**Annual Assessment Report to the College 2011-2012**

**College: Humanities**

**Department: English**

**Program: Subject Matter & FYI/JYI**

**Committee Chairs: Dorothy Clark (SM); Kent Baxter (FYI/JYI)**

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

**Liaison: RosaMaria Chacon**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s)**

|  |
| --- |
| 1a. **Assessment Process Overview:** Provide a brief overview of the intended plan to assess the program this year. Is assessment under the oversight of one person or a committee?  Assessment is conducted through the English Dept.’s Subject Matter Committee. The plan calls for assessment of two SLOs: (1) Departmental SLO #2, Students will demonstrate effective writing skills, by using a scale/survey of 1-5 presented to instructors of English 406 (Advanced Expository Writing for Teachers) and English 495ESM (senior seminar for English Subject Matter students; (2) Subject Matter/FYI/JYI SLO #2, Students will apply rhetorical and composition theory. Students were assessed in both English 406 and English 495ESM. In both English 406 and 495ESM, students were given a questionnaire about their writing habits, particularly the influence of rhetorical and composition theory on their writing process. This survey was given twice in English 406—a class generally taken before the senior seminar—to determine any increase in learning in this area. A second survey was given to students in two sections of the senior seminar, English 495ESM. In this course, students focus on writing process (a core component of Subject Matter/FYI/JYI SLO #2) and write extensive on-line peer evaluation suggestions on each other’s drafts. In this survey, students’ peer evaluations for an out-of-class expository essay were evaluated. |
| 1b. **Implementation and Modifications:** Did the actual assessment process deviate from what was intended? If so, please describe any modification to your assessment process and why it occurred.  Two deviations from the original plan occurred. The original plan had included assessing the English Department’s gateway course, English 355, for the Common Undergraduate SLO #2, and the English Subject Matter summative assessment, the Exit Interview, for the Subject Matter Option #2. Because of budgetary concerns, the essay component of the Exit Interview has been removed, nullifying this area for assessment of these SLOs. English 355 was removed after deliberation that assessment would be redundant given that this course was central and critical to the assessment by the Literature Option. |

**2. Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project:** Answer questions according to the individual SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, report in the next chart below.

|  |
| --- |
| **2a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?**   1. Common Undergrad SLO #2:Students will demonstrate effective writing skills 2. Subject Matter/FYI/JYI SLO #2, Students will apply rhetorical and composition theory. (see below for analysis of this SLO) |
| **2b. What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?**    Department-selected five-point rubric to measure this SLO: Common Undergrad SLO #2: Students will demonstrate effective writing skills:  The following articulated common scale and rubric was implemented:  1: Unsatisfactory: 2: Less than Satisfactory; 3: Satisfactory; 4:More than Satisfactory; 5: Excellent |
| **2c. Describe the participants sampled to assess this SLO**: discuss sample/participant and population size for this SLO. For example, what type of students, which courses, how decisions were made to include certain participants.  Two English Subject Matter courses from Spring 2012 were assessed: English 406 (Advanced Expository Writing for Teachers) (one section) and English 495ESM, the option’s senior seminar (one section).  For English 406, two batches of randomly selected essays from 27 students, covering early to late in the term were assessed as per 1-5 scale rubric.  For English 495ESM, a late in the term essay assignment was assessed as per 1-5 scale rubric. Essays were randomly selected from 19 students. |
| **2d. 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.    The SLO was assessed longitudinally—both English 406 as well as in the senior seminar, English 495ESM. |
| **2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO:** Provide a summary of how the data were analyzed and highlight important findings from the data collected.  Assessment of the two batches of essays in English 406 showed substantial improvement. In the first batch, 18% of the students were 1 (less than satisfactory); only 9% were4 (more than satisfactory). The second batch at a later date indicated no students as 1 (less than satisfactory) and a 36 percentage increase in the 4 (more than satisfactory) scale with a total of 45% of the students. In the second batch 72% of the students scored either a 4 (more than satisfactory) or a 5 (excellent) as compared with the first batch of 31% for these two scales. However, the assessment did reveal that for the senior seminar, English 495ESM, 11% of the students scored 2 (less than satisfactory) with a positive combined result of 42% for scales 4 (more than satisfactory) and 5 (excellent).  It should be noted, however, that the size of the senior assessment was quite small (only 19 students) and this may have significantly skewed our data. So further assessment might be completed in this area in the future. |
| **2f. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO:** Think about all the different ways the results were or will be used. For example, to recommend changes to course content/topics covered, course sequence, addition/deletion of courses in program, student support services, revisions to program SLO’s, assessment instruments, academic programmatic changes, assessment plan changes, etc. Please provide a clear and detailed description of each.  The positive results of our assessment indicate that the English Department has achieved strong success with Common Undergraduate SLO #2. The committee was troubled by the 11% of our seniors who performed less than satisfactorily on this assessment. This may indicate that while the majority of our students have developed strong writing skills, a small number may be falling through the cracks. One suggestion the committee had for the department is to identify this small population earlier in their matriculation (perhaps at the gateway course, English 355 or through GPA in the major) and offer them access to some student support services. |

Some programs assess multiple SLOs each year. If your program assessed an additional SLO, report the process for that individual SLO below. If you need additional SLO charts, please cut & paste the empty chart as many times as needed. If you did NOT assess another SLO, skip this section.

|  |
| --- |
| **2a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?**  Subject Matter/FYI/JYI SLO #2, Students will apply rhetorical and composition theory. |
| **2b. What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?**  Two surveys were used:  (1)  In order to assess SLO #2 (Students will apply rhetorical and composition theory) for the ESM option, students’ peer evaluations for an out-of-class expository essay were analyzed for two sections of English 495ESM, a senior seminar specifically required for students in the English Subject Matter and FYI/JYI options.  In these courses, students wrote drafts of a poetry analysis paper and then were asked to write short evaluations of each other’s drafts and provide suggestions for improvement.  The English Subject Matter committee evaluated these peer reviews according to the following six parameters:  1. Students provide constructive suggestions for revision.  2. Students evaluate essay according to the parameters of the assignment.  3. Students show awareness of writing as a process (i.e. make specific suggestions for revision).  4. Students show awareness of the intended audience of the paper.  5. Students show awareness of the rhetorical context of the assignment.  6. Students not only make surface level corrections (i.e. grammar and style), but also discuss issues relating to structure and/or logic.  Each peer review response was assessed according to the following articulated common scale:  1: Unsatisfactory; 2: Less than Satisfactory; 3: Satisfactory; 4: More than Satisfactory; 5: Excellent  (2)  A questionnaire was given to students in English 406 and English 495ESM about their writing habits, in particular the influence of rhetorical and composition theory on their writing process.  The seven questions on the survey were as follows:   1. When writing my academic essays, I understand I can consider whether to use multiple drafts. 2. When writing my academic essays, I usually consider some sort of prewriting activity (brainstorming, mapping, freewriting, etc.). 3. When writing my academic essays, I make certain to introduce/explain/clarify my quotations. 4. When revising my academic essays, I look for surface errors as well as problems with structure or logic. 5. When writing my academic essays, I consider audience and rhetorical context with regards to structure, style, purpose. 6. In my writing process, I understand the purpose of the thesis statement. 7. In reading my academic texts, I monitor language use and consider how strategies I discover might apply to my own writing.   Students were asked to check one of the following response to each question: Always, More Often Than Not, Not Usually, Not Something I Ever Do  The English Subject Matter Committee tabulated the answers to the surveys by first applying the following numerical value to each answer: Always = 4, More Often Than Not = 3, Not Usually = 2, Not Something I Ever Do = 1. We then averaged the score in each category for the English 406 students and the English 495ESM students. |
| **2c. Describe the participants sampled to assess this SLO**: discuss sample/participant and population size for this SLO. For example, what type of students, which courses, how decisions were made to include certain participants.  Survey #1 was given to two sections of English 495ESM after the mid-point of the semester with a total of 47 responses.  Survey # 2 was given to 60 students in English 406 (both fall 2011 and spring 2012 semesters); students in the fall 2011 English 406 were surveyed once; two surveys were given to the spring 2012 English 406 students, early and later in the semester. This survey was given to 16 students in English 495ESM, spring 2012, later in the semester. |
| **2d. Describe the assessment design methodology:** 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.  Both surveys reflected a longitudinal assessment strategy. |
| **2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO:** Provide a summary of how the data were analyzed and highlight important findings from the data collected.  **For Survey #1:**  Forty seven peer responses were assessed. Following are the mean scores for each parameter:  1. Students provide constructive suggestions for revision. (Mean score = 3.81)  2. Students evaluate essay according to the parameters of the assignment. (Mean score = 4.11)  3. Students show awareness of writing as a process (i.e. make specific suggestions for revision). (Mean score = 4.21)  4. Students show awareness of the intended audience of the paper. (Mean score = 4.34)  5. Students show awareness of the rhetorical context of the assignment. (Mean score = 4.04)  6. Students not only make surface level corrections (i.e. grammar and style), but also discuss issues relating to structure and/or logic. (Mean score = 3.98)  The English Subject Matter committee was presently surprised to see that the senior English Subject Matter students were doing a more than satisfactory job when faced with the task of peer editing/evaluating an expository essay. This shows that the senior students have a general familiarity with rhetorical and composition theory and rely on certain aspects of this theory when evaluating expository essays. The only area where the seniors scored a satisfactory was in their general ability to provide “constructive suggestions.” This score might possibly be a reflection of the fact that the students did not design the original assignment and thus were not completely aware of how it would ultimately be graded. But this score also demonstrates that there is some room for improvement in the amount of and quality of peer review the students are completing in the option.  **For Survey #2:**   1. When writing my academic essays, I understand I can consider whether to use multiple drafts.(ENGL 406 Students = 3.2; ENGL 495ESM Students = 3.75) 2. When writing my academic essays, I usually consider some sort of prewriting activity (brainstorming, mapping, freewriting, etc.) .(ENGL 406 Students = 3.13; ENGL 495ESM Students = 3.56) 3. When writing my academic essays, I make certain to introduce/explain/clarify my quotations. (ENGL 406 Students = 3.63; ENGL 495ESM Students = 3.81) 4. When revising my academic essays, I look for surface errors as well as problems with structure or logic. (ENGL 406 Students = 3.5; ENGL 495ESM Students = 3.56) 5. When writing my academic essays, I consider audience and rhetorical context with regards to structure, style, purpose. (ENGL 406 Students = 3.37; ENGL 495ESM Students = 3.38) 6. In my writing process, I understand the purpose of the thesis statement.( ENGL 406 Students = 3.87; ENGL 495ESM Students = 3.94) 7. In reading my academic texts, I monitor language use and consider how strategies I discover might apply to my own writing.( ENGL 406 Students = 3.28; ENGL 495ESM Students = 3.50)   The English Subject Matter Committee was pleasantly surprised to see that the students’ responses averaged at least a 3 (“More Often Than Not”) for all of the statements. Indeed, many students answered “Always” to these statements. Scores were particularly high with statement #6 (“In my writing process, I understand the purpose of the thesis statement”).  There was an increase in the average score for each category as well, between the English 406 students and the English 495ESM students, indicating that some improvement in the use of rhetorical and composition theory in the writing process is taking place. The improvement was particularly apparent with statement #1 (“When writing my academic essays, I understand I can consider whether to use multiple drafts”), statement #2 (“When writing my academic essays, I usually consider some sort of prewriting activity”), and statement #7 (“When writing my academic essays, I consider audience and rhetorical context with regards to structure, style, purpose”). |
| **2f. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO:** Think about all the different ways the results were (or could be) used. For example, to recommend changes to course content/topics covered, course sequence, addition/deletion of courses in program, student support services, revisions to program SLO’s, assessment instruments, academic programmatic changes, assessment plan changes, etc. Please provide a clear and detailed description of each.  The positive results of our assessment of the English Subject Matter/FYI/JYI SLO #2 (“Students will apply rhetorical and composition theory”) suggests that the critical elements of rhetorical and composition theory are both cognitively understood by our students and practically applied to their own writing and response to peers. The strong positive assessment of their understanding of the thesis statement is especially noteworthy since this is a critical element of academic discourse. The only area that appears to need further consideration has to do with the nature of peer responses, providing “constructive suggestions.” The committee will review this area and consider suggestions for instructors with the advice and counsel of Composition and Rhetoric professors. |

1. **How do your assessment activities connect with your program’s strategic plan?**

|  |
| --- |
| **LiThe Th**  The Subject Matter Option assessment activities directly aligned with its five year plan for the 2011-2012 Academic Year. In addition to assessment as designated, new rubrics and surveys were designed for the specific assessment of the Subject Matter Option SLO #2. |

1. **Overall, if this year’s program assessment evidence indicates that new resources are needed in order to improve and support student learning, please discuss here.**

|  |
| --- |
| Our assessment indicated that more resources are needed in the following two areas:   1. In response to the cutting of reassigned time for ESM and JYI/FYI Advisors: Reinstatement of previous resources to support adequate and option-specific advisement; because of the technical and complex nature of these options as well as the size and complicated nature of their student populations, advisement support is critical to the functioning of the two options and, hence, to the continued positive performance of students. Although support advisement has been instituted in the College of Humanities Counseling Office, the technical nature of these two options requires continued, active, engaged on-site departmental support. Without adequate advisement and program coordination, student and program performance will be substantially deleteriously affected.  * Without adequate advisement and program supervision, the number of students who struggle with substantial subject matter academic issues will increase, more students “falling through the cracks,” resulting in an increase in negative outcomes. * Advisement does not simply direct students to class choice, but also supports students in evaluating academic strengths and weaknesses, consideration of course choice within this knowledge-based context. Advisement provides for academic counseling in areas that need added support, arranges for workshops to support academic need as determined from individual student performance as well as larger program assessments, provides support for students in the “extra” program components as required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the CCTC. * Because a technical knowledge is needed as to how CCTC requirements have been integrated in specific classes, advisement and coordination also involve articulating these specifics to students, tracking to ensure that faculty teaching these classes are aware of these specifics and of CCTC requirements; without this technically specific knowledge base, advisement to students will be insufficient and the danger of faculty not including these needed subject areas increased, thereby, putting the academic performance of students in these options at risk. * Because the population base of these options is more complicated and diverse than others, technical knowledge of the CCTC requirements is critically necessary as part of advisement and advisement has additional dimensions not required by other options; without support, students from these diverse domains are in danger of not receiving adequate support and, hence, not performing satisfactorily in the subject matter required areas.  1. Continued resources to address the needs of students who are not receiving the full benefit of classroom instruction. While the English Department is clearly accomplishing its SLOs there is a small population of majors who need more individualized attention. |

1. **Other information, assessment or reflective activities not captured above.**

|  |
| --- |
| **NA** |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **6. 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.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **NA** |