Annual Assessment Report 2022-2023

BA English – Literary Studies, English Education, Applied Language Studies

English & Modern Languages

College of Letters, Arts, & Social Sciences

CONTACT
Name of Program Assessment Lead Dr. Alyssa Kermad
Name of Person Completing Report Dr. Alyssa Kermad

DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION No

DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)
  - o   We developed them as a program/department using our own knowledge and expertise of the field.

Other than the CPP Catalog and the Office of Assessment and Program Review website, where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.
- Department Website - provide URL: https://www.cpp.edu/class/english-modernlanguages/about/theenglish-ba.shtml
- Course Syllabi

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2022-2023

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2022-2023.** This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?
- 11+

How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2022-2023?

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2022-2023 (e.g., artifact collection, scoring, closing the loop, etc.). May also have engaged in assessment planning activities unrelated to specific SLOs (e.g., modified curriculum matrix, assessment plan, etc.).

Please list the SLOs examined

- SLO #1: Critical Reading: Students will critique—make and defend judgments based on internal evidence or external criteria—literary, expository, and/or linguistic texts.
- SLO #2: Linguistics: Students will understand the grammatical structure of language and how this knowledge is used in interpreting the structure of texts.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): Critical Reading: Students will critique—make and defend judgments based on internal evidence or external criteria—literary, expository, and/or linguistic texts.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)		
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning • Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence	• Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework • Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc.) • Portfolio/E-portfolio of student work	• Used rubric or scoring guide
• Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) • Scored indirect evidence of student learning • Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence	• Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement • Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement • Interviews or focus groups that contain self-reports of SLO achievement	
• Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)	•	

Findings			
N of Artifacts	**Criterion Used**	**Goal Met**	**Eye-opening Result**
While we collected around 105 undergraduate portfolios in AY22-23, we are unable to assess every single portfolio. Our procedure is to take faculty volunteers from EML to score portfolios over the summer. Every portfolio requires two raters; therefore, depending on the number of raters, we select a sample of artifacts. In AY22-23, this was a random sample of 12 artifacts (4 from each option). We administered group exit interviews in all six capstone classes over the academic year. We also administered exit surveys via Qualtrics in all six capstone classes, obtaining responses from a total of 79 students.	Mastery-4 Practicing-3 Developing-2 Introductory-1	Yes	When the Critical Reading scores across all options were averaged, we observed scores at/about our targeted range. That is, for the three sub-criteria, we observed the following scores: Analysis (3.47); Interpretation (3.25); and Reader Engagement (3.25). The total Critical Reading average was 3.32. These scores fall on our scale of Mastery-4, Practicing-3, Developing-2, and Introductory-1. When looking at scores individually for each option, we noticed that the English Education option scored the highest out of the three options. English Education was followed by Literary Studies and then by the Applied Language Studies option. However, all three options performed at our targeted range—all averaging above 3 across all criteria on our critical reading scale. Overall, these results are satisfactory and we are pleased with how students are demonstrating their skills in critical reading. While not causal, it would appear that ENG 3000, a course which all options take, is proving its effectiveness in training students how to critically read and analyze texts.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): Linguistics: Students will understand the grammatical structure of language and how this knowledge is used in interpreting the structure of texts.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)		
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)	• Exit exam created by the program	
• Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) • Scored indirect evidence of student learning • Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence	• Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement • Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement • Interviews or focus groups that contain self-reports of SLO achievement	
• Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)		
• Implemented closing the loop improvement strategies to improve SLO achievement		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	**Criterion Used**	**Goal Met**	**Eye-opening Result**
We administer the Linguistics exam in ENG 3210 which has a course cap of 30 students and usually fills to or past this number. Students typically complete the Linguistics exam for program assessment in the final weeks of the semester in which they are enrolled in ENG 3210. We collected indirect evidence from students who self-assessed their mastery of the core Linguistics student learning outcome. This self-assessment appears in the reflection portion of the capstone portfolio as well as in the Qualtrics exit survey. In AY22-23, we administered exit surveys via Qualtrics in all six capstone classes, obtaining responses from a total of 79 students.	The linguistics exam has 25 multiple choice items, and scores are averaged across these items.	Yes	In the analysis of indirect assessment from AY22-23, the majority of students across all options reported significant growth when self-assessing how they met the Linguistics student learning outcome. However, there are some observations across options which differ with respect to this outcome. For Literary Studies students, when analyzing data from those who reported "moderate growth," this was reported more often for the Linguistics SLO when compared to other SLOs. This trend was the same for the English Education students. Four Literary Studies students reported low growth in the Linguistics SLO, and one student reported low growth in this outcome from the English Education option. The trend was the opposite for Applied Language Studies students who specialize in Linguistics—none reported low growth, and when considering those who reported "moderate growth" in SLOs, linguistics was reported the least often. Considering we have core linguistics classes which all options take, we would prefer that students report moderate or significant growth; therefore, the committee will strategize ways to close the loop so that fewer to no students report "low growth" in this outcome. On a positive note, not a single student reported "no growth" in any of our SLOs.

IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2022-2023? Select all that apply.
- Assessment procedure changes (SLOs, curriculum matrix, rubrics, evidence collected, sampling, communications with faculty, etc.)
- Course-level changes (e.g., syllabus, content, pedagogy)
- Program curricular changes (e.g., course sequencing, changes to required curriculum, added or deleted courses)
- Students' out-of-course changes (e.g., advising, co-curricular experiences, mentoring, program website, workshops, brown bag lunches, etc.)

Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2021-2022? Select all that apply.
- Program/department faculty as whole
- A committee of program/department faculty
- Program/department assessment committee

The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2022-2023 so that others may learn from your experiences.
AY22-23 was our second year back post pandemic, and it was a year in which most of our classes returned to their face-to-face modality. This was a change from AY21-22 when more classes were being held online. In the Spring 2023 semester, we held a departmental meeting on the teaching/learning challenges that arose in AY22-23. Our faculty body discussed differences in how students were learning post-pandemic. We found that students needed more support in developing study skills, in breaking down tasks, and in completing assignments. Overall, we agreed that students needed more scaffolding, and faculty members were employing different strategies to adjust accordingly. We also found that our students are quite split between their education and their personal commitments, such as family and work. The majority of our students reported that they were working, and the majority reported that they were working between 20-40 hours per week. This is astounding considering that the large majority of students were also taking 5 courses per semester. In the qualitative data that we analyzed from our indirect assessment, many students reported challenges in balancing school/work/personal circumstances. Inflation has aggravated financial hardships for our students; therefore, pedagogical flexibility and patience has been key to student success.

Please share how the program triangulates various data sources to determine student success. Consider assessment findings, CPP's GI2025 markers, CSU Dashboard, CPP's Student Success Dashboard on Tableau, course evaluations, etc.
<narrative here>

Does the program offer a certificate or credential (e.g., teaching credential)?
- No

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found <u>here</u>. To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

Assessment Plan - Yes

Curriculum Matrix - Yes