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NOTE: Report uses data from section 03 of ENGL 198T in both Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters.

Catalogue Course Description: Features specialized topics taught by a variety of instructors depending upon the semester. Topics can include subject matter from literature, linguistics, English education, creative writing, composition/rhetoric, and film. Tend to the production of a significant research paper, a paper which will emphasize the student's ability to: Analyze and interpret multiple texts; Integrate primary and secondary sources; Construct a sustained, coherent, and rhetorically sophisticated piece of writing.

1. What goals or learning objectives/outcomes were assessed in the AY ending June 30 2010?

1) Students will analyze and interpret multiple texts.
2) Students will integrate primary and secondary sources.
3) Students will construct a sustained, coherent, and rhetorically sophisticated piece of writing.
4) Students will compile a presentation portfolio showcasing and reflecting on the development of their scholarship during their college career.

2. How did you assess these learning outcomes?
   a. Describe the measures you used and the information gathered? (Description, date administered, results)
   b. As a result of these assessments what did you learn about the program’s success in helping its students achieve these learning outcomes?
   c. In what areas are students doing well and achieving expectations?
   d. What areas are seen as needing improvement within your program?

1) Students will analyze and interpret multiple texts.
   a. Regular classroom and SacCT discussions (see Data Table A), with substantial participation grades. Regular SacCT posts were required throughout both semesters.
   b. The program has taught students how to read closely for layered meanings and how to engage in and conduct constructive, respectful debate about their interpretations with their peers and their instructor.
   c. Students are adept readers and respectful and open-minded discussion participants. They are curious and open to challenge. They are competent at oral and written expression of those ideas.
d. However, students clearly prefer detailed guidelines from the professor and are uncomfortable expressing an opinion or idea when specific parameters have not been defined. We would like our students to exhibit more confidence in themselves and their ideas. Students also need to improve their time management skills, especially related to online posting assignments on deadline.

2) Students will integrate primary and secondary sources.

3) Students will construct a sustained, coherent, and rhetorically sophisticated piece of writing.

   a. Annotated Bibliography and Seminar Paper (see Data Tables B and C)
   b. The program has taught students the basics of scholarly research. They have learned to use library resources (hard copy and digital), and they are familiar and generally competent with MLA formatting style.
   c. Students find secondary sources independently and competently. They understand the general expectations and formatting of an academic research paper, and they are able to summarize, paraphrase, and quote from secondary sources. Students are able to establish a topic and eventually a thesis, and they are able to develop and focus their ideas with that thesis in mind.
   d. Students have generally not yet gained the confidence to widen their searches beyond those sources which directly correspond to their own topics. Some students are still developing their ability to gracefully incorporate and contextualize secondary sources into their own papers. While students are able to establish topics and develop theses, they tend to be hesitant and uncertain in the beginning stages. Topics and theses come together best through peer-peer and student-professor consultations and workshops; students are generally not yet confident working independently.

4) Students will compile a presentation portfolio showcasing and reflecting on the development of their scholarship during their college career.

   NOTE: this outcome was assessed by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee as a whole; other outcomes were assessed by Susan Fanetti, instructor of ENGL 198T.03, AY 2010-2011.

   a. Capstone Portfolio (see Data Table D)

   The Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CAC) reviewed the (anonymous) cover letters of the portfolios for the Fall 2010 198T. Section 3 course[43] and referred to the complete portfolios as necessary. The committee broke into teams; each team came to a consensus in its assessment of the portfolios. Based on the cover letters—the intent of which was for students to reflect on the selected pieces and make a claim
about the story those pieces helped to tell about the student’s college writing—each team scored the portfolios on a scale from 4-1 (4 being highest).

b. The program has taught students the importance of revision and conventional correctness.
c. Students are able to review their written product and select pieces that are emblematic of their strengths and challenges as writers and readers. Students are able to articulate their strengths and weaknesses and the ways in which they have worked to improve on their weaknesses.
d. Students are less competent at thinking holistically about their writing. They were asked to select pieces of their college writing that were emblematic of—and helped them tell the story of—their academic experience. Though they were generally adept at understanding what they did “wrong” and explaining how and why they understood that, they were less successful at thinking about how these elements made up a “big picture.”

3. As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?

As a result of faculty reflection on these results, we have decided that we need to develop a more holistic approach to assessment, one that will define specific values that apply across the many facets of our discipline and that will encourage our majors to be likewise reflective and confident in their values and ideas.

4. Did your department engage in any other assessment activities such as the development of rubrics, course alignment?

The department focused on these two sections of ENGL 198T for our AY 2010-2011 assessment. We have however, recently revised our major, and we recognize our new design as an optimal opportunity for focusing and aligning our shared learning outcomes.

5. What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?

In AY 2011-2012, we will devote our assessment attention to defining our departmental assessment priorities and establishing a coherent assessment strategies thereupon. Because our department is programmatically diverse, we expect that process to comprise our assessment activities for the academic year.

***see next page for data tables***
ENGL 198T.03, FALL 2010-SPRING 2011

DATA TABLE A
Class and SacCT Participation Score (Percentage) Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMESTER</th>
<th>IN-CLASS</th>
<th>SAC CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>140.4/150 (93.6%)</td>
<td>299.8/350 (85.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>42.9/50 (85.8%)</td>
<td>319.3/400 (79.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA TABLE B
Annotated Bibliography Score Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMESTER</th>
<th>ANNOTATED BIBLIO.</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>41.3/50 (82.6%)</td>
<td>0 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>45.7/50 (91.4%)</td>
<td>35 - 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA TABLE C
Seminar Paper Score Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMESTER</th>
<th>SEMINAR PAPER</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>211.3/250 (84.5%)</td>
<td>0 - 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>255.6/300 (85.2%)</td>
<td>234 - 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA TABLE D
Note: data was only collected in Fall 2010; see below for explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT TEAM</th>
<th>SCORE 4 (high)</th>
<th>SCORE 3 (mid-high)</th>
<th>SCORE 2 (mid-low)</th>
<th>SCORE 1</th>
<th>NOT SUBMITTED FOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEAM 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAC collected and reviewed the portfolios from the Spring 2011 section in the same manner in which the Fall 2010 portfolios had been collected, but in our preliminary discussions about the portfolios we came to understand that what the portfolios told us most of all was that we as a department need to more clearly define a coherent, repeatable assessment strategy. Therefore, we did not score the spring portfolios as we had the fall portfolios.