

**Program Assessment: Annual Report**

**Program(s):** Undergraduate Major, Undergraduate Writing Program and Graduate Program  
**Department:** English  
**College/School:** College of Arts and Sciences  
**Date:** August 13, 2020  
**Primary Assessment Contact:** Toby Benis (Department Chair); Joya Uraizee (Assessment Coordinator); Nathaniel Rivers (Writing Program Director), Rachel Greenwald Smith (Graduate Program Director)

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

<p><u>A. Undergraduate Major Outcomes Assessed:</u>                  Form and Genre (Outcome 3):                  “Students who complete the undergraduate program in English will analyze the ways in which medium, form, and/or genre create and shape meaning in a variety of works.”</p>
<p><u>B. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessed:</u>                  Assessment on MA student performance in graduate courses (Learning Outcome B) and PhD student professionalization (Learning Outcome F) were not assessed due to the COVID-19 situation in Spring 2020.</p>
<p><u>C. Writing Program:</u> Not assessed this cycle</p>

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

<p><u>A. Undergraduate Major:</u>                  Form and Genre (Outcome 3):                  The Assessment Committee evaluated 39 essay assignments that were submitted by English majors in 2017 and 2019 for Form and Genre courses on the North and Madrid campuses. Of these papers, 12 were from English majors and minors, and 27 were from non-majors.                  No focus group surveys were conducted in Spring 2020 due to the COVID-19 situation.</p>
<p><u>B. Graduate Program:</u>                  The spring meeting devoted to assessing MA Student Performance in Graduate Courses (Learning Outcome B) was canceled due to the COVID-19 situation.</p>
<p><u>C. Writing Program:</u> Not assessed this cycle</p>

How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

**NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.**

<p><u>Undergraduate Major and Graduate Program (See Appendix for Rubric):</u>          For academic year 2019-20, the Undergraduate and Graduate Program Assessment committee consisted of the following people: Dr. Joya Uraizee (Assessment Director), Dr. Ruth Evans, Dr. Donald Stump, and Dr. Anne Dewey (Fall 2019 only; SLU Madrid). They were assisted by Ms. Lindsay Adams, PhD student, and Ms. Kathleen Eck, MA student (both Fall 2019 only).          The Assessment Committee members discussed and scored assessment artifacts based on the scales below. The committee reported in written form to the Undergraduate Committee. No report was written about graduate assessment due to the COVID 19 situation.          The artifacts received numerical scores: 4 (High Proficiency); 3 (Proficiency); 2 (Competency); 1 (Marginal Competency) and 0 (Does not meet Marginal Competency). Please see appendix for actual rubric used.</p>
<p><u>Writing Program: Not assessed this cycle</u></p>

3. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

**NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.**

<p><b><u>Undergraduate Major</u></b>  <u>Form and Genre Outcome 3, Assignments: :</u>          The average rating for all 39 assignments was <b>2.4</b> (in between Proficiency and Competency) on a scale of 1–4, with 4 being the highest. This suggests our students may need more training in analyzing forms and recognizing how and why they are used. While the average rating for all 12 assignments from majors was 2.7 (in between proficiency and competency), the average rating for all 27 assignments from non-majors was 2.2 (Competency). This suggests that some review of assignments and courses might be necessary.</p>
<p><b><u>Graduate Program:</u></b>          No direct or indirect assessment took place due to the COVID 19 situation.</p>
<p><b><u>Writing Program: Not assessed this cycle</u></b></p>

4. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

<p><u>Recommendations for the Undergraduate Program:</u>          In Fall 2019, the Assessment committee wrote 2 reports on its assessment of the Form and Genre assignments. 1 was sent to the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the other will be sent on in Fall 2020. In the reports, the committee recommended that instructors include at least one assignment in their Form and Genre courses that directly addresses the Form and Genre outcomes/objectives.          In Spring 2020, the Director of Undergraduate Studies briefly discussed the Assessment Committee report (including its recommendations) and suggested it be discussed at an upcoming faculty meeting.</p>
<p><u>Recommendations for the Graduate Program:</u>          The assessment committee was unable to write up its report on MA Learning Outcome B due to the COVID-19 situation.</p>
<p><u>Recommendations for the Writing Program:</u> <input type="text" value="input from NR needed"/></p>

5. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

<p><u>Undergraduate Program:</u>          Due to lack of time, neither the Culture and Critique Assessment Reports nor the Form and Genre Assessment Report were discussed at any faculty meeting in 2019-2020. However, at the recently concluded Fall 2020 Faculty Retreat (English Department) both reports and some general recommendations were discussed. It was agreed that over the next year, the English major would be revised along with the undergraduate outcomes and the assessment plan. This is partly because both the undergraduate major and the assessment plan have been in place for a while and need to be updated.</p>
<p><u>Graduate Program:</u>          The proposal for the MA exam, which resulted from the 2018-2019 assessment cycle, is now being used by our incoming master’s students in 2020-2021.</p>
<p><u>Writing Program:</u> <input type="text" value="input from NR needed"/></p>

***IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.***

Please see appendix on the next page

**APPENDIX: FALL 2019 RUBRIC TO ASSESS  
FORM AND GENRE IN 3000 LEVEL ENGLISH COURSES**

**SLU English BA Outcome # 3:** *Students who complete the undergraduate program in English will analyze the ways in which medium, form, and/or genre create and shape meaning in a variety of works.*

Relevant 3000-level (Literature and Film) course-level outcome (as stated on syllabi): *Students who complete this course will be able to:*

- Articulate the ways in which generic conventions and motifs work within texts;
- Produce analyses of the ways in which literary forms and structures inform meaning and purpose;
- Construct clear spoken and written arguments about literary / filmic forms, structures and modes.

Relevant 3000-level (Creative Writing) course-level outcome (as stated on syllabi): *Students who complete this course will be able to:*

- Demonstrate a sense of compositional process;
- Demonstrate an attention to craft techniques through writing;
- Demonstrate creative engagement with a variety of forms, structures and/or modes.

High Proficiency: 4	Proficiency: 3	Competency: 2	Marginal Competency: 1
<p><u>Lit &amp; Film only:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Produces an original and significant analysis of a text and/or other media that interprets complex features of literary and/or rhetorical form.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a high level of awareness of how complex arrangements of language and/or other media create meaning and/or thought.</li> </ul> <p><u>CW only:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composes an original and significant text with an advanced understanding of form.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a high level of awareness of craft techniques.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lit &amp; Film only:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Produces a substantial analysis of a text and/or other media that interprets complex features of literary and/or rhetorical form.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a strong awareness of how complex arrangements of language and/or other media create meaning and/or thought.</li> </ul> <p><u>CW only:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composes a substantial text with a clear understanding of form.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a strong awareness of craft techniques.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lit &amp; Film only:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Produces an analysis of a text and/or other media that identifies basic features of literary and/or rhetorical form.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a basic awareness of how complex arrangements of language and/or other media create meaning and/or thought.</li> </ul> <p><u>CW only:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composes a text with an awareness of how compositional processes work.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a basic awareness of craft techniques.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lit &amp; Film only:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Produces an analysis of a text and/or other media that identifies some features of literary and and/or rhetorical form.</li> <li>• Demonstrates some awareness of how complex arrangements of language and/or other media create meaning and/or thought.</li> </ul> <p><u>CW only:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composes a text with some awareness of how compositional processes work.</li> <li>• Demonstrates some awareness of craft techniques.</li> </ul>

*Evaluators should assign a zero (0) to any artifact that does not meet marginal competency (level 1).*

**WRITTEN COMMENTS / QUALITATIVE REMARKS** (please limit to 300 words):