English

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019
REPORT DUE DATE: 11/01/2019

- Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), as well as graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated in separate sections.
- Undergraduate, graduate and certificate programs must submit separate reports
- It is recommended that each assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices.
- A curricular map should be should be submitted along with each assessment report (we suggest that the curricular map should be informed by recent assessment outcomes).

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);

FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I.   LOGISTICS

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Susan Steinberg, Chair

ssteinberg@usfca.edu

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) a Major and Minor aggregated report (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

(C) Submitting a Major and Minor aggregated report

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Have there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

No, we're currently working on major curricular changes.

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting <u>an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor programs</u>

- **Mission Statement (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

No.

- **Mission Statement (Minor):**

No.

2. <u>Were</u> any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting <u>an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.</u>

Note: It is expected that PLOs will vary in level of mastery between different programs in the same discipline (e. g., a major and minor in the same subject area). Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

- **PLOs (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

1. Students will demonstrate in writing and speech the ability to develop clear and coherent interpretive essays and original creative writing; they can articulate in writing and discussion/workshop their responses to literary and/or peer texts.

2. Students will demonstrate knowledge of and sensitivity to pluralism in response to texts that focus on diversity and social justice issues, i.e. writings that underscore the complexity of race, ethnicity, gender, class and sexual orientation.

3. Students will learn to read texts from multiple perspectives: e.g. learn differentiated readings via various contemporary critical theories.

4. Students will identify characteristics of different literary genres: novel, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama.

5. Students will identify differences between various historical periods and literary movements.

- **PLOs (Minor):**

1. Students will demonstrate in writing and speech the ability to develop clear and coherent interpretive essays and original creative writing; they can articulate in writing and discussion/workshop their responses to literary and/or peer texts.

2. Students will demonstrate knowledge of and sensitivity to pluralism in response to texts that focus on diversity and social justice issues, i.e. writings that underscore the complexity of race, ethnicity, gender, class and sexual orientation.

3. Students will learn to read texts from multiple perspectives: e.g. learn differentiated readings via various contemporary critical theories.

4. Students will identify characteristics of different literary genres: novel, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama.

5. Students will identify differences between various historical periods and literary movements.

3. **State the particular program learning outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2018-2019. What rubric did you use?**

The Role of Rubrics
The rubric is the single most important thing you need for assessment, and putting time and thinking into designing a good rubric is going to make the entire process a lot easier, faster, and meaningful. Your rubric should break down your chosen PLO into the smallest measurable components, so that the assessment of each piece of work becomes linear and easy, and the calibration among different faculty assessing more objective. If you still have to debate a while whether that one line of the rubric has been fulfilled or not, chances are your rubric item is still an aggregate and can be broken down further into smaller components. Once you have made a detailed rubric, then not only the "grading" work will be faster and straightforward, but at the end of it you will have data that is significantly more meaningful. For example, some parts of the PLO may be in tiptop shape while others may need to be massaged or tweaked, with more attention given to that particular item in class. Conversely, your data may show you that the PLO itself is not what you thought it should be—it may be that it duplicates something other PLOs include or that a crucial part of what you teach is getting lost in the cracks between your PLOs. So do make sure that the rubric is as detailed and thorough as you possibly can manage (a short rubric in fact makes the grading longer, as counterintuitive as that seems).

- **PLO(s) being assessed (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

PLO #4 "Students will identify characteristics of different literary genres: novel, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama."

Rubric:

a) Below Expectations: More often than not, student does not correctly identify basic characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama.

b) Acceptable: More often than not, student correctly identifies basic characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama.

c) Exemplary: Student demonstrates consistent, comprehensive knowledge of characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama

- **PLO(s) being assessed (Minor):**

PLO #4 "Students will identify characteristics of different literary genres: novel, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama."

Rubric:

a) Below Expectations: More often than not, student does not correctly identify basic characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama.

b) Acceptable: More often than not, student correctly identifies basic characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama.

c) Exemplary: Student demonstrates consistent, comprehensive knowledge of characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama

III.   METHODOLOGY

Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, "the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a score for responses to those questions."

Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use "direct methods," which consist of a <u>direct evaluation of a student work product</u>. "Indirect methods" like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional complements to a direct method.

<u>For any program with fewer than 10 students</u>: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that <u>every 3 years</u>, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

<u>Important</u>: *Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.*

- ● **Methodology used (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

Three faculty members served on the assessment committee.

We used the final exam for the Spring 2019 semester of ENGL 192, the introductory course to the major, which is required of all Majors and Minors. As the culminating assignment for the semester, it seemed best suited to the PLO we were evaluating, since the course introduces students to the different literary genres.

There were 19 students enrolled in the course, 15 of them Majors and 4 of them Minors.

We used 3 exams, randomly selected from among the Majors, for our Norming before we began our assessment.

We assessed 10 exams total, or half the class.

We randomly selected 6 exams from the Major students to assess. These exams did not include the 3 used for norming -- they were 6 additional exams.

- ● **Methodology used (Minor):**

Same as above.

Since there were only 4 Minors, all of them were included in our assessment in order to have a good sample size.

IV.   RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section asks you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

a.   how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,

b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and

c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this question, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

	age of Students
te Mastery of the outcome	
d the outcome in most parts	
d some parts of the outcome	
master the outcome at the level intended	

Results (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

a.

Student #1: Acceptable (*unanimous*)

Student #3: Exemplary (*2 Exemplary; 1 Acceptable*)

Student #5: Acceptable (*unanimous*)

Student #7: Acceptable (*unanimous*)

Student #8: Below Expectations (*2 Below Expectations; 1 Acceptable*)

Student #10: Acceptable (*unanimous*)

83% (5 out of 6) of the Major students mastered the outcome at the level intended.

1.6% (1 out of 6) of the Major students did not fully master the outcome at the level intended.

b.

c. The assignment chosen for assessment turned out to be an imperfect mechanism for assessing the outcome for students. The PLO asks students to identify characteristics of different literary genres, and specifies five genres: novel, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama. While the course ENGL 192 introduces students to these various genres, the final exam focused largely on poetry and drama; it included the definition of literary terms that would apply equally to the other genres as well (novel, short fiction, nonfiction). This assignment allowed us to assess how well students identified the characteristics of poetry and drama specifically.

Results (Minor):

a.

Student #2: Acceptable (*2 Acceptable; 1 Exemplary*)

Student #4: Acceptable (*unanimous*)

Student #6: Acceptable (*2 Acceptable; 1 Exemplary*)

Student #9: Exemplary (*unanimous*)

100% (4 out of 4) of the Minor students mastered the outcome at the level intended.

25% (1 out of 4) of the Minor students demonstrated complete mastery of the outcome.

b.

c. Same as above.

V.   CLOSING THE LOOP: ACTION PLAN BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS

1. Based on your analysis in Section 4, what are the next steps that you are planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require any changes to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

- **Closing the Loop (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

Given that the assignment chosen only allowed us to assess the students' mastery of the characteristics of 2 out of 5 genres, we may need to reconsider the assignments used to assess this outcome in the future. We might also need to break the PLO down into smaller components and assess the students' mastery of the characteristics of each genre separately.

- **Closing the Loop (Minor):**

Same as above.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2017-2018, submitted in October 2018)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in the more recent assessment discussed in this report?

- **Suggestions (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

  We were, then, in the process of revising our PLOs, as well as our entire literature curriculum, and we are still working on this. We've had several departmental retreats to discuss the changes, and we are making great progress, though we've been set back as we are currently absorbing a new track into the major: comparative literature. At this point, we are in the messiest part of the process, trying to figure out everything at once, in hopes that we can submit the new curriculum this academic year – and implement the changes next year. We appreciate your understanding on this can affect our assessment.

- **Suggestions (Minor):**

It was suggested that we the English minor be considered a single program with two tracks, rather than as two distinct minors and that we submit the report to reflect this.

VI. BIG PICTURE

What have you learned about your program from successive rounds of assessment? Is a picture of the whole program starting to emerge? For example, what areas of strength have emerged? What opportunities of improvement have you identified?

- **Big Picture (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

  What we learned last year has been further confirmed: we need to change our PLOs and we're getting there.

- **Big Picture (Minor):**

VII. Feedback to your Assessment Team

What suggestions do you have for your assessment team (the Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development and the Associate Dean for Academic Effectiveness)? What can we do to improve the process?

If a department is undergoing huge curricular changes, as we are, it needs time to make the changes. Assessment is not necessarily, at this particular point, helping us through the process; in my opinion, it's only creating work that keeps the department from doing the work it needs to do based on last year's (and the previous year's) discussions. I recommend that departments be given the time they need to make curricular and PLO changes, within reason, and come back to this assessment process after the changes have been made. We're learning that restructuring a literature program is incredibly challenging and time-consuming – with so many administrative steps – and we really need to focus on creating courses, changes course numbering, changing course names, reconsidering the name of the department, scheduling – many many components to this project. We said last year that our PLOs needed to be changed, and since then we've taken on comparative literature – we can't change the PLOs until we figure out how this new track fits into the department, among other things. I don't see how assessing the old PLOs is helpful; what's helpful is meeting as a department and working on them together. I'm happy to discuss this further.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

Rubric:

a) Below Expectations: More often than not, student does not correctly identify basic characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama.

b) Acceptable: More often than not, student correctly identifies basic characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama.

c) Exemplary: Student demonstrates consistent, comprehensive knowledge of characteristics of literary genres, including novels, short fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama