**Major Assessment Report**

Please either download this document and provide a response to each question in the appropriate section or cut and paste all six questions into a word document and provide a response for each one. E-mail your assessment report(s) to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Melissa Jordine ([mjordine@csufresno.edu](mailto:mjordine@csufresno.edu)). Please complete a separate report for each B.A/B.S. and M.A/M.S. program offered by the department.
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| **Department and Degree: B.A. in English**  **Assessment Coordinator: Dr. Chris Henson and Dr. Alison Mandaville**   1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.   SLO 3.1 Students will demonstrate the ability to use library/information resources for research. (Research Competency)  SLO 2.4 Students will apply critical paradigms and make connections between their readings of texts and those produced by peers, professors, scholars, and critics. |
| 1. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be “On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric.”   We assessed student performance using two methods this past year.  Method 1: The outcomes were assessed through a comparison of performance in the first upper division course (ENGL 105) and the senior seminar (ENGL 193T/194T) that students take in both options of our major (English and English Education). Since both these courses are required in each option, comparing performance in them allows us to assess the progress students make in our major. In the senior seminar in particular, the work produced represents skills and knowledge acquired not just in one class but over the whole of a student’s career as an English major. Although the topics of these seminars vary, we generally offer at least two sections each semester. The combined sample produced over an academic year is thus large enough to yield usable data.  Specifically, instructors assess one of the major writing assignments in each class using a rubric with four items.  The second item on the rubric is the one most closely associated with SLO 3.1: “The writing sample demonstrates a degree of research literacy (and understanding of research methods and the ability to apply those methods).” Instructors select one of four options that range from “no research literacy” (1) to “advanced research literacy for someone at this stage of study” (4).  The third item on the rubric is the one most closely associated with SLO 2.4: “The writing sample demonstrates the application of critical theory to textual analysis.” Instructors select one of our options that range from “no application of critical theory to textual analysis” (1) to “advanced application of critical theory to textual analysis” (4).  The instructors of these courses assessed each outcome in conjunction with the normal grading process. As students complete their degree programs, we might hope that all students’ papers would score a 3. A more realistic expectation, however, would be a mean of 2.5, since students (especially in the Fall semester) are taking this class while they complete their upper division work.  Method 2: In addition, our English Education Option holds portfolio interviews each semester, as mandated by the California Department of Education. The students who are entering into the credential program must prepare an e-portfolio and engage in an interview with two faculty members to demonstrate what the state calls “Subject Matter Competency.” We also use data from this process to assess our program. The two faculty reviewers use a rubric of learning outcomes in the four areas of subject matter competency as required by the state of California (see attachment “English Education Portfolio Rubric”) and roughly aligned with English department SOAPs. One of the domains we assess is closely aligned with our SLO 2.4, thus we are including data from the portfolio interviews in our report. Domain 1: Reading Literature and Informational Texts Breadth of knowledge in literature, literary analysis and criticism, as well as informational text analysis. Literary analysis of the relationship between form and content. The curriculum should embrace representative selections from multiple literary traditions and major works from diverse cultures. Candidates must know and apply effective reading strategies and compose thoughtful, well-crafted responses to literary and informational texts.  In this area of competency, students are evaluated as: Not Yet Competent, Partly Competent, Competent, Sophisticated. In this program, our expectation is that at least 80% will score as competent in each area. |
| 1. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).   Method One: The following data is drawn from review of 28 students, 7 who were enrolled in ENGL 105 and 21 from ENGL 193T.  The results from our assessment of item 2 on our rubric (SLO 3.1) were as follows:  ENGL 105: 2.286  ENGL 193T: 2.905  The results from our assessment of item 3 on our rubric (SLO 2.4) were:  ENGL 105: 2.0  ENGL 193T: 3.190  These results indicate that our program does foster student growth in both SLOs, though clearly the results for SLO 2.4 are stronger than for SLO 3.1. Moreover, the grand mean on all four items moved from 2.143 to 3.167. We feel that these results demonstrate the strengths of our program in moving students towards mastery of both research literacy and literary analysis and interpretation. This method evaluates students from both of our Options (English and English Education) illustrating that our program benefits both groups of students when taken as a whole.  Method 2: The following data is drawn from review of work submitted by 14 graduating students in culminating subject matter portfolios followed by interviews with two English faculty, Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. Overall, most students achieved competency or sophistication in all four areas, though there were some differences. No students were deemed “Not yet competent” in any area, though 1-3 were only partly competent in each area. 78% of students were deemed competent or sophisticated in:   * Composition and Rhetoric * Language, Linguistics and Literacy   As mandated by the state, we also assess and therefore have data in two more areas which were not part of our assessment plan for this year, but which are still related to our SLOs.  92% of students were deemed competent or sophisticated in:   * Communications: Speech, Media and Creative Performance   85% of students were deemed competent or sophisticated in:   * Literature and Informational Texts -- Reading and Analysis (written and oral)     This data helped us see that in comparison with other aspects of our program, we are weakest in the area of student writing. As a result, we have decided to shift our Assessment focus for the coming year to focus on student writing as will be discussed in section 3. |
| 1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.   In reviewing these results, our new chair, Dr. Kathleen Godfrey, realized that we have been assessing the same outcomes using the same methods for the last few years. Our department has made changes based on these results. We are currently in the process of changing our major, adding several lower division courses that will address writing skills. Over the years, we have felt that the department’s focus on literature has not reflected the evolution of the field of English studies, thus in our proposed new major, students will have more in depth study of genre, writing, and argumentation.  Moreover, in our English Education Option, Our recent revisions of the major option, including a new course in Rhetoric and Composition Studies (ENGL 132S), are designed to address challenges some students seem to be having in the two areas of Composition and Rhetoric and Language/Linguistics/Literacy. These changes just went online this fall – we hope to see some improvement in these two areas in coming years. In addition, we are currently planning for revision of the English undergraduate core, with added options that will include several new courses. These new option courses, particularly in the proposed new options of Creative Writing and Rhetoric and Composition, will also feed into and better support the related English Education areas of emphasis.  We also hope to move more students to the level of “sophisticated” in all four areas, through ongoing work on our department courses in these areas as well as collaboration with our partner departments offering courses for our core (Drama, Linguistics, Communications). Even with these efforts, we expect there will continue to be some variation across areas, with students rising to the level of sophisticated often corresponding to the number choosing related areas of emphasis in the option. The added coursework students take in these extended areas will tend to give them greater competency in the related area of competency. For example, while the core coursework supporting student learning in the area of textual analysis is clearly bringing nearly all students to competency, those choosing extended studies in literature are more likely to have taken additional coursework that brings them to the level of sophistication in that area.  Nevertheless, we feel that we’ve learned what we needed to using these methods and that it is time to target new SLOs using new methods. We will discuss our assessment plans in section 4. |
| 1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2018-2019 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.   On our SOAP timeline, the area designated to be our focus this year is creative writing, however, students in our B.A. in English are not required to take creative writing classes. Moreover, we recently changed our English Education major so that now our students take only one creative writing class rather than the two they took previously. Therefore, it doesn’t make sense for us to focus on creative writing this year.  Because some of our faculty have registered concern about the writing abilities of our incoming students, we would like to assess how our program influences the writing process and abilities of our students. In a recent department meeting, we discussed how to best assess student learning in relation to the following SLOs:  SLO 1.1 Students will be able to create, assesses, and adjust a plan for writing, systematically gathering, generating and evaluating information and writing in the light of rhetorical and audience considerations.  SLO 1.2 Students will develop and execute workable drafting plans.  SLO 1.3 Employ revision and editing strategies.  Our department decided to use two measures to assess these areas. First, we will ask students to self assess their writing process. Since we understand that self-reporting is not the most accurate measure, we have also devised a plan to evaluate our students’ writing process by having students produce reflective writing describing their writing process for a specific assignment which faculty assess using a rubric which focuses on specific approaches to writing. Our faculty in Rhetoric and Writing Studies will be helping us develop both of these forms of assessment. |
| 1. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”   Our last report stated that we had yet to determine our assessment. I’m encouraged by our recent department meeting during which we discussed how we would approach assessment over the coming year. The discussion was thoughtful and engaged, leading me to believe that our department is capable of assessing in a deeper way.  **Additional Guidelines:** If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions. |