

Assurance of Student Learning 2018-2019	
PCAL	English
English Major – Reference 662	

Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.

**Student Learning Outcome 1: Analyze the formal structure of a text under consideration**

Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of sample writing from Capstone course
Instrument 2	Indirect: Exit Interview
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	<b>Met</b>	Not Met
---	------------	---------

**Student Learning Outcome 2: Use textual evidence to build an interpretation**

Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of sample writing from Capstone Course
Instrument 2	Indirect: Exit Interview
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	Met	<b>Not Met</b>
---	-----	----------------

**Student Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate an understanding of close reading**

Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of sample writing from Capstone Course
Instrument 2	Indirect: Exit Interview
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	<b>Met</b>	Not Met
---	------------	---------

**Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)**

Overall, we met or exceeded two of our three SLOs, all of which fall under the larger heading of Close Reading – a skill in which we want all English majors (regardless of individual concentration) to excel. Plans to address the outcome we failed to meet are outlined below. In general we feel that we have had more productive conversations about pedagogy and student learning in this round of assessment, and are especially pleased with the extensive (and growing) faculty development page we have created on Blackboard that addresses the SLOs for the department as a whole.

--

<b>Student Learning Outcome 1</b>			
<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Analyze the formal structure of a text under consideration</b>		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	Direct Measure: Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from all three English Capstone Courses (ENG 416, literature; ENG 414, professional writing, and ENG 413, creative writing.) This learning outcome falls under the department's larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to closely read texts (broadly defined), and each capstone course assigned student writing that addressed this goal.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students at the Capstone level should be able to successfully analyze not only the content of a document but also its formal style and structure, in particular to demonstrate how content and form work together to produce meaning. Student learning across the major will be shown if 70% or more of students average 2.5 or higher from three faculty reviewers, indicating that they have not only "passed" this SLO but shown good or excellent analysis. No student at this stage (senior capstone level) should fail this measurement.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	70% higher than 2.5, none at 1.0	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	68 % scored above 2.5; 0 students failed/scored at 1.
<b>Methods</b>	32 students across the three capstone courses submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. Each sample was made anonymous and evaluated independently by three faculty members on the following scale (additional rubric guidelines attached): 4 = Excellent 3 = Good 2 = Pass 1 = Poor/Fail		

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)		
<p>We came close enough to meeting this target that we feel that we can move on to focus on a different SLO in 2019-20. Evidence of improvement comes in the fact that the average score for all 32 student writing samples was 2.7, up from 2.48 (n=44) in 2017-18. In addition, the resources we gathered on the faculty professional development Blackboard site include several resources that address the pedagogy of formal analysis, which faculty have been applying in courses (especially touchstone courses such as ENG 299 and the three Capstone courses).</p>		
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)		
<p>As indicated above the overall average score has improved. The department continues to have conversations about how formal analysis may differ within our disciplinary concentrations (literature, professional writing, and creative writing), but we are committed to emphasizing this SLO for ALL English majors. The department will devote one meeting in the fall of 2020 to discuss the results of this assessment and how to continue to implement this SLO across the curriculum.</p>		

### Student Learning Outcome 2

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Use textual evidence to build an interpretation</b>		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<b>Direct Measure: Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from all three English Capstone Courses (ENG 416, literature; ENG 414, professional writing, and ENG 413, creative writing.) This learning outcome falls under the department's larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to closely read texts (broadly defined), and each capstone course assigned student writing that addressed this goal.</b>		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students at the Capstone level should be able to successfully analyze not only the content of a document but also its formal style and structure, in particular to demonstrate how content and form work together to produce meaning. Student learning across the major will be shown if 70% or more of students average 2.5 or higher from three faculty reviewers, indicating that they have not only "passed" this SLO but shown good or excellent analysis. No student at this stage (senior capstone level) should fail this measurement.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	70% higher than 2.5, none at 1.0	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>56% scored above 2.5; 2 students failed/scored at 1 (6%)</b>
<b>Methods</b>	32 students across the three capstone courses submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. Each sample was made anonymous and evaluated independently by three faculty members on the following scale (additional rubric guidelines attached): 4 = Excellent 3 = Good 2 = Pass 1 = Poor/Fail		
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.</b>		<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
This was another SLO within the broader category of close reading , and the results were short of our goals. The department will meet (see timeline below) to address this issue and will include it again in our 2019-2020 assessment goals.			
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Spring 2020: Discuss the results of the assessment of this SLO at a department meeting dedicated to assessment. Spring 2020: Using LEAP and our existing, department-specific rubric, identify more clearly elements of student writing that need improvement when it comes to building and interpretation. August 2020: Breakout session at departmental retreat to address how this SLO can be incorporated into the curriculum Fall 2020: Assess current capstone students (ENG 413, ENG 414, ENG 416) on the same SLO and note any significant changes.			

### Student Learning Outcome 3

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Demonstrate an understanding of close reading</b>		
---------------------------------	--	--	--

<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<b>Direct Measure: Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from all three English Capstone Courses (ENG 416, literature; ENG 414, professional writing, and ENG 413, creative writing.) This learning outcome falls under the department's larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to closely read texts (broadly defined), and each capstone course assigned student writing that addressed this goal.</b>		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students at the Capstone level should be able to successfully analyze not only the content of a document but also its formal style and structure, in particular to demonstrate how content and form work together to produce meaning. Student learning across the major will be shown if 70% or more of students average 2.5 or higher from three faculty reviewers, indicating that they have not only "passed" this SLO but shown good or excellent analysis. No student at this stage (senior capstone level) should fail this measurement.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	<b>70% higher than 2.5, none at 1.0</b>	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>79% scored higher than 2.5, 0 scored 1.0.</b>
<b>Methods</b>	32 students across the three capstone courses submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. Each sample was made anonymous and evaluated independently by three faculty members on the following scale (additional rubric guidelines attached): 4 = Excellent 3 = Good 2 = Pass 1 = Poor/Fail		
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.</b>			<b>Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) <b>We met our criteria for student success, and will not include it in our next round of assessment. However, it is closely related to other SLOs, including those we will assess in 2019-20. We will continue to include pedagogical resources on close reading in the departmental faculty development Blackboard page.</b>			
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
N/A			

## Assessment Rubric: Student Learning Outcomes 1-3 – English major and English For Secondary Teaching Major

### COMMON FEATURES OF ESPECIALLY GOOD CLOSE READING IN STUDENT WRITING

- Accuracy reporting source evidence
- Interpreting and contextualizing evidence and reading new questions into it
- Putting sources in conversations
- Finding patterns across sources
- Strong logic and recognizing where assumptions needed evidence and logic for support
- Ability to concisely summarize & paraphrase, in addition to quoting.
- Multiple well-chosen short quotes that supports one claim—multiple sources
- Writer engages with quotations
- Textual material brought in to support an argument (not simply appreciation)
- Writing reflects the reading process: showing how the student has moved from a surface understanding of the text to a deeper understanding
- Creativity in interpretation and argument supported by evidence
- Raising questions about the text(s), not just providing answers

### COMMON FEATURES OF WEAK CLOSE READING

- Relying heavily on generalizations or assumptions
- Lack of specific evidence or full evidence to support claims
- Shoddy logic
- Lack of articulating what textual sources were included and WHY
- Over-reliance on one source or one element of source(s) (“selective” reading rather than close reading)
- Limited or partial understanding of the text(s) or source(s)
- No indication of what is at stake; why interpreting this text is important
- Lack of argument (too descriptive and/or evaluative)
- Repeats well-worn and obvious reading of text(s)