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1. Degree Program [ ] Undergraduate  [x] Graduate

2. Assessment Instruments

- [ ] AM Form
- [x] MFT
- [ ] Department Senior Test
- [ ] Portfolio
- [ ] Survey
- [ ] Other [ ]

3. Students Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Results of assessment:
   Please see attachment.

5. Faculty analysis of results (extent to which learning goals were met):
   Please see attachment.

6. Recommendations for improvement:
   Please see attachment.
4. Results of assessment:

MFT SCORES

Last year only 2 Day students took the MFT, one of whom did not respond to enough questions to keep the score from being thrown out. This year 9 Day students and 4 Evening students completed our Senior Seminar class and all completed the MFT, giving our department its first real numbers measuring our students' scores in the field of Literature compared to other seniors nationwide. While ETS states that its Mean and Median figures come from “Seniors Only,” it should be noted that Columbia College English majors are only required to have 60 hours completed in order to take English 431, our Senior Seminar course. Therefore some of our students were clearly only Juniors when taking the exam. The number of scores we now have are obviously not high enough to warrant any statistically valid observations about our Departmental Summary Assessment Indicators and do not yield much decisive data in relation to subscores. In the next two years, because of course rotation in a newly designed major, we might well see, for example, the Departmental Summary Assessment Indicators completely reverse.

The good news from the Humanities Department’s first significant group of MFT scores is that of the 13 tests, all but one scored within one standard deviation of or higher than the National Mean of 4147 Literature test scores. One Evening student scored more than a standard deviation below the National Mean. All day students scored well within one standard deviation of the National mean, with 6 scoring above the national mean in a range of better than 55% to 89% of all test scores Nationally. The highest score at the 90% mark of National test scores was well over a standard deviation above the National mean score. The 3 day student scores that fell below the 40% mark were still within the standard deviation of 17.8 from the National Mean of 154.4. Of the four Evening students tested, the highest score was at the 55% mark, with the two others at the 40 and 50% marks and still well within a standard deviation of the National Mean. One Evening outlier was at the 7% mark and almost 2 standard deviations below the average.

From the range of these scores and considering they only represent 13 students in all, no statistically valid conclusions may be made. However, so far the Day program can say a majority of our students tested score better than the National average on the Major Field Test in Literature, while the Evening scores fell within a standard deviation of the national average except for one outlier. Overall Day scores were better than Evening, but statistically not by much and the number is small enough to make any conclusions questionable at best.

PORTFOLIOS

Students in ENGL 431 submitted portfolios in addition to their research project in ENGL 431. The new English major put in place last year requires a portfolio representing a students' cumulative work at Columbia College be submitted as a component of ENGL 431. Beyond this initial structure, no assessment strategies had yet been designed. Tying students' grades in ENGL 431 to the portfolio at all will be impossible until the program has been in place for 4 years so that incoming freshmen are introduced to this requirement of their Senior Seminar class. We have begun developing portfolio assessment strategies that we will begin implementing in the fall. For these strategies, please see section on proposed Portfolio Assessment.

SENIOR ESSAYS

Senior Seminar papers of 20 to 25 pages with Bibliographies of at least 25 sources were submitted.

5. Faculty analysis of results (extent to which learning goals were met):

MFT SCORES

From these scores, we believe our department is meeting a significant number of its learning goals.
However, these tests really measure a combined course load from our old English major and from the two new tracks created in the new English major. Until our new major has been in place for more than 4 years it would be inaccurate to say MFT scores represent our current curriculum.

SENIOR ESSAYS
As the instructor for ENGL 431 last fall, I graded the submitted research essays. Please see attached Assessment of the Major form "Program Summary." These comments all directly relate to the quality of senior essays submitted. Need for better preparation in organization and revision of longer research essays emerged as a concern overall. This is being addressed in our new Sophomore Seminar (ENGL 221) course offering and will not be assessable in ENGL 431 until students who have taken ENGL 221 begin taking ENGL 431. This will happen in the next year as students who took ENGL 431 on the old track are filtered out.

6. Recommendations for improvement:

In reducing the course requirements from our old English Major by 20 hours to our current English major requirement of 45 hours, we significantly reduced the breadth of elective offerings for our students. We believe the reduction in breadth could be significant enough as to show in lower MFT scores eventually. Because of this, the department is considering adding prerequisites to some 300 and 400-level courses to require some work in general education 200-level courses in English that were required for the major in the past but are not now. These 200-level general education surveys have been traditionally (with the old program) responsible for the breadth that has helped a majority of our current Day students score above the National Mean on the MFT.
Assessment of the Major

Instructions: Please complete this form and submit online. The objectives are those listed in the master syllabus for this course. You are to estimate the proportion of students in your culminating experience class who meet the objectives at the levels indicated. All boxes expand to accommodate your narrative. After completing the assessment, close the document and click 'yes' when the computer prompts you to save the changes to the document. Forward the email that the assessment came in (with the form attached) to tmobergmeister@ccis.edu.

Instructor’s Name: Danny Campbell  Campus: Columbia Day

Course Prefix, #, Section, Title: ENGL 431 A

Term: Fall 2005  Date Submitted: December 21, 2005

Guidelines: Rank each of the objectives using the following rankings:

4 = Strong (STR) outstanding performance in field of study; exceeds expectations.
3 = Satisfactory (SAT) performance meets the expected level.
2 = Needs Growth (NG) need for improvement.
1 = Unsatisfactory (UNSAT) overall performance is not acceptable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives in the Major</th>
<th>STR</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>UNSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrate critical writing skills at a level sufficient to show mastery of basic critical and theoretical concerns in the English discipline. | # =4 | # =1 | # =5 | # =
|                          | % =40 | % =10 | % =50 | % =
| Recognize the terminology of major schools of literary criticism. | # =4 | # = | # =6 | # =
|                          | % =40 | % = | % =60 | % =
| Demonstrate mastery of canonical literature in multiple genres. | # =4 | # =4 | # =2 | # =
|                          | % =40 | % =4 | % =20 | % =
| Demonstrate advanced revisionary capabilities. | # =4 | # =1 | # =5 | # =
|                          | % =40 | % =10 | % =50 | % =
| Demonstrate complete mastery of MLA citation and research methodology. | # =8 | # = | # =2 | # =
|                          | % =80 | % = | % =20 | % =
|                          | # = | # = | # = | # =
|                          | % = | % = | % = | % =
|                          | # = | # = | # = | # =
|                          | % = | % = | % = | % =
|                          | # = | # = | # = | # =
|                          | % = | % = | % = | % =
|                          | # = | # = | # = | # =
|                          | % = | % = | % = | % =

Academic Affairs 4/05
Descriptive Evidence of Performance: Please check all data used to complete this form. Multiple measures should be used.

Evidence: □ Tests □ Papers □ Oral Presentations □ Audiovisual Materials

□ Other; Please list: ____________________________________________________________

Program Summary

Observed strengths of the degree program:
Based on the senior projects and work done in this class, the program seems strong in training students in research methodology. It does an acceptable job in developing critical writing skills, mastery of canonical literature and developing a basic level of understanding of major theoretical movements.

Observed weaknesses of the degree program:
Program needs to foster better revision skills in advanced writers.

Recommended proposed strategies to improve content in program:
Revision and continued work on critical writing skills must be a constant focus in the program’s core and elective courses.

Recommended proposed strategies to improve instruction in program:
Focusing coursework more clearly on writing and revision skills throughout the program will lead to improved skills of senior-level students.

Personal strategies implemented from prior report and results:
The attempt was made in this course to give students ownership of their own research and focus on deadlines for multiple drafts of final project that were more clearly drawn than when I taught course last. The deadlines helped in some instances and not in others. Earlier deadlines need to be instituted as well as a greater grade percentage tied to these deadlines next time course is taught. Also, decision upon appropriate research projects needs to be arrived at more quickly and definitively. Earlier deadlines for more complete project outlines, which are more clearly prescribed, should improve this next time I teach the course.
English Major Portfolio Assessment Structure

Students in ENGL 431 “Senior Seminar” will submit a portfolio representing their best written work produced during the course of the major.

CONTENTS

For majors in the literature emphasis the portfolio will include:

- One critical essay from an English class in each of the student’s freshman, sophomore, junior and senior years.

For majors in the creative writing emphasis the portfolio will include:

- a selection of poetry and/or fiction from each of the student’s freshman, sophomore, junior and senior years.

Majors in both emphases will also submit

- An “Academic Biography” or narrative of intellectual growth explaining how they have developed as a thinker, writer, and as a person during the course of the major.
- The critical essays completed as part of the grading requirement for both Sophomore and Senior Seminar courses.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

English majors will submit the portfolio to the professor teaching ENGL 431 organized in a ringbinder in the following order:

Title Page
Table of Contents
(including Title, Course number, Professor, and Semester of each essay piece in the portfolio)
Academic Biography
Senior Seminar Essay
Sophomore Seminar Essay
Representative Critical Essays / Creative Works

All materials will be submitted in fresh unmarked copies formatted according to MLA guidelines.
ASSESSMENT

At least two English faculty in addition to the senior seminar instructor will assess each portfolio.

The portfolio will be measured in terms of the quality of the overall product, with particular emphasis on the senior seminar essay and on the demonstration of intellectual growth.

Portfolios should demonstrate a steady development toward

- Outstanding composition, carefully crafted and compelling argumentative writing
- Detailed knowledge of literature, literary technique, and vocabulary of literary criticism.
- Familiarity with literary theory & research methods suitable to an entering graduate student
- Mastery of MLA format

After individual consideration and discussion the assessors will award the portfolio a rank as follows:

Superior Quality (A)
High Quality (B)
Satisfactory Quality (C)

In the case of disagreement the decision of a 2/3 or 3/4 majority of assessing faculty will apply.

Other Considerations

What about students who transfer into the major with English credit from other institutions? It seems reasonable to let students know precisely which faculty read their portfolio. I think we should write a formal response to the students providing responses and constructive critique (as one might receive for example from a colleague, editor, manuscript reader). The grade students receive for their senior seminar essay should obviously be graded independently by the instructor of record, its assessment by the other faculty should be restricted to its contribution to the portfolio as a capstone task. An unsatisfactory portfolio must be resubmitted to the assessing faculty?