

# 2017 - 2018 Annual Program Assessment Report

The Office of Academic Program Assessment  
California State University, Sacramento

For more information visit our [website](#)  
or [contact us](#) for more help.

**Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down.**

If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

**BA English**

**OR enter program name:**

## Section 1: Report All of the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed

### Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

**Q1.1.**

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) **did you assess?** [Check all that apply]

- 1. **Critical Thinking**
- 2. **Information Literacy**
- 3. **Written Communication**
- 4. **Oral Communication**
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- 19. **Professionalism**
- 20A. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

20B. **Check here if your program has not collected any data for any PLOs.** Please go directly to Q6 (skip Q1.2 to Q5.3.1.)

**Q1.2.**

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

**Q1.2.1.**

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

- 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- 4. N/A
- 5. Other, specify:

**Q1.3.**

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q1.4.**

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

**Q1.4.1.**

**If** the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q1.5.**

Did your program use the **Degree Qualification Profile** ("DQP", see <http://degreeprofile.org>) to develop your PLO(s)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
- 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is
- 4. Don't know

**Q1.6.**

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

**Section 2: Report One Learning Outcome in Detail****Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO****Q2.1.**

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Select PLO

If your PLO is **not listed**, please enter it here:

**Q2.1.1.**

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

**Q2.2.**

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit program standards of performance/expectations** for this PLO? (e.g. "We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Written Communication VALUE rubric.")

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

**Q2.3.**

Please **1) provide and/or attach the rubric(s) AND 2) the standards of performance/expectations** that you have developed for *the selected PLO* here:

No file attached  No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the <b>PLO</b> , the <b>standard (stdrd)</b> of performance, and the <b>rubric</b> that was used to measure the PLO:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: <input style="width: 500px;" type="text"/>

**Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO**

**Q3.1.**

Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

**Q3.1.1.**

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

**Q3.2.**

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

**Q3.2.1.**

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

**(Remember: Save your progress)**

**Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)****Q3.3.**

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

**Q3.3.1.**

Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- 6. E-Portfolios
- 7. Other Portfolios
- 8. Other, specify:

**Q3.3.2.**

Please **1) provide and/or attach the direct measure** (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, **THEN 2) explain here** how it assesses the PLO:

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q3.4.**

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

**Q3.4.1.**

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- 4. Other, specify:

(skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

**Q3.4.2.**

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

**Q3.4.3.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

**Q3.4.4.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

**Q3.5.**

Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

**Q3.5.1.**

Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

**Q3.5.2.**

**If** the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

**Q3.6.**

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

**Q3.6.1.**

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

**Q3.6.2.**

Please enter the number (#) of students that were in the class or program?

**Q3.6.3.**

Please enter the number (#) of samples of student work that you evaluated?

**Q3.6.4.**

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**(Remember: Save your progress)**

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

**Q3.7.**

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- 1. Yes

- 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
- 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

**Q3.7.1.**

Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
- 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
- 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
- 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- 7. Other, specify:

**Q3.7.1.1.**

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q3.7.2.**

**If** surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

**Q3.7.3.**

**If** surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:



**Q3.7.4.**

If surveys were used, please enter the response rate:

**Question 3C: Other Measures**  
(external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)**Q3.8.**

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

**Q3.8.1.**

Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
- 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- 4. Other, specify:

**Q3.8.2.**

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

**Q3.8.3.**


If other measures were used, please specify:


(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

### Q4.1.


Please provide tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1** (see Appendix 12 in our [Feedback Packet Example](#)):


 No file attached

 No file attached

### Q4.2.

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? **If not**, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

 No file attached

 No file attached

### Q4.3.

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- 6. Don't know

## Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

### Q4.4.

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q4.5.**

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)**

**Q5.1.**

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate **making any changes** for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

**Q5.1.1.**

Please describe **what changes** you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO.

**Q5.1.2.**

Do you have a plan to assess the **impact of the changes** that you anticipate making?

- 1. Yes, describe your plan:

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q5.2.**

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment results** collected through your program in the following areas?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Very Much	Quite a Bit	Some	Not at All	N/A

1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Other, specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q5.2.1.**

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

**Q5.3.**

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Standards of Performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Rubrics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Data Collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Use of Assessment Data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q5.3.1.**

Please share with us an example of how you applied **previous feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:


(Remember: **Save your progress**)


**Section 3: Report Other Assessment Activities**

Other Assessment Activities

**Q6.**

If your program/academic unit conducted assessment activities that are **not directly related to the PLOs** for this year (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.), please provide those activities and results here:

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q6.1.**

Please explain how the assessment activities reported in **Q6** will be linked to any of your PLOs and/or PLO assessment in the future and to the mission, vision, and the strategic planning for the program and the university:

Having completed a 5-year assessment cycle of the major, we are currently developing a long-term assessment plan in the Department based on the findings of our last assessment cycle. A plan proposal has been developed by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and submitted to the Executive Committee. The proposal will be presented to the Department for a vote.

**Q7.**

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. **Critical Thinking**
- 2. **Information Literacy**
- 3. **Written Communication**
- 4. **Oral Communication**
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- 19. **Professionalism**
- 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a.

b.


c.


**Q8.**


Please explain how this year's assessment activities help you address recommendations from your department's last program review?


We are currently developing a long-term assessment plan, focusing on content-area knowledge, in the Department based on the findings of our last assessment cycle.

**Q9.** Please attach any additional files here:

 CAC Assessment Plan Proposal 2018.02.23.pdf  
118.55 KB

 No file attached

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q9.1.**

If you have attached **any** files to this form, please list **every** attached file here:

CAC Assessment Plan Proposal 21018.02.23

**Section 4: Background Information about the Program**

Program Information (**Required**)

**Program:**

(If you typed in your program name at the beginning, please skip to **Q11**)

**Q10.**

Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name is already selected or appears above]

BA English

**Q11.**

Report Author(s):

Hellen Lee

**Q11.1.**

Department Chair/Program Director:

David Toise

**Q11.2.**

Assessment Coordinator:

Hellen Lee

**Q12.**

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit (select):

English

**Q13.**

College:

College of Arts & Letters

**Q14.**

What is the total enrollment (#) for Academic Unit during assessment (see Departmental Fact Book):

2016=462

**Q15.**

Program Type:

- 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- 2. Credential

- 3. Master's Degree
- 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- 5. Other, specify:

**Q16.** Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

**Q16.1.** List all the names:

English BA  
English Pre-Credential BA

**Q16.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

**Q17.** Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

**Q17.1.** List all the names:

English MA  
TESOL MA

**Q17.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

**Q18.** Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

**Q18.1.** List all the names:

English Pre-Credential BA

**Q19.** Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

**Q19.1.** List all the names:




When was your <b>Assessment Plan...</b>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.

**Q20.** Developed?

**Q20.2. (Required)**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

 **English Department Assessment Plan and Learning Goals.doc**  
**31 KB**


**Q21.**

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q21.1.**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

 No file attached

**Q22.**

Has your program indicated explicitly in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q23.**

Does your program have a capstone class?

- 1. Yes, specify:

ENGL 198T Senior Seminar

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q23.1.**

Does your program have a capstone project(s)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**(Remember: Save your progress)**

Save When Completed!

ver. 10.31.17

When was your <b>Assessment Plan...</b>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
<input type="button" value="Undo"/>	Before 2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	No Plan	Don't know
<b>Q20.</b> Developed?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Q20.1.</b> Last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Curriculum and Assessment Committee  
Department of English

**5-YEAR ASSESMENT PLAN PROPOSAL:  
ASSESSING CONTENT AREA KNOWLEDGE  
IN THE ENGLISH MAJOR**

February 23, 2018

Jason Geiger  
Julian Heather

Proposal author by:

Ti Macklin  
Hellen Lee, Chair

**I. SUMMARY**

Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CAC) proposes conducting an in-depth assessment of Content Area Knowledge for the next assessment cycle. The proposed assessment cycle would last 5 years:

- Year 1: Learning assessment methods for investigating this area;
- Year 2: Articulating content knowledge expected of students;
- Year 3: Developing an assessment measure of selected content knowledge;
- Year 4: Conducting assessment of selected content knowledge;
- Year 5: Analyzing collected data and report out to Department.
- Note: At each stage, CAC will regularly consult with and provide updates faculty.

Across all four Learning Outcomes, the results of the 5-year Assessment Plan (2012-2017) indicated that an average of 93% of 1000 English Majors perform at or above the Satisfactory level. The samples were taken from 26 different courses—ranging from introductory, large lectures to Senior Seminars—where instructors volunteered to participate in the Department Assessment.

While students performed at least satisfactorily or higher in three areas (Critical Reading at 95%, Critical Writing at 99%, and Scholarly Research at 93%) of the Department's four Learning Goals, there was a significant variation in the fourth area, Content Area Knowledge with 83% of students performing at satisfactory levels.

**II. BACKGROUND**

In Fall 2011, the Department updated and revised the Assessment Plan and Learning Outcomes to a more cohesive program, based on the recommendation of the 2007-2008 Department of English Assessment Committee Report. The 2008-2009 Department of English Assessment Committee chose not to pursue creating a 5-year plan, but strongly recommended that it be acted

upon. The 2011-2012 Department of English Assessment Committee, chaired by Julie Yen, brought forward a proposal that was approved by the Department in the fall. Additionally, based on the campus-wide Graduation Initiative, the assessment plan coordinates and responds to the University's Baccalaureate Learning Goals.

The four Learning Goals for the Department of English are (See Appendix 1):

- *Critical Reading*  
“Students will demonstrate an ability to apply critical reading strategies to a variety of texts, which may include written, oral, or visual works, and to analyze language and texts using appropriate critical, theoretical, rhetorical, and disciplinary methodologies.”
- *Writing*  
“In a process that includes revision based on feedback from peers and instructors, students will produce a variety of written texts that demonstrate an ability to analyze language, ideas, and forms and creatively engage with the writing traditions of our various disciplines.”
- *Content Area Knowledge*  
“Students will demonstrate content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines.”
- *Scholarly Research*  
“Students will demonstrate an ability to perform scholarly research that incorporates analysis of primary and secondary sources using appropriate disciplinary methodologies.”

### III. RATIONALE

After consulting with the Department and reviewing suggestions for the next assessment cycle, CAC has determined that assessing Content Area Knowledge is critical to understand better why this is the weakest area of student performance. While 83% of students performing at Satisfactory levels or higher is indeed impressive, it is an outlier for our Department that needs further investigation to begin to ascertain why this is the case. Questions: Is it a result of the previous assessment tool? Is it a result of the parameters of the open major? How can we assess this area to indicate more clearly why there is a drop in this area?

## IV. PLAN PROPOSAL

CAC proposes that the Department approve a plan to assess Content Area Knowledge expected of English majors over the next 5 years. Indeed, as CAC embarks on the journey of investigation, the details will organically change and adapt, but we have outlined the provisional steps for each stage below to provide a clear vision of what will occur between 2018-2023.

Year 1 (2018-2019):

### **Practice Run: Map curriculum in Single-Subject Program**

- Articulate Single-Subject Learning Outcomes as coordinated with State-mandated outcomes to practice the process in a highly defined major.
- Rationale: to conduct a “practice run” of mapping curriculum to learning outcomes and learn from that process before proceeding to assessing the broader open Major.
- **Goal:** Provide a framework for year two activities by using the state-mandated curriculum and learning outcomes as a model for our investigation

Year 2 (2019-2020):

### **Articulate Content Area Knowledge expected of all majors.**

- Gather information from instructors regarding critical content knowledge (general, not specific) for their courses
- **Goal:** Identify expectations regarding content knowledge through curriculum mapping

Year 3 (2020-2021):

### **Create an assessment measure that assesses selected Content Area Knowledge.**

- Determine selected content knowledge areas to be assessed
- Draft assessment measure
- Seek department approval
- **Goal:** Identify and articulate specific assessment plan

Year 4 (2021-2022):

### **Conduct a programmatic assessment of selected Content Area Knowledge.**

- We are leaving the steps for this year open since they will be determined once we craft the assessment measure in the previous year.

Year 5 (2022-2023):

### **Compare assessment results against the Content Area Knowledge expectations and present it to the department.**

- We are leaving the steps for this year open since it will be determined once we collect the data in the previous year.

## ***English Department Learning Goals (Updated Fall 2011)***

- 1) Students will demonstrate an ability to perform scholarly research that incorporates analysis of primary and secondary sources using appropriate disciplinary methodologies.***
- 2) Students will demonstrate content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines.***
- 3) In a process that includes revision based on feedback from peers and instructors, students will produce a variety of written texts that demonstrate an ability to analyze language, ideas, and forms and creatively engage with the writing traditions of our various disciplines.***
- 4) Students will demonstrate an ability to apply critical reading strategies to a variety of texts, which may include written, oral, or visual works, and to analyze language and texts using appropriate critical, theoretical, rhetorical, and disciplinary methodologies.***

## ***English Department Assessment Plan (Updated Fall 2011)***

### ***Years 1-4***

- The English Department's Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CAC) will assess work from 3-5 courses related to one of the department's four learning outcomes. CAC will examine a different learning outcome in each of the first four years of the plan.***
- Each year, CAC will read a sample of the students' work and will prepare a summary of their findings to be presented to the department.***
- The department will discuss the implications of that year's findings and changes that could be implemented in response to them.***
- The English Department's Student Activities and Outreach Committee (SAOC) will administer a senior survey, an alumni survey, and an entering student survey. Findings from these surveys will be presented the department for discussion along with the results of CAC's annual summaries.***

### ***Year 5***

***The department will (a) synthesize and holistically discuss findings from the four previous years, (b) identify possible curricular revisions that emerge from those findings, (c) determine which revisions will be implemented and develop a plan for doing so, and (d) review the assessment plan and revise it as necessary.***

***Linking our learning goals to BLGs***

***1) Students will demonstrate an ability to perform scholarly research that incorporates analysis of primary and secondary sources using appropriate disciplinary methodologies.***

Could be related to these parts of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals: Competence in the Disciplines; Intellectual and Practical Skills including *inquiry and analysis, critical, philosophical, and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, teamwork and problem solving*; Personal and Social Responsibility including *intercultural knowledge and competence, ethical reasoning and action, foundations and skills for lifelong learning*; Integrative Learning.

***2) Students will demonstrate content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines.***

Could be related to these parts of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals: Competence in the Disciplines.

***3) In a process that includes revision based on feedback from peers and instructors, students will produce a variety of written texts that demonstrate an ability to analyze language, ideas, and forms and creatively engage with the writing traditions of our various disciplines.***

Could be related to these parts of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals: Competence in the Disciplines; Knowledge of Human Cultures; Intellectual and Practical Skills including *inquiry and analysis, critical, philosophical, and creative thinking, written and oral communication teamwork and problem solving*; Personal and Social Responsibility *ethical reasoning and action, foundations and skills for lifelong learning*; Integrative Learning.

***4) Students will demonstrate an ability to apply critical reading strategies to a variety of texts, which may include written, oral, or visual works, and to analyze language and texts using appropriate critical, theoretical, rhetorical, and disciplinary methodologies.***

Could be related to these parts of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals: Competence in the Disciplines; Knowledge of Human Cultures; Intellectual and Practical Skills including *inquiry and analysis, critical, philosophical, and creative thinking, written and oral communication*; Personal and Social Responsibility including *intercultural knowledge and competence, ethical reasoning and action, foundations and skills for lifelong learning*.