

2012-2013 Annual Program Assessment Report

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College and the assessment office. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

College: Humanities

Department: English

Program: Rhetoric and Composition Theory Graduate Option

Assessment liaison: RosaMaria Chacon

1. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s) (optional). Provide a brief overview of this year's assessment plan and process.

Assessment for the Rhetoric and Composition Theory Graduate option focused on Common Graduate_SLO #2: Students will conduct research and/or produce creative work appropriate to their option. Seven student papers were selected at random from English 600B, College Composition: Theory and Pedagogy, and English 654, The Politics of Information, and assessed by six members of the Composition Committee according to the common rubric previously developed for Common Graduate SLO #2: "Students will conduct research and/or produce creative work appropriate to their option."

2. Assessment Buy-In. Describe how your chair and faculty were involved in assessment related activities. Did department meetings include discussion of student learning assessment in a manner that included the department faculty as a whole?

Assessment Buy-In. Describe how your chair and faculty were involved in assessment related activities. Did department meetings include discussion of student learning in a manner that included the department faculty as a whole?

During the previous year (2011-2012), our assessment activities and discussions were often conducted with all department faculty during monthly department meetings. Unfortunately, the English Department found this method to be rather unwieldy and unmanageable. This is particularly true since the English Department has five options with an additional graduate program in Rhetoric and Composition. This has resulted in 6 different 5-year plans, which can be confusing and unwieldy for all (whole) department discussions.

Therefore, this year (2012-2013), the English Department tried something different. At the beginning of each semester, the department chair met with each option head and the assessment coordinator (liaison) to discuss assessment plans and tasks. After these meetings, each option head met with their committees and conducted assessment. These 6 committees included 28 different faculty members (out of a total of 32 full time faculty).

Thus, almost all English Department faculty were directly involved in assessment. Doing our assessment in this manner enabled us to conduct assessment more effectively in a focused effort.

In addition, the English department did conduct (in October 2012) one all faculty discussion and consensus re the adoption of a new rubric for assessment of Common Undergraduate SLO #3: Students will demonstrate knowledge of creative, literary, linguistic, and/or rhetorical theories. This SLO and rubric are shared by several options.

3. **Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project.** Answer items a-f for each SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, copy and paste items a-f below, BEFORE you answer them here, to provide additional reporting space.

3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

Common Graduate SLO #2 “Students will conduct research and/or produce creative work appropriate to their option.

3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university’s Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)

- Critical Thinking
- Written Communication
- Information Literacy

3c. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?

Student papers were assessed directly, using the following rubric for Common Graduate SLO #2: Students will conduct research and/or produce creative work appropriate to their option:

5: Excellent	4: More than satisfactory	3: satisfactory	2: Less than satisfactory	1: Not demonstrated
Thesis/Paper effectively engages with the issues and accurately uses theory and terminologies appropriate to professional discourse. Thesis/Paper is thorough and demonstrates in-depth knowledge. Consistent use of conventions appropriate to the medium.	Thesis/Paper engages with the issues and uses some theory and some terminologies appropriate to professional discourse. Thesis/Paper is clear and demonstrates some knowledge. In general, use of conventions appropriate to the medium.	Thesis/Paper may engage with the issues and show awareness of theory and terminologies appropriate to the professional discourse, but occasionally misuses them. Thesis/Paper is uneven and may demonstrate lack of knowledge. Uneven use of conventions appropriate to the medium.	Thesis/Paper engages in a way that demonstrates some awareness of the issues. Thesis/Paper lacks clear sense of theory and terminologies appropriate to the discourse, and minimally engages with these elements. Inappropriate use of conventions appropriate to the medium.	Thesis/Paper does not address the issues or engage with appropriate theories or terminologies. Thesis/Paper is incomplete and incoherent, with mechanically flawed sentence structure. Inappropriate use or no use of conventions appropriate to the medium.

3d. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

This SLO was assessed on the basis of culminating projects submitted at the end of the Fall 2012 semester. The projects represented students' mastery of course content.

3e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

Seven student papers were read independently by six Composition Committee faculty members. Results indicated that all student work was evaluated as Excellent, More Than Satisfactory, and Satisfactory, although there was some variation in scoring. The categories in the top row refer to the titles of the student papers that were assessed, the three on the right referring to the syllabus rationale that students in English 600B prepared for their final portfolios. Results are summarized below:

Readers	Kong	Motherhood	Casual	New Med	Rationale	Syll Rat	Syll Rat
Reader 1	5	5	5	5	4.5	5	4
Reader 2	5	4	5	5	4	5	5
Reader 3	3	4	5	4	3	5	4
Reader 4	4.5	3.5	3	5	5	5	4
Reader 5	5	4	4	4	5	5	3
Reader 6	4	3	4	5	3	3	4

3f. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

The results of this assessment suggest the need for additional discussion among Composition committee members about the nature of course assignments and the criteria used to evaluate student work in particular courses. Evaluation of student work also focused attention on how evaluation of new media texts might differ from that used for traditional print texts. This is a difference future assessment needs to consider and adjust for.

4. Assessment of Previous Changes: Present documentation that demonstrates how the previous changes in the program resulted in improved student learning. N/A

5. Changes to SLOs? Please attach an updated course alignment matrix if any changes were made. (Refer to the Curriculum Alignment Matrix Template, http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html.) N/A

6. Assessment Plan. Evaluate the effectiveness of your 5 year assessment plan. How well did it inform and guide your assessment work this academic year? What process is used to develop/update the 5 year assessment plan? Please attach an updated 5 year assessment plan for 2013-2018. (Refer to Five Year Planning Template, plan B or C, http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html.)

Assessment work in the English Department is always completely guided and aligned with the 5 year Assessment Plans (all six of them). We begin with the plans and stay with them. The only changes we ever have are in small supplemental tasks, which are not part of the actual assessment work. The changes are generally necessitated by an inability to fully complete a supplemental task due to organizational parameters, and are accounted for in our Annual Assessment Reports.

The English Department has updated or made adjustments in some of the Assessment Plans based on 1) discovery of previous errors in writing the initial 5 year Plans and 2) the overwhelming workload necessitated by six different, comprehensive 5 year Assessment Plans. In completing a self-study, writing six 5 year Assessment Plans, and conducting assessment all in one year (during 2010-2011) in addition to regular teaching, service, research and administrative duties, the English Department was quite swamped by work. Returning to the 5 year plans, on a year by year basis, we discover inadvertent errors and overwhelming assessment workloads. Therefore, we make small adjustments that will either correct our previous errors and/or alleviate some of the workload. During 2012-2013 adjustments were made to the Honors and Graduate option Assessment Plans. The corrected plans were sent to Gregory Mena, Marilyn Filbeck, and Bonnie Paller February 16, 2013.

7. Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program? Please provide citation or discuss. No.

8. Other information, assessment or reflective activities or processes not captured above.

In the course of conducting this assessment, we reviewed course offerings and sequences and hope to devote additional attention in the future to discussing course content and assignments. We also reviewed assessment materials, including rubrics, for utility and flexibility.