student's graduation due to missing English major requirements. While results of this year's Senior Questionnaire are extremely positive, two suggestions from the Senior Questionnaire merit faculty discussion:

1. "Provide hands-on examples of how to do library research."
2. "There needs to be some sort of ceremony to acknowledge high achieving students. Other department have this. Professors need to be more involved in student life."

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.