1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication:

ENGL4800

2. Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:

n/a

3. Assessment Method(s): Explain how assessment for this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method.)

A check list was developed to assess the learning outcomes. Students in ENGL4800 developed term papers on the basis of primary literary and secondary critical sources text during the course. Twenty-four students submitted electronic copies of their final papers. The papers were assessed by six faculty members of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. Two committee members evaluated each paper with yes/no responses to the five questions above. If the raters disagreed on a question, a third rater judged the paper. Initial inter-rater reliability was 88.1.

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:

n/a

5. Findings: (what add assessment data tell you about student proficiency in this outcome?)

Assessment Results: Students performed at the following levels by item:
1. One hundred percent of the students produced a sustained analysis of a literary text.
2. Seventy-one percent of the students were able to analyze a literary genre.
3. Eighty percent of the students produced effective research papers.
4. Eighty-eight percent of students established an acceptable critical voice
5. Eighty-eight percent of students discussed literary movements and period.
Looking at the data another way, the results indicate that fifty-four percent of the students met all five criteria. Twenty-nine percent of the students met four criteria. Thirteen percent of the students met three criteria, one student met one criterion

6. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement? (What questions/issues/concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department/program take as a result of this analysis?)

The program is largely accomplishing its stated objectives with slightly more than half of the students meeting all of the learning objectives. The results were shared with area faculty with an eye to further improving student achievement. Analysis of rater responses suggests raters are interpreting question 2 differently. A rater training session is scheduled for January with an eye to enhancing inter-rater reliability for this assessment item.
7. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)

Submitted by Cheryl Grisham for R. Sabino (attachment is the original doc)

8. Committee Comments

3.8/4 - Robin has the wrong track name for Professional Writing and she needed to explain that the uploaded document for Professional Writing was the same that all the other tracks used for assessment.
Assessment of Literature Track
Spring 2012
Prepared by R. Sabino, October 1, 2012

Departmental Learning outcome: Students in the ENGL 4800, the literature capstone, will demonstrate effective written communication skills in the form of a substantial research paper of at least twenty pages. Specifically, papers were judged on the
1. analysis of literary texts
2. analysis of literary genres
3. creation of an effective research paper
4. ability to establish a compelling critical voice
5. ability to discuss literary movements and period

Assessment Method: A check list was developed to assess the learning outcomes. Students in ENGL4800 developed term papers on the basis of primary literary and secondary critical sources text during the course. Twenty-four students submitted electronic copies of their final papers. The papers were assessed by six faculty members of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. Two committee members evaluated each paper with yes/no responses to the five questions above. If the raters disagreed on a question, a third rater judged the paper.

Initial inter-rater reliability was 88.1.

Assessment Results: Students performed at the following levels by item:

1. One hundred percent of the students produced a sustained analysis of a literary text.
2. Seventy-one percent of the students were able to analyze a literary genre.
3. Eighty percent of the students produced effective research papers.
4. Eighty-eight percent of students established an acceptable critical voice
5. Eighty-eight percent of students discussed literary movements and period.

Looking at the data another way, the results indicate that fifty-four percent of the students met all five criteria. Twenty-nine percent of the students met four criteria. Thirteen percent of the students met three criteria, one student met one criterion.

Conclusion and Recommendations: The program is largely accomplishing its stated objectives with slightly more than half of the students meeting all of the learning objectives. The results were shared with area faculty with an eye to further improving student achievement. Analysis of rater responses suggests raters are interpreting question 2 differently. A rater training session is scheduled for January with an eye to enhancing inter-rater reliability for this assessment item.