English PLO Assessment Report

Assessment Plan

In the 2015 - 2016 cycle, the English program assessed two learning outcomes by examining the ten most recent capstone portfolios.

- Outcome 6: Examine the ways in which texts shape and/or are shaped by history, culture, and context.
- Outcome 7: Respond to and analyze diverse texts from various cultures.

Students generated portfolios, working with one mentor in their final semester, and a 3-4 member committee assessed these portfolios to provide the student feedback on their progress and achievements. For these program assessments, different faculty readers read the portfolios, looking just at these two outcomes, using rubrics generated for the purpose. The results were good, but the faculty felt this method was very time consuming, so we considered the following question:

- Is it necessary to do this separate analysis, or can we rely on portfolio committee reports on the portfolios?

Assessment Findings

Committee reports were not available for many of the portfolios. Of those that were (5 reports), only 2 of them explicitly assessed each outcome.

For student 3, the portfolio committee concluded she met expectations on both outcome six and outcome seven, while the result of the assessment indicates that she met outcome six and exceeded expectations on outcome 7. For student 9, the committee concluded that she exceeded expectations on both outcomes while the assessment concluded that she met expectations for outcome six and exceeded them for outcome 7.

For students 1, 5, and 6 there was a blanket statement by the committee that the students had exceeded expectations on all outcomes. The assessment concurred for outcome six for students 5 and 6 but found student 1 only met expectations. For outcome 7, the assessment found that student 1 only approached expectations and students 5 and 6 met expectations.

Conclusion:

So far, it does not seem like the portfolio committee’s results, as they try to evaluate the whole portfolio and the student’s story of growth during the major, in the present form can be used as a substitute for a learning assessment like this one. However, ideally we would like to avoid the need for re-reading past portfolios.
Action Plan

Revising Portfolio evaluation process to support assessment more efficiently

Details:

1. Revamp guide to mentors and instructions for portfolio review committees
   Mentors should emphasize to the student importance of considering achievement of the outcomes in the essay and that the student can talk about classroom experiences and written or oral work not chosen for the portfolio in the reflection essay.

2. Students should continue to select the pieces that best represent the story he or she is telling in the reflective essay and portfolio, but in the course of assembling the portfolio, the student and mentor will consider and discuss other student work that the mentor can refer to when assessing the student’s achievement.

3. The committee should explicitly consider all program learning outcomes and the level of student achievement when reviewing the portfolios. Detailed notes should be made for program review that draw on the portfolio itself, the reflective essay, and, as necessary and applicable, the mentor’s knowledge of other student work, and other committee members’ knowledge of the student’s performance in their classes. Committee members will save the detailed notes for future program assessments, at the same time and in addition to the report for the student. This should eliminate the need for re-reading the portfolios in order to use them as a learning assessment measure.

4. Mentors need to make sure to upload the committee reports and the outcomes assessments to nexus.

Implementation Plan:

Curriculum committee to discuss revision of guide to mentors Fall 2015; revisions to be made and tested spring 2016, outcomes assessment for each portfolio to be recorded going forward. Once ten portfolios are available (probably by fall 2018 or earlier), use for next assessment.

Responsible Personnel:

Laurie Leach, curriculum committee, English faculty acting as mentors

Measures:

Have new guidelines and new forms for recording committee reactions been created?
Has data been collected for each portfolio?
Did this information work well in future assessments?

Budget request: $0

Priority: Medium
**Status Report**

**Jan 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status:</th>
<th>In progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional information:</td>
<td>Guidelines were revised and we have begun applying them and collecting the data. Two portfolios have been submitted so far. We attached the new guidelines as supporting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td>Continue collecting the data until we have 10 portfolios and can do another assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Update Fall 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status:</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional information:</td>
<td>8 more portfolios collected in spring 2017. Portfolios used in the 2016-2017 assessments and going forward where program review chair generated the reports by looking for the responses for the outcomes being assessed on the most recent portfolios. This worked well. Currently we have 21 portfolios with assessment data and are continuing to use this procedure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>