



Program Assessment Report due

Program or Certificate: AA English
Academic Year Assessed: 2015-2016
Program Lead Faculty: Caroline Mains
Department Chair: Vicente Guillot

Please NOTE:

1. Program Learning Outcome #1 is "Demonstrate knowledge of individual and collaborative research processes" and would not be assessable by the artifact selected by the department. Therefore, this report begins with Program Learning Outcome #2.
2. Because Program Learning Outcome #2 addresses multiple skills, that outcome was assessed using more than one criterion. For a more detailed explanation, see the evaluation of the previous action plan described in the 2014-2015 Program Assessment Report.
3. Because components of Program Learning Outcome #s 2 and 3 overlap, those outcomes were assessed using the same criterion. For a more detailed explanation, see the evaluation of the previous action plan described in the 2014-2015 Program Assessment Report.
4. The sections that discuss the new action plan and evaluate the previous action plan are identical for each Program Learning Outcome.

Program Learning Outcome #2	<p>Outcome #2: Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.</p> <p>Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will construct a clear, concise thesis.</p>
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	<p>Writing samples from ENGL 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching ENGL 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.



Program Assessment Report due

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 30 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 60.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 30 papers/60 ratings, the expectation is that 42 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	<p>75% (45/60 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient</p>
Target Met or Not Met	Target Exceeded
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>After reviewing the results of the 2015-2016 Program Assessment, the department decided on the following action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Given that the target of 70% proficiency was achieved, the department will focus on maintaining the positive trend.• To ensure the most accurate and comprehensive assessment of the Program, the department will expand the sampling population in the 2016-2017 assessment to include student artifacts from adjunct faculty sections.



Program Assessment Report due

	<p>Because the 2014-2015 assessment results represented a marked departure from years prior, faculty believe the increased sample size will support an on-going effort to evaluate trends in outcome proficiencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As noted in the evaluation of the previous action plan, in Spring 2017 two faculty are piloting an enhanced version of the department text, which includes technology supplements that target two of the traditionally low-performing outcomes, Outcome #s 4 and 5. Student proficiency levels in the pilot sections will be compared to those in non-pilot sections to determine the effectiveness of the intervention.• To promote an equitable division of labor, the department will rotate the task of assessment yearly. The previous two assessments (2013-2014 and 2014-2015) had been conducted by the same faculty assessors; by rotating the task, all full-time faculty will develop an awareness of student proficiencies outside their own sections.• The last time a faculty member attended a discipline-specific conference was in 2008; therefore, the department believes it should explore options for sending a member yearly to either the Conference on College Composition and Communication or the Modern Language Association Conference.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<p>Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2014-2015 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly. The results for 2014-2015 had shown a 10-20% decrease in proficiency levels.• The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.• Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark. <p>What challenges emerged to the action plan?</p>



Program Assessment Report due

	<p>No challenges emerged; the implementation of the action plan was carried out in its entirety.</p> <p>To what extent was the action plan successful?</p> <p>The action plan was successful; the 2015-2016 assessment results for all five Program Outcomes were above the 70% proficiency benchmark. In addition, the data seems to indicate that the dramatically lower proficiency scores in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment were anomalies, a theory posited by faculty in the previous action plan.</p> <p>Further, to address the third component of the 2014-15 action plan, the department initiated a careful review of the curriculum of ENGL 1302, the course selected for Program Assessment as it is the foundational course for English majors. This project is extensive and ongoing; the curriculum committee members are aware of the proficiency trends in the Program Assessment.</p> <p>In addition, since the last assessment, the department has worked closely with the textbook publisher to explore curriculum supplements to address the Program Learning Outcomes that decreased most significantly in proficiency levels during the 2014-2015 Program Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outcome #4: Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.• Outcome #5: Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.) <p>After meeting with the textbook representative during Fall 2016, the department determined that two faculty members will participate in a spring pilot of an alternate version of the department text that includes significant technology-enhancements that can be integrated into Canvas. Importantly, these enhancements will provide students with online practice and assessment of their use of correct grammar, punctuation, and mechanics (Program Learning Outcome #4) and MLA citation skills (Program Learning Outcome #5).</p>
<p>Program Learning Outcome #2</p>	<p>Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.</p>



Program Assessment Report due

	<p>Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will demonstrate an effective organizational strategy to support the thesis.</p>
<p>Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome</p>	<p>ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351</p>
<p>Assessment Method</p>	<p>Writing samples from ENGL 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching ENGL 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 30 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 60.
<p>Targets for Achievement</p>	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 30 papers/60 ratings, the expectation is that 42 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>



Program Assessment Report due

Results	83% (50/60 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient
Target Met or Not Met	Target Exceeded
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>After reviewing the results of the 2015-2016 Program Assessment, the department decided on the following action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Given that the target of 70% proficiency was achieved, the department will focus on maintaining the positive trend.• To ensure the most accurate and comprehensive assessment of the Program, the department will expand the sampling population in the 2016-2017 assessment to include student artifacts from adjunct faculty sections. Because the 2014-2015 assessment results represented a marked departure from years prior, faculty believe the increased sample size will support an on-going effort to evaluate trends in outcome proficiencies.• As noted in the evaluation of the previous action plan, in Spring 2017 two faculty are piloting an enhanced version of the department text, which includes technology supplements that target two of the traditionally low-performing outcomes, Outcome #s 4 and 5. Student proficiency levels in the pilot sections will be compared to those in non-pilot sections to determine the effectiveness of the intervention.• To promote an equitable division of labor, the department will rotate the task of assessment yearly. The previous two assessments (2013-2014 and 2014-2015) had been conducted by the same faculty assessors; by rotating the task, all full-time faculty will develop an awareness of student proficiencies outside their own sections.• The last time a faculty member attended a discipline-specific conference was in 2008; therefore, the department believes it should explore options for sending a member yearly to either the Conference on College Composition and Communication or the Modern Language Association Conference.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan.



Program Assessment Report due

The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2014-2015 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components:

- Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly. The results for 2014-2015 had shown a 10-20% decrease in proficiency levels.
- The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.
- Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark.

What challenges emerged to the action plan?

No challenges emerged; the implementation of the action plan was carried out in its entirety.

To what extent was the action plan successful?

The action plan was successful; the 2015-2016 assessment results for all five Program Outcomes were above the 70% proficiency benchmark. In addition, the data seems to indicate that the dramatically lower proficiency scores in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment were anomalies, a theory posited by faculty in the previous action plan.

Further, to address the third component of the 2014-15 action plan, the department initiated a careful review of the curriculum of ENGL 1302, the course selected for Program Assessment as it is the foundational course for English majors. This project is extensive and ongoing; the curriculum committee members are aware of the proficiency trends in the Program Assessment.

In addition, since the last assessment, the department has worked closely with the textbook publisher to explore curriculum supplements to address the Program Learning Outcomes that decreased most significantly in proficiency levels during the 2014-2015 Program Assessment:



Program Assessment Report due

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outcome #4: Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.• Outcome #5: Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.) <p>After meeting with the textbook representative during Fall 2016, the department determined that two faculty members will participate in a spring pilot of an alternate version of the department text that includes significant technology-enhancements that can be integrated into Canvas. Importantly, these enhancements will provide students with online practice and assessment of their use of correct grammar, punctuation, and mechanics (Program Learning Outcome #4) and MLA citation skills (Program Learning Outcome #5).</p>
Program Learning Outcomes #2 and #3	<p>Outcome #2: Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.</p> <p>Outcome #3: Analyze, interpret, and evaluate a variety of texts for the ethical and logical uses of evidence.</p> <p>Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will demonstrate the use of relevant and sufficient evidence in writing, including the analysis, synthesis, and interpretation of primary and secondary source material.</p>
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	Writing samples from Engl 1302 will be assessed using the following method: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching Engl 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.



Program Assessment Report due

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 30 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 60.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 30 papers/60 ratings, the expectation is that 42 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	<p>88% (53/60 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient.</p>
Target Met or Not Met	<p>Target Exceeded</p>
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>After reviewing the results of the 2015-2016 Program Assessment, the department decided on the following action plan:</p>



Program Assessment Report due

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Given that the target of 70% proficiency was achieved, the department will focus on maintaining the positive trend.• To ensure the most accurate and comprehensive assessment of the Program, the department will expand the sampling population in the 2016-2017 assessment to include student artifacts from adjunct faculty sections. Because the 2014-2015 assessment results represented a marked departure from years prior, faculty believe the increased sample size will support an on-going effort to evaluate trends in outcome proficiencies.• As noted in the evaluation of the previous action plan, in Spring 2017 two faculty are piloting an enhanced version of the department text, which includes technology supplements that target two of the traditionally low-performing outcomes, Outcome #s 4 and 5. Student proficiency levels in the pilot sections will be compared to those in non-pilot sections to determine the effectiveness of the intervention.• To promote an equitable division of labor, the department will rotate the task of assessment yearly. The previous two assessments (2013-2014 and 2014-2015) had been conducted by the same faculty assessors; by rotating the task, all full-time faculty will develop an awareness of student proficiencies outside their own sections.• The last time a faculty member attended a discipline-specific conference was in 2008; therefore, the department believes it should explore options for sending a member yearly to either the Conference on College Composition and Communication or the Modern Language Association Conference.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<p>Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2014-2015 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly. The results for 2014-2015 had shown a 10-20% decrease in proficiency levels.



Program Assessment Report due

- The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.
- Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark.

What challenges emerged to the action plan?

No challenges emerged; the implementation of the action plan was carried out in its entirety.

To what extent was the action plan successful?

The action plan was successful; the 2015-2016 assessment results for all five Program Outcomes were above the 70% proficiency benchmark. In addition, the data seems to indicate that the dramatically lower proficiency scores in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment were anomalies, a theory posited by faculty in the previous action plan.

Further, to address the third component of the 2014-15 action plan, the department initiated a careful review of the curriculum of ENGL 1302, the course selected for Program Assessment as it is the foundational course for English majors. This project is extensive and ongoing; the curriculum committee members are aware of the proficiency trends in the Program Assessment.

In addition, since the last assessment, the department has worked closely with the textbook publisher to explore curriculum supplements to address the Program Learning Outcomes that decreased most significantly in proficiency levels during the 2014-2015 Program Assessment:

- Outcome #4: Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.
- Outcome #5: Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)

After meeting with the textbook representative during Fall 2016, the department determined that two faculty members will participate in a spring pilot of an alternate version of the department text that includes



Program Assessment Report due

	<p>significant technology-enhancements that can be integrated into Canvas. Importantly, these enhancements will provide students with online practice and assessment of their use of correct grammar, punctuation, and mechanics (Program Learning Outcome #4) and MLA citation skills (Program Learning Outcome #5).</p>
<p>Program Learning Outcome #4</p>	<p>Outcome #4: Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.</p> <p>Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will incorporate clear, correct and appropriate sentences and paragraphs in his/her writing.</p>
<p>Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome</p>	<p>ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351</p>
<p>Assessment Method</p>	<p>Writing samples from ENGL 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching ENGL 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.



Program Assessment Report due

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 30 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 60.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 30 papers/60 ratings, the expectation is that 42 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	<p>80% (48/60 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient</p>
Target Met or Not Met	<p>Target Exceeded</p> <p>•</p>
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>After reviewing the results of the 2015-2016 Program Assessment, the department decided on the following action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Given that the target of 70% proficiency was achieved, the department will focus on maintaining the positive trend.• To ensure the most accurate and comprehensive assessment of the Program, the department will expand the sampling population in the 2016-2017 assessment to include student artifacts from adjunct faculty sections. Because the 2014-2015 assessment results represented a marked departure from years prior, faculty believe the increased sample size will support an on-going effort to evaluate trends in outcome proficiencies.• As noted in the evaluation of the previous action plan, in Spring 2017 two faculty are piloting an enhanced version of the department text, which includes technology supplements that target two of the traditionally



Program Assessment Report due

	<p>low-performing outcomes, Outcome #s 4 and 5. Student proficiency levels in the pilot sections will be compared to those in non-pilot sections to determine the effectiveness of the intervention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To promote an equitable division of labor, the department will rotate the task of assessment yearly. The previous two assessments (2013-2014 and 2014-2015) had been conducted by the same faculty assessors; by rotating the task, all full-time faculty will develop an awareness of student proficiencies outside their own sections.• The last time a faculty member attended a discipline-specific conference was in 2008; therefore, the department believes it should explore options for sending a member yearly to either the Conference on College Composition and Communication or the Modern Language Association Conference.
<p>Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans</p>	<p>Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2014-2015 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly. The results for 2014-2015 had shown a 10-20% decrease in proficiency levels.• The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.• Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark. <p>What challenges emerged to the action plan? No challenges emerged; the implementation of the action plan was carried out in its entirety.</p> <p>To what extent was the action plan successful?</p>



Program Assessment Report due

	<p>The action plan was successful; the 2015-2016 assessment results for all five Program Outcomes were above the 70% proficiency benchmark. In addition, the data seems to indicate that the dramatically lower proficiency scores in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment were anomalies, a theory posited by faculty in the previous action plan.</p> <p>Further, to address the third component of the 2014-15 action plan, the department initiated a careful review of the curriculum of ENGL 1302, the course selected for Program Assessment as it is the foundational course for English majors. This project is extensive and ongoing; the curriculum committee members are aware of the proficiency trends in the Program Assessment.</p> <p>In addition, since the last assessment, the department has worked closely with the textbook publisher to explore curriculum supplements to address the Program Learning Outcomes that decreased most significantly in proficiency levels during the 2014-2015 Program Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outcome #4: Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.• Outcome #5: Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.) <p>After meeting with the textbook representative during Fall 2016, the department determined that two faculty members will participate in a spring pilot of an alternate version of the department text that includes significant technology-enhancements that can be integrated into Canvas. Importantly, these enhancements will provide students with online practice and assessment of their use of correct grammar, punctuation, and mechanics (Program Learning Outcome #4) and MLA citation skills (Program Learning Outcome #5).</p>
Program Learning Outcome #5	Outcome #5: Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)



Program Assessment Report due

	Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will cite sources correctly and format the paper properly according to MLA documentation style
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	<p>Writing samples from ENGL 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching ENGL 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 30 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 60.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 30 papers/60 ratings, the expectation is that 42 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	88% (53/60 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient



Program Assessment Report due

Target Met or Not Met	Target Exceeded
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>After reviewing the results of the 2015-2016 Program Assessment, the department decided on the following action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Given that the target of 70% proficiency was achieved, the department will focus on maintaining the positive trend.• To ensure the most accurate and comprehensive assessment of the Program, the department will expand the sampling population in the 2016-2017 assessment to include student artifacts from adjunct faculty sections. Because the 2014-2015 assessment results represented a marked departure from years prior, faculty believe the increased sample size will support an on-going effort to evaluate trends in outcome proficiencies.• As noted in the evaluation of the previous action plan, in Spring 2017 two faculty are piloting an enhanced version of the department text, which includes technology supplements that target two of the traditionally low-performing outcomes, Outcome #s 4 and 5. Student proficiency levels in the pilot sections will be compared to those in non-pilot sections to determine the effectiveness of the intervention.• To promote an equitable division of labor, the department will rotate the task of assessment yearly. The previous two assessments (2013-2014 and 2014-2015) had been conducted by the same faculty assessors; by rotating the task, all full-time faculty will develop an awareness of student proficiencies outside their own sections.• The last time a faculty member attended a discipline-specific conference was in 2008; therefore, the department believes it should explore options for sending a member yearly to either the Conference on College Composition and Communication or the Modern Language Association Conference.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<p>Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <p>The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2014-2015 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components:</p>



Program Assessment Report due

- Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly. The results for 2014-2015 had shown a 10-20% decrease in proficiency levels.
- The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.
- Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark.

What challenges emerged to the action plan?

No challenges emerged; the implementation of the action plan was carried out in its entirety.

To what extent was the action plan successful?

The action plan was successful; the 2015-2016 assessment results for all five Program Outcomes were above the 70% proficiency benchmark. In addition, the data seems to indicate that the dramatically lower proficiency scores in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment were anomalies, a theory posited by faculty in the previous action plan.

Further, to address the third component of the 2014-15 action plan, the department initiated a careful review of the curriculum of ENGL 1302, the course selected for Program Assessment as it is the foundational course for English majors. This project is extensive and ongoing; the curriculum committee members are aware of the proficiency trends in the Program Assessment.

In addition, since the last assessment, the department has worked closely with the textbook publisher to explore curriculum supplements to address the Program Learning Outcomes that decreased most significantly in proficiency levels during the 2014-2015 Program Assessment:



Program Assessment Report due

- Outcome #4: Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.
- Outcome #5: Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)

After meeting with the textbook representative during Fall 2016, the department determined that two faculty members will participate in a spring pilot of an alternate version of the department text that includes significant technology-enhancements that can be integrated into Canvas. Importantly, these enhancements will provide students with online practice and assessment of their use of correct grammar, punctuation, and mechanics (Program Learning Outcome #4) and MLA citation skills (Program Learning Outcome #5).



Program Assessment Report

Program or Certificate: AA English
Academic Year Assessed: 2014-2015
Program Lead Faculty: Caroline Mains
Department Chair: Vicente Guillot

Please NOTE:

1. Program Learning Outcome #1 is "Demonstrate knowledge of individual and collaborative research processes" and would not be assessable by the artifact selected by the department. Therefore, this report begins with Program Learning Outcome #2.
2. Because Program Learning Outcome #2 addresses multiple skills, that outcome was assessed using more than one criterion. See evaluation of previous cycle's action plan for a more detailed explanation.
3. Because components of Program Learning Outcome #s 2 and 3 overlap, those outcomes were assessed using the same criterion. See evaluation of previous cycle's action plan for a more detailed explanation.

Program Learning Outcome #2	Outcome #2: Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments , including one or more research-based essays. Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will construct a clear, concise thesis.
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	Writing samples from ENGL 1302 will be assessed using the following method: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching ENGL 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.



Program Assessment Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 40 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 80.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 40 papers/80 ratings, the expectation is that 56 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	<p>73.75% (59/80 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient</p>
Target Met or Not Met	<p>Target Exceeded</p>
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although our target of 70% proficiency was achieved, the 2014-2015 assessment results for this outcome are 19.25% lower than that of the 2013-2014 assessment and 11.25% lower than that of the 2010 assessment. <p>As discussed below in the evaluation of the previous action plan, prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, the department revised the Program SLOs and assessment artifact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ to ensure that the SLOs aligned with those of THECB for ENGL 1302 and



Program Assessment Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ to better represent the rigor faculty felt essential in an A.A. in English. <p>Thus, when the department met at the beginning of the Fall 2015 semester to review the 2014-2015 assessment results, faculty noted that it seemed logical for proficiency results to decrease, given the increased sophistication of the skill sets required by the new artifact criteria and evaluated by the new SLOs. After careful consideration of these factors, the department decided on the following new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly.● The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.● Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan. <p>The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components: review and possible revision of the Program SLOs; review and possible revision of the artifact selected for assessment; and administration of the assessment to a sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 student work. The first two components resulted in the following changes to the Program Assessment Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Align Program Assessment SLOs with the THECB SLOs for English 1302. As mentioned in the 13-14 Assessment Report, THECB revised the SLOs for this course. Although ENGL 1302 is not a "capstone" course in the traditional sense, the department has focused on it for Program Assessment because it is a requirement for all English majors, and it is included on all university transfer guides; further, the course provides the foundational skills necessary for English majors. Therefore, the



Program Assessment Report

faculty felt it was logical and prudent to adopt the THECB ENGL 1302 SLOs as the English Program SLOs. To illustrate this change:

Program SLOs Prior to 2014-2015

1. The student will construct a clear, concise thesis.
2. The student will demonstrate an effective organizational strategy to support the thesis.
3. The student will demonstrate the use of relevant and sufficient evidence in writing.
4. The student will incorporate clear, correct and appropriate sentences and paragraphs in his/her writing.

Revised Program SLOs

1. Demonstrate knowledge of individual and collaborative research processes.
 2. Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.
 3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate a variety of texts for the ethical and logical uses of evidence.
 4. Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.
 5. Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)
- 2. Select an artifact for assessment that addresses and reflects the rigor inherent in the new SLOs.**
The second component of the assessment plan required a review of the assessment artifact. Prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, artifacts were chosen based on the following broad criteria:

“Any academic writing sample.”

Faculty felt that the criteria did not adequately reflect the academic challenge of the new SLOs nor the mastery appropriate for the English A.A., specifically noting the omission of primary and secondary source integration and MLA documentation. Logically, students who earn an A.A. in English, a reading, writing and researching intensive major, must demonstrate an adequate foundation in source usage; thus, faculty believed this omission was an oversight that should be rectified. Therefore, the department revised the assessment artifact criteria to:



Program Assessment Report

"A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources."

- What challenges emerged to the action plan?
After faculty review and revision of the Program SLOs and assessment artifact, one challenge emerged:

The SLOs, as described by THECB, seemed too broad or indistinct to assess readily and accurately. For example:

- Some SLOs address multiple skills. SLO #2 mentions use of sources and the development of an academic argument. An academic argument itself has many components that must be reviewed for proficiency—thesis, organization, etc.
- Other SLOs overlap. To illustrate, SLO #2 and SLO #3 both target proficiencies related to paragraph development.

To rectify this issue, faculty tailored and cross-walked academic essay criteria to the SLOs. See Assessment Criteria and SLO Crosswalk below.

Assessment Criteria and SLOs Crosswalk					
	SLO 1— Research processes	SLO 2— Academic argument	SLO 3— Analyze, interpret, and evaluate evidence	SLO 4— Style and clarity Grammar/mechanics	SLO 5— Citation conventions
Thesis		X			
Organization		X			



Program Assessment Report

	<p>Development of ideas using primary and secondary sources, including analysis and synthesis of evidence</p> <p>Style, clarity, grammar and mechanics</p> <p>MLA format and documentation</p>		X	X			
					X		
						X	
	<p>Once this issue was resolved, the third component of the 13-14 action plan could be completed, the administration of the assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was the action plan successful? The implementation of the new methodology was successful; however, review of the 2014-2015 assessment results revealed that the revision of the SLOs and assessment artifact seemed to have a large impact on competency rates. Although the target of 70% proficiency was achieved in 3 of the 5 outcomes, the percentage of proficiency decreased between 9 and 30 points overall. 						
Program Learning Outcome #2	Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.						



Program Assessment Report

	Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will demonstrate an effective organizational strategy to support the thesis.
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	<p>Writing samples from ENGL 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching ENGL 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 40 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 80.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 40 papers/80 ratings, the expectation is that 56 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	73.75% (59/80 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient



Program Assessment Report

Target Met or Not Met	Target Exceeded
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although our target of 70% proficiency was achieved, the 2014-2015 assessment results for this outcome are 22.25% lower than that of the 2013-2014 assessment and 11.25% lower than that of the 2010 assessment. <p>As discussed below in the evaluation of the previous action plan, prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, the department revised the Program SLOs and assessment artifact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ to ensure that the SLOs aligned with those of THECB for ENGL 1302 and○ to better represent the rigor faculty felt essential in an A.A. in English. <p>Thus, when the department met at the beginning of the Fall 2015 semester to review the 2014-2015 assessment results, faculty noted that it seemed logical for proficiency results to decrease, given the increased sophistication of the skill sets required by the new artifact criteria and evaluated by the new SLOs. After careful consideration of these factors, the department decided on the following new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly.• The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.• Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan.



Program Assessment Report

The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components: review and possible revision of the Program SLOs; review and possible revision of the artifact selected for assessment; and administration of the assessment to a sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 student work. The first two components resulted in the following changes to the Program Assessment Methodology:

1. Align Program Assessment SLOs with the THECB SLOs for English 1302.

As mentioned in the 13-14 Assessment Report, THECB revised the SLOs for this course. Although ENGL 1302 is not a "capstone" course in the traditional sense, the department has focused on it for Program Assessment because it is a requirement for all English majors, and it is included on all university transfer guides; further, the course provides the foundational skills necessary for English majors. Therefore, the faculty felt it was logical and prudent to adopt the THECB ENGL 1302 SLOs as the English Program SLOs. To illustrate this change:

Program SLOs Prior to 2014-2015

1. The student will construct a clear, concise thesis.
2. The student will demonstrate an effective organizational strategy to support the thesis.
3. The student will demonstrate the use of relevant and sufficient evidence in writing.
4. The student will incorporate clear, correct and appropriate sentences and paragraphs in his/her writing.

Revised Program SLOs

1. Demonstrate knowledge of individual and collaborative research processes.
2. Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.
3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate a variety of texts for the ethical and logical uses of evidence.
4. Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.
5. Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)

2. Select an artifact for assessment that addresses and reflects the rigor inherent in the new SLOs.



Program Assessment Report

The second component of the assessment plan required a review of the assessment artifact. Prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, artifacts were chosen based on the following broad criteria:

“Any academic writing sample.”

Faculty felt that the criteria did not adequately reflect the academic challenge of the new SLOs nor the mastery appropriate for the English A.A., specifically noting the omission of primary and secondary source integration and MLA documentation. Logically, students who earn an A.A. in English, a reading, writing and researching intensive major, must demonstrate an adequate foundation in source usage; thus, faculty believed this omission was an oversight that should be rectified. Therefore, the department revised the assessment artifact criteria to:

“A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.”

- What challenges emerged to the action plan?

After faculty review and revision of the Program SLOs and assessment artifact, one challenge emerged:

The SLOs, as described by THECB, seemed too broad or indistinct to assess readily and accurately. For example:

- Some SLOs address multiple skills. SLO #2 mentions use of sources and the development of an academic argument. An academic argument itself has many components that must be reviewed for proficiency—thesis, organization, etc.
- Other SLOs overlap. To illustrate, SLO #2 and SLO #3 both target proficiencies related to paragraph development.

To rectify this issue, faculty tailored and cross-walked academic essay criteria to the SLOs. See Assessment Criteria and SLO Crosswalk below.

[Assessment Criteria and SLOs Crosswalk](#)



Program Assessment Report

	SLO 1— Research processes	SLO 2-- Academic argument	SLO 3— Analyze, interpret, and evaluate evidence	SLO 4— Style and clarity Grammar/mechanics	SLO 5— Citation conventions
Thesis		X			
Organization		X			
Development of ideas using primary and secondary sources, including analysis and synthesis of evidence		X	X		
Style, clarity, grammar and mechanics				X	
MLA format and documentation					X

Once this issue was resolved, the third component of the 13-14 action plan could be completed, the administration of the assessment.



Program Assessment Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">To what extent was the action plan successful? The implementation of the new methodology was successful; however, review of the 2014-2015 assessment results revealed that the revision of the SLOs and assessment artifact seemed to have a large impact on competency rates. Although the target of 70% proficiency was achieved in 3 of the 5 outcomes, the percentage of proficiency decreased between 9 and 30 points overall.
Program Learning Outcomes #2 and #3	<p>Outcome #2: Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.</p> <p>Outcome #3: Analyze, interpret, and evaluate a variety of texts for the ethical and logical uses of evidence.</p> <p>Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will demonstrate the use of relevant and sufficient evidence in writing, including the analysis, synthesis, and interpretation of primary and secondary source material.</p>
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	<p>Writing samples from Engl 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching Engl 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.



Program Assessment Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 40 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 80.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 40 papers/80 ratings, the expectation is that 56 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	<p>80% (64/80 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient.</p>
Target Met or Not Met	<p>Target Exceeded</p>
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although our target of 70% proficiency was exceeded, the 2014-2015 assessment results for this outcome are 11% lower than that of the 2013-2014 assessment. However, the 14-15 results are 1% higher than that of the 2010 assessment. <p>As discussed below in the evaluation of the previous action plan, prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, the department revised the Program SLOs and assessment artifact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ to ensure that the SLOs aligned with those of THECB for ENGL 1302 and○ to better represent the rigor faculty felt essential in an A.A. in English. <p>Thus, when the department met at the beginning of the Fall 2015 semester to review the 2014-2015 assessment results, faculty noted that it seemed logical for proficiency results to decrease, given the increased sophistication of the</p>



Program Assessment Report

	<p>skill sets required by the new artifact criteria and evaluated by the new SLOs. After careful consideration of these factors, the department decided on the following new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly.• The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.• Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<p>3. Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan. The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components: review and possible revision of the Program SLOs; review and possible revision of the artifact selected for assessment; and administration of the assessment to a sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 student work. The first two components resulted in the following changes to the Program Assessment Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Align Program Assessment SLOs with the THECB SLOs for English 1302. As mentioned in the 13-14 Assessment Report, THECB revised the SLOs for this course. Although ENGL 1302 is not a "capstone" course in the traditional sense, the department has focused on it for Program Assessment because it is a requirement for all English majors, and it is included on all university transfer guides; further, the course provides the foundational skills necessary for English majors. Therefore, the faculty felt it was logical and prudent to adopt the THECB ENGL 1302 SLOs as the English Program SLOs. To illustrate this change:<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Program SLOs Prior to 2014-2015</u></p><ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The student will construct a clear, concise thesis.2. The student will demonstrate an effective organizational strategy to support the thesis.



Program Assessment Report

3. The student will demonstrate the use of relevant and sufficient evidence in writing.
4. The student will incorporate clear, correct and appropriate sentences and paragraphs in his/her writing.

Revised Program SLOs

1. Demonstrate knowledge of individual and collaborative research processes.
 2. Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.
 3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate a variety of texts for the ethical and logical uses of evidence.
 4. Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.
 5. Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)
2. **Select an artifact for assessment that addresses and reflects the rigor inherent in the new SLOs.**
The second component of the assessment plan required a review of the assessment artifact. Prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, artifacts were chosen based on the following broad criteria:

“Any academic writing sample.”

Faculty felt that the criteria did not adequately reflect the academic challenge of the new SLOs nor the mastery appropriate for the English A.A., specifically noting the omission of primary and secondary source integration and MLA documentation. Logically, students who earn an A.A. in English, a reading, writing and researching intensive major, must demonstrate an adequate foundation in source usage; thus, faculty believed this omission was an oversight that should be rectified. Therefore, the department revised the assessment artifact criteria to:

“A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.”

- What challenges emerged to the action plan?
After faculty review and revision of the Program SLOs and assessment artifact, one challenge emerged:



Program Assessment Report

The SLOs, as described by THECB, seemed too broad or indistinct to assess readily and accurately. For example:

- o Some SLOs address multiple skills. SLO #2 mentions use of sources and the development of an academic argument. An academic argument itself has many components that must be reviewed for proficiency—thesis, organization, etc.
- o Other SLOs overlap. To illustrate, SLO #2 and SLO #3 both target proficiencies related to paragraph development.

To rectify this issue, faculty tailored and cross-walked academic essay criteria to the SLOs. See Assessment Criteria and SLO Crosswalk below.

Assessment Criteria and SLOs Crosswalk					
	SLO 1— Research processes	SLO 2-- Academic argument	SLO 3— Analyze, interpret, and evaluate evidence	SLO 4— Style and clarity Grammar/mechanics	SLO 5— Citation conventions
Thesis		X			
Organization		X			
Development of ideas using primary and secondary sources, including analysis and		X	X		



Program Assessment Report

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>synthesis of evidence</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Style, clarity, grammar and mechanics</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>MLA format and documentation</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> </tr> </table>	synthesis of evidence							Style, clarity, grammar and mechanics				X			MLA format and documentation						X
synthesis of evidence																						
Style, clarity, grammar and mechanics				X																		
MLA format and documentation						X																
	<p>Once this issue was resolved, the third component of the 13-14 action plan could be completed, the administration of the assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was the action plan successful? The implementation of the new methodology was successful; however, review of the 2014-2015 assessment results revealed that the revision of the SLOs and assessment artifact seemed to have a large impact on competency rates. Although the target of 70% proficiency was achieved in 3 of the 5 outcomes, the percentage of proficiency decreased between 9 and 30 points overall. 																					
Program Learning Outcome #4	<p>Outcome #4: Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.</p> <p>Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will incorporate clear, correct and appropriate sentences and paragraphs in his/her writing.</p>																					
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351																					
Assessment Method	Writing samples from ENGL 1302 will be assessed using the following method:																					



Program Assessment Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching ENGL 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 40 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 80.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For this particular sample of 40 papers/80 ratings, the expectation is that 56 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.
Results	<p>63.75% (51/80 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient</p>
Target Met or Not Met	Target Not Met
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The target of 70% proficiency was not achieved; however, the new assessment methodology used may explain these results. Please see below.



Program Assessment Report

	<p>As discussed below in the evaluation of the previous action plan, prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, the department revised the Program SLOs and assessment artifact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ to ensure that the SLOs aligned with those of THECB for ENGL 1302 and○ to better represent the rigor faculty felt essential in an A.A. in English. <p>Thus, when the department met at the beginning of the Fall 2015 semester to review the 2014-2015 assessment results, faculty noted that it seemed logical for proficiency results to decrease, given the increased sophistication of the skill sets required by the new artifact criteria and evaluated by the new SLOs. After careful consideration of these factors, the department decided on the following new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly.● The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.● Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan. The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components: review and possible revision of the Program SLOs; review and possible revision of the artifact selected for assessment; and administration of the assessment to a sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 student work. The first two components resulted in the following changes to the Program Assessment Methodology:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Align Program Assessment SLOs with the THECB SLOs for English 1302.



Program Assessment Report

As mentioned in the 13-14 Assessment Report, THECB revised the SLOs for this course. Although ENGL 1302 is not a “capstone” course in the traditional sense, the department has focused on it for Program Assessment because it is a requirement for all English majors, and it is included on all university transfer guides; further, the course provides the foundational skills necessary for English majors. Therefore, the faculty felt it was logical and prudent to adopt the THECB ENGL 1302 SLOs as the English Program SLOs. To illustrate this change:

Program SLOs Prior to 2014-2015

1. The student will construct a clear, concise thesis.
2. The student will demonstrate an effective organizational strategy to support the thesis.
3. The student will demonstrate the use of relevant and sufficient evidence in writing.
4. The student will incorporate clear, correct and appropriate sentences and paragraphs in his/her writing.

Revised Program SLOs

1. Demonstrate knowledge of individual and collaborative research processes.
 2. Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.
 3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate a variety of texts for the ethical and logical uses of evidence.
 4. Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.
 5. Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)
2. **Select an artifact for assessment that addresses and reflects the rigor inherent in the new SLOs.**
The second component of the assessment plan required a review of the assessment artifact. Prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, artifacts were chosen based on the following broad criteria:

“Any academic writing sample.”

Faculty felt that the criteria did not adequately reflect the academic challenge of the new SLOs nor the mastery appropriate for the English A.A., specifically noting the omission of primary and secondary source



Program Assessment Report

integration and MLA documentation. Logically, students who earn an A.A. in English, a reading, writing and researching intensive major, must demonstrate an adequate foundation in source usage; thus, faculty believed this omission was an oversight that should be rectified. Therefore, the department revised the assessment artifact criteria to:

“A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.”

- What challenges emerged to the action plan?

After faculty review and revision of the Program SLOs and assessment artifact, one challenge emerged:

The SLOs, as described by THECB, seemed too broad or indistinct to assess readily and accurately. For example:

- Some SLOs address multiple skills. SLO #2 mentions use of sources and the development of an academic argument. An academic argument itself has many components that must be reviewed for proficiency—thesis, organization, etc.
- Other SLOs overlap. To illustrate, SLO #2 and SLO #3 both target proficiencies related to paragraph development.

To rectify this issue, faculty tailored and cross-walked academic essay criteria to the SLOs. See Assessment Criteria and SLO Crosswalk below.

Assessment Criteria and SLOs Crosswalk					
	SLO 1— Research processes	SLO 2— Academic argument	SLO 3— Analyze, interpret, and	SLO 4— Style and clarity Grammar/mechanics	SLO 5— Citation conventions



Program Assessment Report

			evaluate evidence		
Thesis		X			
Organization		X			
Development of ideas using primary and secondary sources, including analysis and synthesis of evidence		X	X		
Style, clarity, grammar and mechanics				X	
MLA format and documentation					X

Once this issue was resolved, the third component of the 13-14 action plan could be completed, the administration of the assessment.

- To what extent was the action plan successful?
The implementation of the new methodology was successful; however, review of the 2014-2015 assessment results revealed that the revision of the SLOs and assessment artifact seemed to have a large impact on competency rates. Although the target of 70% proficiency was achieved in 3 of the 5 outcomes, the percentage of proficiency decreased between 9 and 30 points overall.



Program Assessment Report

Program Learning Outcome #5	<p>Outcome #5: Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)</p> <p>Criteria for Assessment of SLO: The student will cite sources correctly and format the paper properly according to MLA documentation style</p>
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	<p>Writing samples from ENGL 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching ENGL 1302 will choose one course section to assess. Online and dual credit courses are eligible for assessment.• The faculty member will select student sample writing for an assignment that meets the artifact criteria: A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then the instructor should go up the roster and select the writing of the next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the writing samples from the sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 40 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 80.
Targets for Achievement	70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient



Program Assessment Report

	For this particular sample of 40 papers/80 ratings, the expectation is that 56 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.
Results	68.75% (55/80 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient
Target Met or Not Met	Target Not Met
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The achievement target of 70% proficiency was not achieved; however, the new assessment methodology used may explain these results. Please see below. <p>As discussed below in the evaluation of the previous action plan, prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, the department revised the Program SLOs and assessment artifact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ to ensure that the SLOs aligned with those of THECB for ENGL 1302 and○ to better represent the rigor faculty felt essential in an A.A. in English. <p>Thus, when the department met at the beginning of the Fall 2015 semester to review the 2014-2015 assessment results, faculty noted that it seemed logical for proficiency results to decrease, given the increased sophistication of the skill sets required by the new artifact criteria and evaluated by the new SLOs. After careful consideration of these factors, the department decided on the following new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will follow the same methodology for the Spring 2016 assessment. This will allow the department to determine if the 2014-2015 results can be used as a baseline for future assessments or be considered an anomaly.• The achievement target for each SLO will remain 70% proficiency.• Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, faculty will brainstorm possible interventions to address the proficiencies that dip below the 70% benchmark.



Program Assessment Report

<p>Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans</p>	<p>The previous cycle's action plan was implemented as described in the 2013-2014 Program Assessment Report. The action plan included three components: review and possible revision of the Program SLOs; review and possible revision of the artifact selected for assessment; and administration of the assessment to a sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 student work. The first two components resulted in the following changes to the Program Assessment Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Align Program Assessment SLOs with the THECB SLOs for English 1302. As mentioned in the 13-14 Assessment Report, THECB revised the SLOs for this course. Although ENGL 1302 is not a "capstone" course in the traditional sense, the department has focused on it for Program Assessment because it is a requirement for all English majors, and it is included on all university transfer guides; further, the course provides the foundational skills necessary for English majors. Therefore, the faculty felt it was logical and prudent to adopt the THECB ENGL 1302 SLOs as the English Program SLOs. To illustrate this change: <u>Program SLOs Prior to 2014-2015</u><ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The student will construct a clear, concise thesis.2. The student will demonstrate an effective organizational strategy to support the thesis.3. The student will demonstrate the use of relevant and sufficient evidence in writing.4. The student will incorporate clear, correct and appropriate sentences and paragraphs in his/her writing. <u>Revised Program SLOs</u><ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Demonstrate knowledge of individual and collaborative research processes.2. Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate a variety of texts for the ethical and logical uses of evidence.4. Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.5. Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., APA, CMS, MLA, etc.)
--	---



Program Assessment Report

2. Select an artifact for assessment that addresses and reflects the rigor inherent in the new SLOs.

The second component of the assessment plan required a review of the assessment artifact. Prior to the 2014-2015 assessment, artifacts were chosen based on the following broad criteria:

“Any academic writing sample.”

Faculty felt that the criteria did not adequately reflect the academic challenge of the new SLOs nor the mastery appropriate for the English A.A., specifically noting the omission of primary and secondary source integration and MLA documentation. Logically, students who earn an A.A. in English, a reading, writing and researching intensive major, must demonstrate an adequate foundation in source usage; thus, faculty believed this omission was an oversight that should be rectified. Therefore, the department revised the assessment artifact criteria to:

“A documented formal academic essay, 500-600 words minimum, which includes correct citation of primary and secondary sources.”

- **What challenges emerged to the action plan?**

After faculty review and revision of the Program SLOs and assessment artifact, one challenge emerged:

The SLOs, as described by THECB, seemed too broad or indistinct to assess readily and accurately. For example:

- Some SLOs address multiple skills. SLO #2 mentions use of sources and the development of an academic argument. An academic argument itself has many components that must be reviewed for proficiency—thesis, organization, etc.
- Other SLOs overlap. To illustrate, SLO #2 and SLO #3 both target proficiencies related to paragraph development.

To rectify this issue, faculty tailored and cross-walked academic essay criteria to the SLOs. See Assessment Criteria and SLO Crosswalk below.



Program Assessment Report

Assessment Criteria and SLOs Crosswalk					
	SLO 1— Research processes	SLO 2— Academic argument	SLO 3— Analyze, interpret, and evaluate evidence	SLO 4— Style and clarity Grammar/mechanics	SLO 5— Citation conventions
Thesis		X			
Organization		X			
Development of ideas using primary and secondary sources, including analysis and synthesis of evidence		X	X		
Style, Clarity, Grammar and Mechanics				X	
MLA format and documentation					X

Once this issue was resolved, the third component of the 13-14 action plan could be completed, the administration of the assessment.



Program Assessment Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• To what extent was the action plan successful? The implementation of the new methodology was successful; however, review of the 2014-2015 assessment results revealed that the revision of the SLOs and assessment artifact seemed to have a large impact on competency rates. Although the target of 70% proficiency was achieved in 3 of the 5 outcomes, the percentage of proficiency decreased between 9 and 30 points overall.
--	---



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

Program or Certificate: AA English
Academic Year Assessed: 2013-2014
Program Lead Faculty: Caroline Mains
Department Chair: Vicente Guillot

Program Learning Outcome #1	The student will construct a clear, concise thesis.
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	<p>Writing samples from Engl 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching Engl 1302 will choose one course section to assess.• The faculty member will select any academic writing sample in his/her Engl 1302.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then go up the roster and select the writing of next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the 35 writing samples from the 7 sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 35 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 70.
Targets for Achievement	70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

	For this particular sample of 35 papers/70 ratings, the expectation is that 49 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.
Results	93% (65/70 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient
Target Met or Not Met	Target Exceeded
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Because our achievement target was exceeded for this Learning Outcome, our focus will be on maintaining our excellent score. <p>As indicated in the section of this report regarding evaluation of the previous action plan, faculty met during the Spring 2014 Convocation to review the Spring 2010 results and action plan. At that time, the department decided to follow the 2010 assessment method for 2013-2014 but expected that a review of this method would be necessary for future assessment cycles. The plan to review the assessment method correlates with an important change affecting English 1302. Between the 2010 assessment and that of 2013-2014, THECB revised the learning outcomes for the course. Because of this revision, faculty decided that the new action plan should include careful consideration of the SLOs assessed as well as the student artifact selected. This decision is reflected in the remaining items of the new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will meet prior to the Spring 2015 semester to review the assessment artifact selected and decide if a different artifact would better reflect the Program Outcomes.• Faculty will meet prior to the Spring 2015 semester to review the SLOs selected for assessment and determine if any additional SLOs should be included.• Based on faculty input regarding the artifact and SLOs, an end-of-semester assessment will be administered to a similar sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 students.



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

<p>Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan. <p>Two of the four components of the previous action plan were implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The department created a more detailed rubric with descriptions of rating standards (Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient) for each of the SLOs. ○ The department maintained and exceeded its previous excellent score in each SLO. <p>The two components not implemented are discussed as challenges below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What challenges emerged to the action plan? <p>Two challenges emerged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An additional assessment initially slated for Fall 2010 was not conducted. ○ Because the additional assessment was not completed, the planned comparative analysis of the Spring 2010 and the Fall 2010 assessments did not occur. However, as noted in the previous section of this report, faculty did meet during the Spring 2014 Convocation to review both the Spring 2010 results and action plan. Using this information, the department decided to follow the 2010 assessment method for 2013-2014, with an expectation that faculty would review the method for relevancy. See note regarding this review in the new action plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent was the action plan successful? <p>The assessment results for each SLO exceeded the target for achievement by more than 20%.</p>
<p>Program Learning Outcome #2</p>	<p>The student will demonstrate an effective organizational strategy to support the thesis.</p>
<p>Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome</p>	<p>ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351</p>
<p>Assessment Method</p>	<p>Writing samples from Engl 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p>



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching Engl 1302 will choose one course section to assess.• The faculty member will select any academic writing sample in his/her Engl 1302.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then go up the roster and select the writing of next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the 35 writing samples from the 7 sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 35 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 70.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 35 papers/70 ratings, the expectation is that 49 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	<p>96% (67/70 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient</p>
Target Met or Not Met	<p>Target Exceeded</p>
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Because our achievement target was exceeded for this Learning Outcome, our focus will be on maintaining our excellent score. <p>As indicated in the section of this report regarding evaluation of the previous action plan, faculty met during the Spring 2014 Convocation to review the Spring 2010 results and action plan. At that time, the department decided to follow the 2010 assessment method for 2013-2014 but expected that a review of this method would be necessary for future</p>



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

	<p>assessment cycles. The plan to review the assessment method correlates with an important change affecting English 1302. Between the 2010 assessment and that of 2013-2014, THECB revised the learning outcomes for the course. Because of this revision, faculty decided that the new action plan should include careful consideration of the SLOs assessed as well as the student artifact selected. This decision is reflected in the remaining items of the new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will meet prior to the Spring 2015 semester to review the assessment artifact selected and decide if a different artifact would better reflect the Program Outcomes.• Faculty will meet prior to the Spring 2015 semester to review the SLOs selected for assessment and determine if any additional SLOs should be included.• Based on faculty input regarding the artifact and SLOs, an end-of-semester assessment will be administered to a similar sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 students.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan. <p>Two of the four components of the previous action plan were implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The department created a more detailed rubric with descriptions of rating standards (Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient) for each of the SLOs.○ The department maintained and exceeded its previous excellent score in each SLO. <p>The two components not implemented are discussed as challenges below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What challenges emerged to the action plan? <p>Two challenges emerged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ An additional assessment initially slated for Fall 2010 was not conducted.○ Because the additional assessment was not completed, the planned comparative analysis of the Spring 2010 and the Fall 2010 assessments did not occur. However, as noted in the previous section of this report, faculty did meet during the Spring 2014 Convocation to review both the Spring 2010 results and



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

	<p>action plan. Using this information, the department decided to follow the 2010 assessment method for 2013-2014, with an expectation that faculty would review the method for relevancy. See note regarding this review in the new action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was the action plan successful? The assessment results for each SLO exceeded the target for achievement by more than 20%.
Program Learning Outcome #3	The student will demonstrate the use of relevant and sufficient evidence in writing.
Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome	ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351
Assessment Method	<p>Writing samples from Engl 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching Engl 1302 will choose one course section to assess. The faculty member will select any academic writing sample in his/her Engl 1302. The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then go up the roster and select the writing of next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the 35 writing samples from the 7 sections. The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department. A total of 35 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 70.
Targets for Achievement	70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

	For this particular sample of 35 papers/70 ratings, the expectation is that 49 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.
Results	91% (64/70 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient.
Target Met or Not Met	Target Exceeded
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Because our achievement target was exceeded for this Learning Outcome, our focus will be on maintaining our excellent score. <p>As indicated in the section of this report regarding evaluation of the previous action plan, faculty met during the Spring 2014 Convocation to review the Spring 2010 results and action plan. At that time, the department decided to follow the 2010 assessment method for 2013-2014 but expected that a review of this method would be necessary for future assessment cycles. The plan to review the assessment method correlates with an important change affecting English 1302. Between the 2010 assessment and that of 2013-2014, THECB revised the learning outcomes for the course. Because of this revision, faculty decided that the new action plan should include careful consideration of the SLOs assessed as well as the student artifact selected. This decision is reflected in the remaining items of the new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will meet prior to the Spring 2015 semester to review the assessment artifact selected and decide if a different artifact would better reflect the Program Outcomes.• Faculty will meet prior to the Spring 2015 semester to review the SLOs selected for assessment and determine if any additional SLOs should be included.• Based on faculty input regarding the artifact and SLOs, an end-of-semester assessment will be administered to a similar sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 students.



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

<p>Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan. <p>Two of the four components of the previous action plan were implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The department created a more detailed rubric with descriptions of rating standards (Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient) for each of the SLOs. ○ The department maintained and exceeded its previous excellent score in each SLO. <p>The two components not implemented are discussed as challenges below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What challenges emerged to the action plan? <p>Two challenges emerged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An additional assessment initially slated for Fall 2010 was not conducted. ○ Because the additional assessment was not completed, the planned comparative analysis of the Spring 2010 and the Fall 2010 assessments did not occur. However, as noted in the previous section of this report, faculty did meet during the Spring 2014 Convocation to review both the Spring 2010 results and action plan. Using this information, the department decided to follow the 2010 assessment method for 2013-2014, with an expectation that faculty would review the method for relevancy. See note regarding this review in the new action plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent was the action plan successful? <p>The assessment results for each SLO exceeded the target for achievement by more than 20%.</p>
<p>Program Learning Outcome #4</p>	<p>The student will incorporate clear, correct and appropriate sentences and paragraphs in his/her writing.</p>
<p>Courses in the degree plan that address this outcome</p>	<p>ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2327, ENGL 2328, ENGL 2332, ENGL 2333, ENGL 2341, ENGL 2351</p>
<p>Assessment Method</p>	<p>Writing samples from Engl 1302 will be assessed using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are teaching Engl 1302 will choose one course section to assess.



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The faculty member will select any academic writing sample in his/her Engl 1302.• The faculty member will select the writing of students 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 on the roster. If there is not a 21st student on the roster, then go up the roster and select the writing of next available student. The faculty will remove the names of the 5 students and any reference to the section number or faculty member teaching the course, duplicate the papers, and send them on to the two English faculty members who will assess the 35 writing samples from the 7 sections.• The two English faculty assessors will rate the writing samples using the holistic rubric: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient. They will compile the results of the assessment for review by the English department.• A total of 35 papers were rated. Each paper was scored twice (once by each assessor). The total number of ratings for this sample was 70.
Targets for Achievement	<p>70% of the sample surveyed will be either Proficient or Highly Proficient</p> <p>For this particular sample of 35 papers/70 ratings, the expectation is that 49 ratings will be either Highly Proficient or Proficient.</p>
Results	<p>93% (65/70 ratings) were Proficient or Highly Proficient</p>
Target Met or Not Met	<p>Target Exceeded</p>
New action plan for improvement of student learning	<p>If appropriate tie the new action plan to the previous cycle's action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Because our achievement target was exceeded for this Learning Outcome, our focus will be on maintaining our excellent score. <p>As indicated in the section of this report regarding evaluation of the previous action plan, faculty met during the Spring 2014 Convocation to review the Spring 2010 results and action plan. At that time, the department decided to follow the 2010 assessment method for 2013-2014 but expected that a review of this method would be necessary for future assessment cycles. The plan to review the assessment method correlates with an important change affecting English</p>



Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

	<p>1302. Between the 2010 assessment and that of 2013-2014, THECB revised the learning outcomes for the course. Because of this revision, faculty decided that the new action plan should include careful consideration of the SLOs assessed as well as the student artifact selected. This decision is reflected in the remaining items of the new action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty will meet prior to the Spring 2015 semester to review the assessment artifact selected and decide if a different artifact would better reflect the Program Outcomes.• Faculty will meet prior to the Spring 2015 semester to review the SLOs selected for assessment and determine if any additional SLOs should be included.• Based on faculty input regarding the artifact and SLOs, an end-of-semester assessment will be administered to a similar sample of Spring 2015 ENGL 1302 students.
Evaluation of previous cycle's action plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summarize the implementation of the previous cycle's action plan. <p>Two of the four components of the previous action plan were implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The department created a more detailed rubric with descriptions of rating standards (Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient) for each of the SLOs.○ The department maintained and exceeded its previous excellent score in each SLO. <p>The two components not implemented are discussed as challenges below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What challenges emerged to the action plan? <p>Two challenges emerged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ An additional assessment initially slated for Fall 2010 was not conducted.○ Because the additional assessment was not completed, the planned comparative analysis of the Spring 2010 and the Fall 2010 assessments did not occur. However, as noted in the previous section of this



ALAMO
COLLEGES

PALO ALTO COLLEGE

Program Assessment Report due 11/21/14

	<p>report, faculty did meet during the Spring 2014 Convocation to review both the Spring 2010 results and action plan. Using this information, the department decided to follow the 2010 assessment method for 2013-2014, with an expectation that faculty would review the method for relevancy. See note regarding this review in the new action plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To what extent was the action plan successful? The assessment results for each SLO exceeded the target for achievement by more than 20%.
--	---