

Department: ECTA Date: 5/10/19
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: L ZumHofe, G Haley, L. Ashby
General Education Assessment Plan: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology
<p>Analysis of artifacts:</p> <p>1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Analysis papers from Eng 201 were scored using a standardized rubric (see next page)</p>
<p>Summary of RESULTS*:</p> <p>1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> How well does the paper show consideration of the purpose, audience, and circumstances of the writing?</p> <p>2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i></p> <p>76% of the papers were scored were at level 3 or higher,</p> <p>3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). 76% of the papers were scored were at level 3 or higher, indicating that 76% of the papers showed an adequate to thorough understanding of these items.-----In the scoring breakdown, 36% of the papers ranked at 4 (thorough understanding), 40% ranked at 3 (adequate understanding), 20% ranked at 2 (beginning/some awareness), and 3% were at 1 (minimal attention/awareness to the elements), and 1% were at zero (no consideration).-----Our aim in the assessment was to have 70% of the papers score at the 3 level or higher on the rubric, so the aim was achieved. Students are able to show consideration of the purpose, audience and circumstances of writing in a literary analysis paper.</p> <p>4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i></p>
<p>Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 5/10/19 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> The results were shared at a department meeting <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> L ZumHofe, E Lamm, G Haley, P Koprince, B Moore, T Beck, L Ashby</p>
<p>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</p> <p>1. ACTION*- <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i></p> <p>a. <i>Teaching:</i> We will continue to teach literary analysis in the same manner.</p> <p>b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> The assignment and supplemental materials on how to write a literary analysis paper will be continued.</p> <p>c. <i>Program:</i> Literary analysis is will continue to be emphasized as part of our gen ed curriculum.</p> <p>d. <i>Assessment:</i> Our department feels that we would like to assess a different goal in the future.</p> <p>2. IMPACT*- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> We anticipate that learning outcomes will continue to be the same or better in the next academic year.</p> <p>3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> None</p>
<p>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</p>
<p><i>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</i> We would like to assess a different learning outcome for the future. We have assessed analysis goals for several years now, so we believe we should turn our attention to other, equally-important learning outcomes.</p>
<p>Submitted by: L Ashby & L ZumHofe Assessment Committee Reviewed: 6/11/19 Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed: 6/11/19 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na</p>

