

Part 1. General Information

Program(s) Discussed:	Department of English – Creative Writing and Professional Writing Majors.
Current Semester:	Spring 2018
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 17, 2018
Participants in Assessment Meeting(s):	Tom Pace, Phil Metres, George Bilgere

All Annual Assessment Reports are available to the appropriate Associate Dean, Dean, and the Provost, as well as to other administrators for institutional effectiveness and accreditation purposes. Please indicate the degree to which your program would like this information more widely shared.

On-Campus Users

- Freely available
- Available upon request
- Unavailable

Off-Campus Users

- Freely available
- Available upon request
- Unavailable

Part 2. Assessment Process

2A. Learning Goals

Learning Goals for the Creative Writing Track

Students will

1. Read texts with active, critical skill to form and articulate accomplished interpretations.
2. Produce *multiple drafts of original creative works that are honed and revised through the peer workshop process.*
3. Produce *written analyses of creative texts* that demonstrate awareness of audience, artistic form, organizational sophistication, and clear argumentation.
4. Recognize the employment and contextual use of the formal elements of language and genre.
5. Build oral communication skills by listening to others' ideas and articulating their own responses and questions clearly to situate themselves in the conversation.
6. Gain knowledge of cultural and historical contexts of Anglophone and translated creative works that enhance their appreciation for the voices either within or marginalized by the texts.

We met to discuss how the portfolio and cover letter address the learning goals for the creative writing program. The creative writing faculty, Phil Metres and George Bilgere, each semester read the final portfolios for the creative writing program. During the meeting, we discussed each learning outcome.

2B. Measuring Learning

Prompt: In one or two paragraphs, describe your assessment process. What tools did you use to attempt to measure student learning? Where and how were they administered? Who scored them?

We met to discuss the learning outcomes for the creative writing program and to recommend suggestions for updating the portfolio requirements and the language of the learning outcomes.

Part 3. Findings

Prompt: Describe, in words, what your program learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were your strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals you set for them? Along with this report, please submit the data charts the program used during the assessment meeting.

Overall, we learned that the content in the portfolios is meeting expectations and addressing the learning outcomes for CW. But, we also learned that the reflective letters do not address the learning outcomes. One solution is to specify for students to reflect on something they wrote early compared to late.

We learned that we would like to make some changes to the portfolio requirements for the creative writing students. In their cover statement, we would like for them to give us an example of something they wrote in an early course contrasted with something they wrote later and show how they have grown – who they were at the beginning versus who they are at the end.

We learned that Learning Outcome #1 could be addressed more in the cover statement. We would like for students to reflect more on their poetics. One suggestions that arose in the discussion would be to mimic learning outcomes language in the prep guide instructors give seniors in the CW major.

We also discussed the language of Learning Outcome #3. We will suggest for the department eliminate the statement, “Produce written analysis of creative texts,” as this is something that doesn’t happen in CW courses.

We also questioned how we assess oral conversation about poems/fiction from Learning Outcomes #5. We recommend removing the word “oral” from Learning Outcome #5 and, instead, grade their written critiques of others’ work as a way of assessing their ability to critique others’ work.

We also discussed eliminating Learning Outcome #6 from the CW learning outcomes. It doesn’t apply to the material addressed in the class. We discussed replacing it with language about the role of craft and the ability to write.

Name(s) of file(s) containing data charts: [N/A]

Part 4. Planned Changes to the Assessment System

4A. Changes to the Assessment System

Prompt: What changes, if any, do you need to make to your assessment system? (Questions to consider include: 1) Do your measures and processes provide useful data with a reasonable amount of effort? and 2) Are your measures reliable, valid, and sufficient?) On which student learning goals do you plan to focus your attention during the next assessment cycle? Do you need to implement additional formative assessment tools to better understand some of your findings? If so, describe those here.

Based on the APR Visit Team Report from Spring 2018, the English department needs to make its assessment system more systematic. While our procedures so far have provided some useful data, the process is not as systematic as it should be. They noted the following:

In assessment, faculty members are working hard but not as systematically as they should. Current direct assessment involves sampling of graded papers from courses, which a small

committee assesses on a different learning goal each year. Assessment discussions have appropriately led to the recognition that learning goals may need to be revised and to pedagogical changes (specifically, greater attention given to form and genre in 200-level survey courses). The APR report notes that literature majors take the Major Field Test (MFAT): then, “The department sporadically evaluates the students’ sub-scores on the MFAT to determine how we might better teach our majors and minors” (3). The word *sporadically* led the external reviewers to ask why such evaluation was sporadic rather than systematic (APR Visit Team Report p. 4-5).

4B. Changes to the Program in Response to Data

Prompt: What changes, if any, do you need to make to your program in response to what you now know about student learning? (Possibilities include changes to learning goals, pedagogy, assignments in particular classes, activities, and curricular requirements and/or structure.) What is your anticipated timeline for both implementation and assessment of the planned changes?

Based on the findings of the May 2018 meeting, we will update the learning goals for the CW major during the 2018-19 academic year.

Part 5. Institutional Assessment Committee Interactions

5A. Feedback from IAC

Prompt: Briefly summarize the feedback you received from the Institutional Assessment Committee about your last report.

The IAC reported that the English department’s investment of time and energy is balanced by the value of the insights they are drawing from the data and that the department’s plan of action does follow from the data. In addition, the IAC noted that the department’s learning goals and outcomes are exemplary and that the process used to evaluate student learning is satisfactory. The IAC also suggested the following changes: “Possibly consider increasing the sample size. I believe the program evaluated 9/75 student papers. They may get a better picture with a slightly higher sample size. However, I understand that may not be feasible and the program may have felt that they had a good picture based on the 9 evaluated.”

5B. Response to Feedback

Prompt: Briefly describe how your program has made use of the feedback.

[N/A]

5C. Request for Feedback

Prompt: Do you have questions or concerns you would like the IAC or the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to address?

It may be useful for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to visit the English department meeting to address how the department can make program assessment more systematic and useful to the department overall.

Part 6. Evidence

6A. Of Changes

Prompt: Look at previous Annual Assessment Reports to see what changes that the program planned to make at that time. If the changes have been made, please submit evidence of the change (department meeting minutes, syllabi or Bulletin pages from before and after the change). If you have decided to not make change, please provide your rationale.

The department is in the process of updating the major, based on the APR Visit Team Report.

6B. of Impact of Changes

Prompt: Consider the changes reported in Part VI of this and previous reports. What impact has the change had? When the impact of the changes has been assessed, discuss whether changes have had the intended impact and how you know. If the change is too recent or assessment is ongoing, you may wait for a future report.

As a department, we have not addressed these changes. This is one of the issues the next assessment director will need to address.

6C. Academic Program Review Action Plan Update

Prompt: If your program has completed an Academic Program Review since 2011, please review your Action Plan from your most recent Academic Program Review, and add a column indicating the progress made on each item. Attach your update to this report.

See above.