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Enter the number and text of the SLO in this box (we post reports by SLO)
SLO #1: Students will demonstrate the ability to read closely in a variety of forms, styles, structures, and modes, and articulate the value of close reading in the study of literature, creative writing, or rhetoric.

Initial Evidence of Student Learning:

Based on discussions at Curriculum Committee meetings as well as feedback from faculty the English Department went through a process of revising and streamlining its SLOs in 2009-2010. At the end of the process, the Department articulated five specific SLOs for the B.A. program and also set up a five-year schedule to assess these revised SLOs. In accordance with this schedule the Department aimed at assessing SLO#1 in 2010-2011.

SLO#1 focuses on the most basic or fundamental skill that all English majors are expected to learn and demonstrate: the skill of close reading, which includes the ability to anticipate, comprehend, infer, deduce, analyze, and critique the substantive as well as formal aspects of different kinds of texts.

Change(s) to Curriculum or Pedagogy:

The Department chose to assess SLO#1 through data from two classes required for all English majors: English 100W (junior-level writing workshop) and English 193 (senior-level capstone seminar). Both classes involve intensive reading, reflecting, analyzing and writing about a variety of literary texts. From
English 100W, the common final exam was chosen as suitable for assessing SLO#1 because it requires students to do close reading and explication of a poem. Scoring of the final exam is based on a set rubric to ensure reliability. Students' scores from the exam would demonstrate the level of their ability to “read closely in a variety of forms, styles, structures, and modes.” From English 193, the portfolio was chosen as suitable for assessing SLO#1 because it requires students to reflect on and revise essays written in previous classes. The contents of the portfolio not only illustrate “the value of close reading in the study of literature, creative writing, or rhetoric” but also “articulate” that value in the form of self-reflections and revisions. Instructor-assigned grades on the quality of the portfolios would serve as indicators of student achievement levels. The Department’s plan was to systematically compare the students’ 100W final exam scores with their grades on the 193 portfolios as evidence of the levels at which they were meeting SLO#1.

Regrettably, the assessment process did not work out as planned. Although the Department had been maintaining data on 100W final exam scores for as long as the course has existed, when the staff person who oversaw the filing of this data was suddenly laid off over the summer of 2010, it appears that the Office Administrator, Cookie Galvan, unfortunately disposed of this material. While the Department does have the actual 100W exams from Fall 2010, these could not be used for assessment purposes because approximately 40% of the students who take English 100W are not English majors, and because the Department no longer has access to the original class rosters that indicate the students’ majors, the exam scores do not provide an accurate reading of how well English majors did on the exam. If the Department had adequate office staff, it would be possible to find out which students were English majors and which not, but at present, the Department does not have that luxury. Further, because most of the students in English 193 took English 100W prior to Fall 2010, their exams are no longer available, and without the missing data the Department is unable to make the planned comparisons.

Evidence of Student Learning after Change.

Fall 2010: Under the circumstances, the Department based its assessment of SLO#1 on the portfolio grades of students who took English 193 in Fall 2010. Using those grades as evidence for the levels at which our students have met SLO#1, the Department is able to provide the following information: 44% met the SLO at an A level; 19% at a B level; 18% at a C level; 13% at a D level; and 6% failed to meet the SLO.

Spring 2011: The Department also used the English 100W final exam data for this current semester, which indicates that English majors are meeting SLO#1 at the following levels: 8% at an A level; 29% at a B level; 29% at a C level; 28% at a D level; and 16% failed to meet the SLO.

Fall 2011 and Beyond: It is clear the Department needs to improve the process of gathering and filing data in order to get results that are more detailed and useful for making improvements to student learning of SLO#1. Without 100W final exam data going back several years, individual student progress between 100W and 193 cannot be systematically tracked; only group progress can be measured or assessed. The Department therefore needs to begin collecting 100W final exam data once again. To further enhance the quantity and quality of data gathered, the Department proposes to make student response to all five English major SLOs a required part of the self-reflection component of the 193 portfolio. The self-report questionnaire administered to 193 students could also be refined to yield more useable data.