2014-2015 Annual Program Assessment Report

College: Humanities

Department: English

Program: Graduate and Undergraduate

Assessment Liaison: RosaMaria Chacon

1. A. \_\_\_XX\_\_\_ Measured Student Work.

B. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Analyzed Results of Measurement.

C. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Applied Results of Analysis to Program Review/Curriculum/Revision.

2. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s):

 **Graduate** Following the English Department’s revised five-year plan (2014-2020), the Graduate Committee chose to measure

Common Graduate SLO #1 Students will demonstrate knowledge of creative, cultural, linguistic, literary, performative and/or

rhetorical theories.

Inasmuch as this SLO requires the measurement of student knowledge of theory, an element that requires more time to master,

the committee decided to assess it through the culminating experience. Student work was randomly selected from four

different culminating experiences: English 697C (Literature), the English M.A. Literature exam—2 samples; English 697C

(Rhetoric/Composition), the English M.A. Rhetoric/Composition exam—2 samples; English 698D (Literature and

Rhetoric/Composition), the graduate project course for students in the literature and rhetoric/composition options—4 samples; and English 698D (Creative Writing), the graduate project course for students in the creative writing option—4 samples. As such, the sampling of student work is reflective of the three different options in our M.A. program and the students’ knowledge of theory at the completion point of our program.

During Fall 2014, the Graduate Studies Committee, using the five point rubric framework, discussed and developed a rubric to

measure student work in alignment with SLO #1 (see attached).

Student names and course designations were removed from the twelve student samples, which were then distributed to the

committee with the previously approved rubric and a chart to keep track of their scores. In addition to assigning each paper a

score from 1-5 in accordance with the rubric, committee members provided comments on both student work and the

measurement process, in general. Next, the committee met to discuss any discrepancies and problems with the measurement.

The scores for the students’ mastery of theory are fairly high (see attached), with an overall average of 4.1 out of 5.0 (More than Satisfactory). The scores ranged from 3.25 (Satisfactory) to 5.0 (Excellent). Indeed, three of the student papers/exams were measured at a 5.0 (Excellent) and four of the papers/exams achieved a 4.0 (More than Satisfactory). All twelve of the student works were at least satisfactory in demonstrating knowledge of the theory related to their option.

Although SLO #1 was set to be measured in 2010-2011 (under the previous plan 2011-2016), the relation between this year’s measurement of student work and that of past years cannot be ascertained for two reasons. First, the measurement instrument in 2010-2011 was markedly different from this year’s instrument and too diffuse. It was based on a variety of questions for students in English 601, 604, 638, 651, 652, 697C and 698D. The questions were designed and addressed for the different groups of students in each class such as literature and creative writing. Second, the Graduate committee was overwhelmed with the work of rewriting the 5 year Assessment Plan (2011-2016) and working on the Self Study, and thus was not able to devote adequate time and energy to satisfactorily complete the measurement in 2010-2011.

**Undergraduate** Following the English Department’s revised five-year plan (2014-2020), the department chose to measure

Common Undergraduate SLO #4 Students will analyze British and American cultural, historical, and literary texts.

Student papers were randomly selected from two classes: twelve papers from English 456 British Literature Age of

Enlightenment and twelve papers from English 473 American Literature 1607-1860.

During Fall 2014, the Literature Committee, using the five point rubric framework, discussed and developed a rubric to

measure student work in alignment with SLO #4. After developing the rubric, it was submitted to the entire department for

consideration at a department meeting. In accordance with department feedback, the rubric was revised (see attached).

Student names and course designations were removed from the twenty-four student samples, which were then distributed to the

committee with the previously approved rubric and a chart to keep track of their scores. In addition to assigning each paper a

score from 1-5 in accordance with the rubric, committee members provided comments on both student work and the

measurement process, in general. Next, the committee met to discuss any discrepancies and problems with the measurement.

While the scores (in the medium range) suggest that students did meet the SLO, the Literature Committee felt hindered during

the measurement task by the change in the original rubric developed by the committee. There was also some confusion about

SLO #4 and what it is specifically designed to measure. Thus the committee does not feel that the scores are useful for analysis

or application. The committee suggests that the rubric be rewritten but only after revision of SLO #4, which lacks clarity.

Rather than pursuing analysis of this year’s measurement of SLO #4 for next year, I suggest, as Assessment Coordinator, that

the Literature Committee, which is charged with measuring undergraduate SLOs, revise SLO #4 and rewrite the rubric so that

they can be used in the future as more effective measurement tools. To streamline the process and provide a better opportunity

for clarity, I further suggest that all the revision take place, exclusively within the Literature Committee with the direct

assistance of the Assessment Coordinator.

Alternatively, I suggest that the Literature Committee move on to the measurement of another SLO next year.

Additional Assessment Information: An article entitled, “Mining Faculty Complaints for Valuable Assessment Clues” by

RosaMaria Chacon was published in *Assessment Update* Sept/Oct 2014 issue.

3. **Graduate** Next year, the Graduate Committee will analyze the measurement results for this year (SLO #1) and consider

whether application of the information (changes in the program) is both necessary and possible.

**Undergraduate** Next year, **i**n consultation with the Department Assessment Coordinator, the Literature Committee will decide

whether the committee shall revise SLO #4 & rewrite the rubric for future use or move on to measurement of a different SLO.