



Program Assessment Report (PAR)

English (ENG) Baccalaureate Degree

REPORT PREPARED by: McGinley, S.F.

ACADEMIC YEAR COVERED BY THIS REPORT: [AcademicYear]

I. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

All students taking a B. A. in English should be informed readers, able to formulate readings of texts based on their knowledge of literary historical contexts and of basic critical strategies able to develop a thesis and sustain a coherent written argument about literature using secondary sources

II. PROCEDURES USED FOR ASSESSMENT

A. Direct Assessment

The same method was used for all three outcomes. Final papers were collected from the core English major course, ENG 3060, in Fall 2020, and from two representative courses in the major, ENG 4300 in Spring 2019 and ENG 4440 in Fall 2020. Because assessment was not performed last year, permission was obtained to combine the two cycles; thus, two outcomes are both assessed over two years. ENG 3060 had 31 students and 10 papers were provided for assessment by the instructor. All 10 were included. ENG 4300 had 22 students and 18 papers were provided for assessment by the instructor. Only 11 were randomly selected to be included so as not to outweigh the other two classes. ENG 4440 had 12 students and 5 papers were provided for assessment by the instructor. All 5 were included. Sixty-five students from three courses were represented by 26 papers.

B. Scoring of Student Work

Each learning outcome was assessed by a rubric developed by the department undergraduate committee using AACU models provided by Carl Brun. One outcome was split into two rubrics for more accurate measurement. The five members of the undergraduate committee performed the evaluation. Using Aqua Taskstream the

papers were randomly assigned to readers. Each paper was read and scored twice.

C. Indirect Assessment

Students complete course evaluations at the end of the semester. The contents are reviewed by the instructor and department chair.

III. ASSESSMENT RESULTS/INFORMATION:

Outcome 1 Graduates will be informed readers, able to formulate readings of texts based on their knowledge of literary historical contexts and of basic critical strategies. Scale 4 = exemplary, 3 = good, 2 = adequate, 1 = poor, and 0 = no evidence. Rubric attached to assessment report. The average score for this criterion was 2.92. The lowest score was 2 and the highest 4. The median score was a 3. Outcome 2 a Graduates will be able to develop a thesis and sustain a coherent written argument about literature using secondary sources. Scale 4 = exemplary, 3 = good, 2 = adequate, 1 = poor, and 0 = no evidence. Rubric attached to assessment report. The average score for this criterion was 2.81. The lowest score was 1.5 and the highest 4. The median score was a 3. Outcome 2 b Graduates will be able to develop a thesis and sustain a coherent written argument about literature using secondary sources. Scale 4 = exemplary, 3 = good, 2 = adequate, 1 = poor, and 0 = no evidence. Rubric attached to assessment report. The average score for this criterion was 2.77. The lowest score was 1.5 and the highest 4. The median score was a 3.

For all three outcomes, the median score was 3 -- good. The average in all cases was just below good. The lowest score was 1.5 and the highest 4.

A median score of 3 in all outcomes indicates that, overall, students are meeting these outcomes successfully. All three averages were just below a score of good. The difference between the highest average score (2.92) and the lowest (2.77) is minor. Outcome one had the strongest performance with highest average (2.92) and highest low score (2). Students are able to be informed readers, able to formulate readings of texts based on their knowledge of literary historical contexts and of basic critical strategies. Outcome 2 had a larger range of scores (1.5 – 4) and a slightly weaker average. This outcome was evaluated across 2 rubrics. Students performed strongly in their ability to develop a thesis and sustain a coherent written argument (2a) with an average score of 2.81. The weakest scoring was in outcome 2b – use of secondary sources – where the average score was 2.77.

IV. ACTIONS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

Results were not available to be shared at the final department meeting of the year, but will be shared at the first meeting of 21-22. It should be noted that two sets of the assessed course materials were collected during the pandemic, and may thus be atypical. The committee suggests a stronger emphasis on the use of secondary materials in all courses, and suggests it as a topic of departmental discussion in the Fall. The committee also suggests that we initiate exit interviews for graduating students, and, again, suggests it as a topic of departmental discussion in the Fall.

V. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Additional documentation, when provided, is stored in the internal Academic Program Assessment of Student Learning SharePoint site.