

English Learning Assessment Report

1. Assessment Plan

1.a Program Information	
Name of Program (Major)	English
School	Humanities and Sciences
Academic Years Covered by this Plan	2017-18
1.b Primary Faculty Contact	
Name	Blakey Vermeule
Position	Professor/Director of Undergraduate Studies
E-Mail Address	vermeule@stanford.edu
1.c Other Contacts	
Name	John Bender
Position	Professor
E-Mail Address	bender@stanford.edu

1.d Program Mission Statement
<p>To study English at Stanford is to explore -- deeply and rewardingly -- the rich legacy of literature written in English, past and present. We offer a wealth of courses on individual authors, the history of literary genres, literary theory, new media, and creative writing. Given the emphasis on critical thinking and interpretation, the English major is in turn an excellent preparation for many professional fields, including teaching, journalism, law, publishing, medicine, and business.</p>

1.e Undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes
<p>The department expects undergraduate majors in the program to be able to demonstrate the following learning outcomes. These learning outcomes are used in evaluating students and the department's undergraduate program. Students are expected to demonstrate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. an understanding of major theories, methods, and concepts of literary study and critical analysis.2. an awareness of how authors and texts develop in relation to their historical contexts.3. a comprehension of the formal qualities of key literary genres, forms, and styles.4. an effective style of writing and a powerful use of language.

1.f Assessment Design	
Assessment Question	To what extent have our students achieved the learning outcomes of the major and has student writing improved with the continued implementation of the course English 162W, "Writing Intensive Seminar in English" (WISE), in 2017-18
Nature of Student Work or Performance	In 2017-18, 15 students from the three different sections of English 162W, "Writing Intensive Seminar in English," in winter quarter submitted their final paper. The goal of the course is to produce a high-quality final research paper. Courses are oriented around a single text or a small group of texts in conversation with a larger spectrum of scholarship and knowledge in literary criticism and theory, film, painting, or material culture. The small format allows undergraduates to receive detailed commentary and one-on-one feedback on their writing.
How Student Work will be Analyzed	A committee of faculty members, joined ex officio by the departmental chair, assessed the submitted papers using the learning outcomes rubric. The scores were discussed and analyzed and compared to those from a similar sample taken from 19 students enrolled in English 162W in 2015. The goal was to determine to what extent (if any) students' mastery of learning outcomes had improved and to what extent students' writing had improved after taking the Writing Intensive Seminar in English.

Rubric: English Department Portfolio 2017-18

Task Description: Evaluate papers from writing intensive seminars in English: courses devoted to critical methods and writing

1.g Learning Outcomes Rubric				
	Unacceptable	Marginal	Proficient	Exemplary
1. Understanding of relevant theories, methods, and concepts of literary study and critical analysis.	Limited and confused knowledge of literary terminology and critical methodology.	Some appreciation of critical methods.	Substantial understanding of methods of literary interpretation.	Strong understanding of the principles of fundamental literary form, technique, and interpretative strategy.
2. Awareness of the placement of authors and texts in relation to their historical contexts.	Fails to link literary texts to their historical contexts.	Limited range and sketchy understanding of the links between text and context.	Competent knowledge of relevant periods, movements, and cultures.	Deep sense of how literature becomes a crucial representation of human experience at specific times.
3. Comprehension of the nature of literary genre, form, and style.	Little understanding of literary form over time.	Some awareness of formal qualities and of the ability to link literary form to content.	Ability to discuss cogently the form of literary expression and to link it to content and context.	Strong comprehension of how the form of literary expression works in relation to thematic content and cultural context.
4. Effective style of writing and a powerful use of language.	Unconvincing and sloppy comprehension of written style, form, and organization.	Inconsistent mastery of written conventions, a formulaic style, and a choppy structure.	Writes effectively with a mastery of the mechanics of expression and organization.	A stylistic voice that engages the reader with its fresh language and clarity of expression.

2. Collect and Assess Student Work

2.a Timeline of Assessment Activities		
Academic Year	Planned Activities	Actual Assessment Activities Completed
2012-13	Completed the learning outcomes rubric and collected and scored student work from senior seminar.	We completed the assessment plan and finalized the learning outcome rubric. Collected final papers from 17 students enrolled in senior seminar and entered scores in learning outcomes data table.
2014-15	Continued to collect and score student work.	We reconfirmed the assessment plan and finalized the learning outcome rubric for 2014-15. Collected 19 final papers from three sections of writing intensive seminar in its pilot quarter. Scored student papers, and updated scores in table and created comparison chart to measure success of the pilot course re learning outcome and student writing.
2017-18	Continued to collect and score student work.	We reconfirmed the assessment plan and, for the sake of continuity, reused the learning outcome rubric for 2014-15. Collected 15 final papers from three sections of writing intensive seminar in its third year. Scored student papers, and updated scores in table and created comparison chart to test any continued success of the WISE course regarding learning outcome and student writing.

3. Results and Assessment Report (2018)

3.a Learning Outcomes Data Table					
	Unacceptable	Marginal	Proficient	Exemplary	Total Number of Students Assessed on Each Dimension
1. Understanding of relevant theories, methods, and concepts of literary study and critical analysis.	0 (0%)	3 (6.7%)	10 (22.2%)	32 (71.1%)	15
2. Awareness of how authors and texts develop in relation to their historical contexts.	0 (0%)	5 (11.1%)	7 (15.6%)	33 (73.3%)	15
3. Comprehension of the formal qualities of key literary genres, forms, and styles.	0 (0%)	6 (13.3%)	11 (24.4%)	28 (62.2%)	15
4. Effective style of writing and a powerful use of language.	0 (0%)	5 (11.1%)	10 (22.2%)	30 (66.7%)	15

Note: Raw count scores include 45 results per learning outcome (15 essays graded by 3 assessors to equal 45 results).

LEARNING OUTCOMES	N/A			Unacceptable			Marginal			Proficient			Exemplary		
	2013	2015	2018	2013	2015	2018	2013	2015	2018	2013	2015	2018	2013	2015	2018
1. Understanding of major theories, methods, and concepts of literary study and critical analysis	30%	-	-	0%	0%	0%	24%	16%	7%	32%	47%	22%	14%	37%	71%
2. Awareness of how authors and texts develop in relation to their historical contexts.	39%	-	-	6%	0%	0%	10%	6%	11%	32%	47%	16%	13%	47%	73%
3. Comprehension of the formal qualities of key literary genres, forms, and styles.	26%	-	-	2%	0%	0%	23%	0%	13%	32%	47%	24%	17%	53%	62%
4. Effective style of writing and a powerful use of language.	0%	-	-	0%	0%	0%	45%	6%	11%	30%	26%	22%	25%	68%	67%
2013: n=17															
2015: n=19															
2018: n=15															

Note: Learning outcome 3 scores do not equal 100% due to rounding down.

3.b Assessment Report	
Written Summary of Assessment Results	<p>The procedures for assessment in 2018 were close to those used in 2013 and 2015. The same course, English 162W “Writing Intensive Seminar in English” (WISE), was used to assess the continued improvement in senior writing since the development of the WISE courses. These courses were developed in direct response to lower than ideal scores in writing by majors found in the 2013 assessment of the then required Senior Seminar. The attached comparative chart shows the marked improvement, especially in understanding of theories, methods, and concepts; awareness of historical contexts; and comprehension of genres, forms, and styles.</p> <p>The increase in the effectiveness of the WISE seminars as they have developed since 2015 is markedly confirmed by the 2018 assessment. The writing learning outcome (#4) remains relatively constant but the other three learning outcomes (#1-3) improved significantly (an accurate analysis requires that one combine proficient and exemplary scores).</p>
Limitations of the Assessment Results	Comparatively small sample
What mechanisms will you use to share these results with program faculty?	The departmental faculty has approved and has been supervising the WISE courses. Faculty are being notified about the outcomes of these changes.
What changes in the program do these findings suggest?	<p>The present findings reflect changes made in response to the 2013 assessment. A completely new kind of course (WISE) was developed and offered in multiple sections starting in 2014-15. We are continuing with these WISE courses under close faculty supervision.</p> <p>The present outcomes assessment indicates the success of the WISE courses, especially in the marked improved in the understanding of theories, methods, and concepts; awareness of historical contexts; and comprehension of genres, forms, and styles.</p> <p>The value of the WISE courses is clearly affirmed by the analysis; not only does the assessment show steady success as compared to the 2013 assessment, the current assessment shows an improvement in the learning outcomes (#1-3) and steady performance in writing skills as compared to 2015.</p> <p>The department hopes to increase the number of WISE courses in order to ensure accessibility of small sections to its majors. The current evaluation suggests that small section size is crucial to the kind of coaching necessary in the teaching of writing.</p>

	<p>The department and H&S may wish to consider that the positive impact of smaller sections might transfer to the question of section size in other English courses. Possibly, smaller discussion sections can be attempted in the core literature survey (English 10, 11, and 12) on an experimental basis, and some of the methods being employed in WISE might also be considered for those sections.</p>
--	--

3.c Notes for the Next Assessment Cycle

The current assessment indicates improved success with the WISE courses as the program has stabilized during its early phases. The department will continue to evaluate section size in relation to outcomes and will consider this issue in the next assessment. The next assessment also may well affirm the increased scores in the three improved categories that we found in 2018.

The faculty assessment committee recommends the use of the same “learning outcomes” grid for the sake of continuity and to continue using faculty members as assessors.