

2021 – 22 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: ECTA	Date: 5/31/2022
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: all ECTA FT faculty	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: <i>a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology</i>	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Each paper was scored on the two items listed below. The overall scores were averaged. Item 1: Terminology (5) Superior: The poetic terms and their definitions are correctly used with no errors (4) Above average: The poetic terms and their definitions are used correctly with minor errors (3) Average: Uses poetic terms but has notable errors in the definition of a term or occasionally substitutes incorrect vocabulary for the term (2) Developing: Uses some poetic terms but mostly defines them incorrectly or has a general sense of a poetic device but generally does not use the correct term for the device (1) Failing: Does not use poetic terminology or uses terms entirely incorrectly Item 2: Identification and Application (5) Superior: Correctly identifies all pertinent poetic devices in the text (4) Above average: Correctly identifies most poetic devices in the text with minor errors (3) Average: Identifies some poetic devices but skips a few others or notably misidentifies several (2) Developing: Mostly incorrect identification of poetic devices in the text (1) Filing: Entirely misses or misidentifies poetic devices in the text	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> How well are students able to correctly identify the kinds of poetic devices used within a text? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.)</i> The class average score was 9.5 out of ten. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The students scored well above average in their use of poetic terminology, identification and application. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> We had to change item two to examine all "pertinent" poetic devices rather than "all" poetic devices. This was because the students focused their analysis to support a specific thesis statement. It would be unreasonable to expect them to identify and discuss every single poetic device when it was not pertinent to their argument. We also noted that our sample pool was small (only 6 in the class).	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> At the April, 2022, ECTA department meeting <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Met as a department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Beck, Lamm, Koprince, Moore, ZumHofe, Haley, ZumHofe, Ashby	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> We will continue current teaching of poetic devices, identification and application b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> We will continue the poetry analysis assignment as is. c. <i>Program:</i> We will continue the Poetry Writing class in the program. d. <i>Assessment:</i> If we had two classes that had a poetry analysis during the same semester or year, we could use both of them for assessment. This might provide us with a larger sample set. 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 student achievement would continue at superior levels. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> none	
If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.	
What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? We could examine other literary devices in different genres to ensure that analysis is consistent across	

all types of literature.

Submitted by: Lisa Ashby

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/14/22

Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed: 6/14/22

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na