UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO | College of Arts and Sciences

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018
REPORT DUE DATE: 10/26/2018

Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), 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.

Note: Dear Colleagues: In an effort to produce a more streamlined and less repetitive assessment report format, we are piloting this modified template for the present annual assessment cycle. We are requesting an assessment report that would not exceed eight pages of text. Supporting materials may be appended. We will be soliciting your feedback on the report as we attempt to make it more user-friendly.

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
6. Ms. Corie Schwabenland, Academic Data & Assessment Specialist- ceschwabenland@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 & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

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. **Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program.**

No.

The mission of the Department of English:

The study of literature and writing has long stood at the center of humanistic education. In that tradition, the department of English educates students in the rich intellectual and creative values embodied in literary works. Because literature by its very nature expresses the complex intellectual, spiritual, moral, social and psychological life of human cultures, its study is integral to the Jesuit mission of valuing "learning as a humanizing, social activity." Our inclusive curriculum fully supports "a diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice.

This mission statement was in place before our APR in 2008-09 and has not been revised, though we are planning to revise it this academic year. This is the statement from the department website:

The Department of English at the University of San Francisco offers both major and minor programs with a literature or writing concentration. Central to these programs is the belief that the close study of literature offers great pleasure, intellectual challenge and versatile training for a variety of careers. Our professors help students develop a greater understanding of the power of language and thought, the rich diversity of literary traditions and the cultural contexts of literary production. Students will mature as readers, thinkers and writers, be able to engage in analysis and discussion and write with acuity and critical self-awareness.

3. **Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.**

   Note: 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.

   No. After our Program Review in 2008, we revised the Program Learning Outcomes (PLO), and went from four goals and seven outcomes to five outcomes. We are about to revise them again, as we revise the curriculum.

   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.

4. **Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?**

   1. We assessed our third PLO: "Students will learn to read texts from multiple perspectives: e.g. learn differentiated readings via various contemporary critical theories."

II.   METHODOLOGY

5. **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 grade for responses to those questions."

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

    We collected portfolios of written papers – three paper per portfolio – from six students in Ana Rojas's Spring 2018 Critical Analysis course. In the papers, the students were asked to read and comment on a text looking through the lens of one or more of the critical theories presented in class. The portfolios were assessed by three full-time faculty in the English Department – Ana Rojas, Samira Abdur-Rahman, and Susan Steinberg. We used a rubric, attached, that placed each portfolio into one of three categories: exemplary, acceptable, or below expectation. We first conducted a norming session to share our expectations of the rubric. We then read the portfolios on our own and shared our assessments, which turned out to be in line with one another's.

III.   RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

6. **What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?**

    This section is for 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, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Level	Percentage of Students
Complete Mastery of the outcome	8.7%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	20.3%
Mastered some parts of the outcome	66%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	5%

All of the students whose work we read appeared to have mastered the learning outcome in most parts. Of the six students, five of them fell into the "acceptable" category, one in the "exemplary" category, and none in the "below expectation" category. We cold see improvement from paper to paper, which shows students can become even more knowledgeable in these critical theories as they're applied to texts throughout the semester. We have no doubt that the course meets the department's learning outcome.

IV.   CLOSING THE LOOP

7. **Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you 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 that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.**

It may be that other courses are not reaching this outcome as well, so it could prove interesting to look at another type of course the next time we are asked to assess this one. Too, we have discovered that this learning outcome does not necessarily apply to the writing courses we offer. We are talking about writing a separate set of learning outcomes for these classes.

8. **What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?**

We were asked to consider making a curricular map, but due to the complicated nature of our current curriculum – we are in the midst of revising the literature curriculum, our

mission statement, and our learning outcomes – it is a bigger challenge to approach this at this time.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

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

Rubric:

a) Below Expectation: Students fail to show familiarity with at least two different literary theories; they do not show understanding of the critical issues in the field.
b) Acceptable: Students can compare and contrast at least two literary theories; they understand the critical issues in the field.
c) Exemplary: Students demonstrate superior ability to analyze texts with precision and rigor via a broad range (more than two) of literary theories; they show understanding of the critical issues and can contribute to debates in the field.

Measurement Tools:

Papers, portfolio, or projects from Critical Analysis courses and other 300-level literature and writing courses