

Course or Program Assessment Summary http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **English**

Program: **English A.A. Degree**

Date: **Updated 3/2014**

Courses in program, or course: _____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **Dennis Baeyen, Matt Fleming, Steve Leone, Jim West, Roland Finger, Tom Patchell, Courtney Brogno, Leslie St. John, Sally Demarest, Cythia Gaw, Tad Walters, June Beck, and all other members of the English Division.**

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes X No _____

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | <p>Student Learning Outcome Statements</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Course</p> | <p>Upon complete of an AA Degree in English, students will be able to . . .</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrate literary knowledge and recognize the value of great works of the human imagination; 2. Think critically about literature, language, and the world; 3. Analyze and interpret literature, using the conventions of academic discourse; 4. Write well-supported arguments about literature and social issues; 5. Employ an effective writing process to complete any written task; 6. Employ ethical and effective rhetorical strategies; and 7. Use correct grammar and effective sentence structure. 8. Demonstrate information fluency. (Added Fall 2012) |
| 2 | <p>Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)</p> | <p>Several methods were used:</p> <p>Course-level assessment data from student surveys was aggregated and mapped to determine results for program-level outcomes.</p> <p>English 201A research papers were assessed and scored on a rubric.</p> <p>Capstone essays by 7 of 10 degree earners were read and scored on a rubric.</p> <p>Fall 2013 Update: In December, a sample of English faculty will submit (anonymously) two research papers—one at an A level, and one at a C level—in order to assess whether or not those papers deems acceptable and superior do, indeed, demonstrate achievement of the student learning outcomes for the course. Faculty intend for this assessment to indicate student achievement as well as clarity of outcomes and standards among faculty in the program. From the sample, examples will be selected that can be shared with faculty for norming purposes.</p> <p>Spring 2014 Update: Indirect assessment will be administered to all courses (except 201A) in the spring.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections,</p> | <p>Hundreds of students were surveyed in Spring 2012 and the data was calculated in weighted averages using a spreadsheet created in the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.</p> <p>The Director of the OIRA randomly selected 60 201A students whose papers were gathered (without student names or</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | scoring procedures, etc.) | <p>instructor names) for direct assessment. Since some students had dropped the course, and a few faculty members failed to make appropriate copies, faculty scored 29 research papers, using a rubric of the course-level outcomes.</p> <p>Faculty scored capstone essays by 7 of 10 degree earners from spring 2012, along with several other essays by students who took at least four upper-level courses in English and transferred to four-year colleges as English majors.</p> <p>Spring 2014 Update: On February 21, 2014, seventeen members of the English faculty submitted two research papers each—one at an A level, and one at a C level—in order to assess whether or not those papers deemed acceptable and superior do, indeed, demonstrate achievement of the student learning outcomes for the course. More than 10 English faculty (and one member of the library faculty) met to score the papers based on a Likert scale, using a rubric related to the 201A course outcomes. For norming purposes, essays were also assigned a grade. All essays were anonymous (no student or instructor names), and each essay had at least two readers. The librarian attended the session in order to getting a better understanding of students’ performance and needs related to information fluency. Results will be calculated and analyzed later in the spring.</p> |
| 4 | Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data) | <p>In the survey data, all program outcome averages were over a 4.0. The lowest average was for program outcome #1 (literary knowledge), but that outcome was self-reported mostly by literature students. Research suggests that upper-level students tend to underrate their abilities while beginning students tend to overrate their abilities. The lower average in PO #1 might reflect this difference. There was not much difference between the outcomes.</p> <p>When assessing the 201A research papers, faculty found that students were weakest in their ability to make sustained and focused arguments that need a strong defense. Students were scored the highest for grammar and style. These results were the inverse of those in the student self-report for English 201A.</p> <p>As might be expected, students earning the English degree earned the highest scores for Program Outcome #1: literary knowledge and appreciation. The lowest areas were PO #7 (grammar) and PO #4 (argument).</p> |
| 5 | Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans | <p>First, it’s clear that students who complete the AA degree in English have achieved the program outcomes. Faculty who read the degree earners’ essays were impressed by the work that the students had done. It is interesting to note, however, that students and instructors often have differing ideas about where strengths and weaknesses lie, particular in the areas of argument and grammar. Students tend to think they are good arguers and bad grammarians, whereas faculty tend to rank students lower in argument. Faculty regularly indicate that students could provide more specific arguments with greater depth that are more focused, more debatable, and better supported by specific evidence.</p> <p>The weighted matrix of course-level data provided a minimal level of insight since the results were aggregated across so many levels of the program and since there was not significant deviation in the results between outcomes. However, student self-report has been informative at the course-level.</p> <p>Faculty involved in direct assessment felt that the dialogue about student work was very meaningful and productive.</p> |
| 6 | Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the process of assessing and mapping courses and the program, faculty realized that “information fluency” was not included in program outcomes and should be included. Also, to support this outcome, the department has changed the Course Outlines of Record for 201B and 201C to include greater emphasis in this area. • Across all levels of the program, faculty need to increase emphasis on the need for essays to be driven by |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>substantive thesis statements that a strong defense based on specific evidence. To that point, the 201A Course Outline of Record is being revised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the literature courses, faculty will emphasize the difference between analysis and summary and will emphasize helping students learn to write specific claims that need to be defended with textual support. Faculty will review course outlines of record to ensure that they are in keeping with the stated program outcomes and these areas for improvement. • Faculty will develop at least two open workshops related to the above topics to be held in the Writing Center. We hope that these workshops will not only increase skill levels but will also build community among students. • In order to improve communication about curricular matters among all faculty (including those who may not attend Division meetings on a regular basis), this CPAS document, along with Student Learning Outcomes and revised Course Outlines will be circulated in hard copy among the faculty, with each individual needing to sign the cover sheet to indicate that he or she has read the attached documents. This will become common practice (as it was in the past) for important curricular or policy issues. |
| 7 | Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results | <p>SLO assessment is a regularly agendized topic at English Division meetings. In addition to these meetings, faculty three times in the past three semester to read, assess, and discuss English 201A research papers and essays written by degree earners in Fall 2012. Each gathering had at least six members of the faculty (for example, the meeting in Fall 2012 had nine members of the faculty, both full-time and part-time, who met for about 3.5 hours on a Friday evening). The results of these gatherings were then discussed at the division meetings. Faculty are also planning to extend dialogue through flex activities and student workshops.</p> |

****Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at <http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa>**