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1. **Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)**
2. List each program SLO and indicate the highest cognitive level it represents. To accommodate more than four SLOs, add rows as needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcomes** | **Bloom’s Taxonomy**  **Cognitive Level**  *(check highest level represented in the SLO)* |
| **SLO 1: Demonstrates the ability to analyze and interpret texts in a senior paper or project** | ☐ Knowledge ☒ Analysis  ☐ Comprehension ☐ Synthesis  ☐ Application ☐ Evaluation |
| **SLO 2: Demonstrates the ability to incorporate research in a senior paper or project** | ☐ Knowledge ☐ Analysis  ☐ Comprehension ☒ Synthesis  ☐ Application ☐ Evaluation |
| **SLO 3:** **Demonstrates the ability to use effective prose style in a senior paper or project** | ☐ Knowledge ☐ Analysis  ☐ Comprehension ☐ Synthesis  ☒ Application ☐ Evaluation |
| **SLO 4:** | ☐ Knowledge ☐ Analysis  ☐ Comprehension ☐ Synthesis  ☐ Application ☐ Evaluation |

1. SLOs reflect professional standards as dictated by an accreditation or other external body. Yes ☒ No ☐
2. Describe how stakeholders are involved in the creation and/or review of SLOs as well as how SLOs are communicated to stakeholders.

**II. Assessment Methods**

1. Complete a table for each SLO. If an SLO is assessed by more than one measure, complete tables for each measure. Duplicate the table as needed to accommodate the number of measures. Attach copies of rubrics.

**Method of Collection**

We have been collecting senior papers in the CNF track since Fall of 2016. We collect papers every semester, but because some students take more than one class, we only assess one of their papers at the 4000 level. Papers were collected by the English Department Coordinator, who identified senior English majors by reviewing class rosters. Once the papers have been collected, they were scrubbed of identifying information. We do not have enough artifacts to create a random sample.

**Method of Assessment for SLO 3**

A team of six readers met on Oct. 25 from 10-12:30 to assess a group of 18 papers. The team normed two papers and discussed criteria for rating using the attached rubric (ratings 1-4 with 4 being the highest). We counted a paper as proficient if it received a 2 or higher. Each paper was rated by two readers and given a score. Rater reliability was determined based on an exact match or within one number (i.e. 3 and 4, 2 and 3). Based on this system we had 94.4% agreement. One paper needed a third reader. After all papers were read and rated, the team discussed some of the findings (discussed under Decisions). The team concluded that the rubric was an effective instrument for assessing the CNF papers.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 1:** | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure** | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** | |
| 1. **Domain**   *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☒ Product ☐ Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☐ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☐ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☐ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of**   **Data Collection** | ☐ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency**   **Threshold** | *Describe:* |
| 1. **Program**   **Proficiency**  **Target** | *Describe:* |
|  | |
| **SLO 2:** | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** | |
| 1. **Domain**   *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☐ Product ☐ Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☐ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☐ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☐ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of**   **Data Collection** | ☐ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency**   **Threshold** | *Describe:* |
| 1. **Program**   **Proficiency**  **Target** | *Describe:* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 3:** | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure: : Senior CNF (Creative Nonfiction) papers** | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO**   Papers were collected from the CNF classes and evaluated on students’ ability to demonstrate elements of prose style appropriate for creative nonfiction. | |
| 1. **Domain**   *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☒ Product ☐ Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☒ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☒ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: In a 4000 level creative nonfiction course |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☐ All students ☒ Sample of students - Describe below  Senior English majors in 4000 level creative nonfiction classes |
| 1. **Frequency of**   **Data Collection** | ☐ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☒ Other - Describe below  We collect papers and projects on a continual basis every semester |
| 1. **Proficiency**   **Threshold** | *Describe:*  Papers will be proficient if they receive a 4 or higher (See results table and rubric) |
| 1. **Program**   **Proficiency**  **Target** | *Describe:*  *80%* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 4:** | |
| 1. **Title of the Measure:** | |
| 1. **Describe How the Measure Aligns to the SLO** | |
| 1. **Domain**   *Check all that apply* | ☐ Examination ☐ Product ☐ Performance |
| 1. **Type** | ☐ Direct Measure ☐ Indirect Measure |
| 1. **Point in Program Assessment is Administered** | ☐ In final term of program ☐ In final year of program  Where does the assessment occur: |
| 1. **Population Measured** | ☐ All students ☐ Sample of students - Describe below |
| 1. **Frequency of**   **Data Collection** | ☐ Once/semester ☐ Once/year ☐ Other - Describe below |
| 1. **Proficiency**   **Threshold** | *Describe:* |
| 1. **Program**   **Proficiency**  **Target** | *Describe:* |

B. Describe any indirect measures or additional data the program uses to complement the direct measures of SLOs.



**III. Data Collection and Analysis**

A. Results Table – Report results for each SLO. If an SLO was assessed by multiple measures, report data for each measure. Add rows as needed to accommodate the number of SLOs and measures.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Data Collection Date Range** | **Number of Students Assessed** | **Percentage of Students who Met/Exceeded Threshold**  **Proficiency** |
| **SLO 1 – Measure one** |  |  |  |
| **SLO 1 – Measure two**  *(if applicable)* |  |  |  |
| **SLO 2 – Measure one** |  |  |  |
| **SLO 2 – Measure two**  *(if applicable)* |  |  |  |
| **SLO 3 – Measure one** | Fall 2016-Spring 2019 | 18 | 94.4% |
| ***SLO 3 – Measure two***  *(if applicable)* |  |  |  |
| **SLO 4 – Measure one** |  |  |  |
| **SLO 4 – Measure two**  *(if applicable)* |  |  |  |
| Note: To maintain student confidentiality, programs with low enrollments can aggregate data across multiple cycles. Programs with adequate enrollments to maintain student confidentiality should report three or more individual cycles (by semesters or academic year) of data. | | | |

1. SLO Status Table – Based on the results reported in the above table and referring to the program proficiency target, indicate the current status of program SLOs as Met, Partially Met, Not Met, or Unknown. Add rows as needed to accommodate additional SLOs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SLO 1 | ☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ Unknown |
| SLO 2 | ☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ Unknown |
| SLO 3 | ☒ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ Unknown |
| SLO 4 | ☐ Met ☐ Partially Met ☐ Not Met ☐ Unknown |

C. Describe how results are communicated within the program. Address each SLO.

**IV. Decisions and Actions**

Briefly describe specific decisions and actions related to each SLO. Include who (e.g., program faculty, a faculty committee, etc.) made the decision, when the decision was made (e.g., faculty retreat, faculty meeting, etc.), what data informed the decision, and a timeline for actions taken or to be taken. Add rows as needed to accommodate additional SLOs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SLO 1** | Last year (Sp 2019) we organized a thesis workshop based on the results of SLO 1, but it was poorly attended. We will plan another similar workshop this semester and will advertise it to faculty and students. |
| **SLO 2** | Not assessed this cycle |
| **SLO 3** | We agreed that the assessment rubric helped readers see specific elements or components (under criteria) more clearly. A number of writers used dialogue with intentionality; some examples had especially nuanced dialogue. Successful profile assignments demonstrated humanistic portrayals of subjects. Some students demonstrated mastery of SLO 3 in part, but struggled to sustain it throughout the whole paper. Although we were encouraged that so many students mastered this SLO, we found it challenging to isolate this SLO from other factors, such as focus and structure. However, we did note informally that focus was consistently maintained in the set of papers examined. We realize how much we are asking of students to demonstrate mastery of all the SLOs.  We have asked the instructors to include the assignment with each paper submitted, but will work on gathering a greater number. (We found that having the assignment would help determine assessments of some artifacts.)  We reported the results to the GPC (at a meeting) and the Department (at a meeting), but we plan to meet with the CNF faculty to determine what actions would be most beneficial and how the Assessment Committee could participate. |
| **SLO 4** |  |

**V.** **Additional Information**