Capstone II AY17 Program Review: Capstone Rubric & 2017 Aggregate Scores
ENGLISH/WRITING

Assessment Type: Program

   Year/Term: 2016-2017

   Level: English/Writing Capstone

   Learning Outcome: Program Outcomes

   Assessment Method/Tool: Program Outcomes Capstone
Rubric

   Measurement Scale: 3-1

   Sample Size: 21

	Proficient (# of students)		Competent (# of students)		Developing (# of students)	
Aesthetic Analysis	5	83%	1	17%	1	N/A
Civic Engagement	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%
Communication	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%
Content Knowledge	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%
Critical Thinking	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%
Inquiry	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%
Integrated Learning	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%
MEDIAN		86%		14%		0%

    Benchmark:　　　　　**100%**　　Institutional benchmark goal for percent of students to meet
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　"Proficient" or "Adequate" levels

Number Achieving Benchmark:　　　6　**of how many participants?**　　**7**　**Mean: 86%**
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Median: 100%

2017 Closing the Loop Statement

1. Reflections on Subdisciplines and Quality

In 2017, 14 English/Writing majors completed capstones, seven on campus and seven online. The capstones fell into the following subdisciplines:

	On-Campus	Online
Creative Writing	4	1
Rhetoric/Composition	2	0
Literary/Film Analysis	1	5
Professional Writing	0	1
	7	7

A. The one online student who produced a creative project had been an on-campus student for most of her course work. The program needs to consider additional encouragement and support for students to complete **creative capstones online**.

B. The one student who produced professional writing wavered among subdisciplines, including creative writing and grant writing, during the research portion of the capstone and ultimately narrowed to professional writing as the most efficient means to complete the project on time. She had not taken WR 320 Professional Writing, so she taught herself about report-writing using a textbook and instructor feedback. This approach was not optimal but succeeded because the student was exceptional.

C. The quality of literary analysis among the online students was also exceptional, perhaps in part because the capstone instructor's specialty is literary analysis and scaffolding for literary analysis within the program. It would be useful to have some **dialogue among faculty teaching ENGL 136 and 201** regarding ensuring this scaffolding is consistent.

D. The lack of quality in analysis of a television series resulted from the student transferring to EOU late in her career with little apparent understanding of analysis or writing from scholarly research. This student wanted to produce a creative project but had no coursework to support such efforts. It might be helpful to consider **transfer students' program entry point**—how can we be sure that they have the skills their coursework indicates and that they take coursework on time to support a capstone in their preferred subdisciplines?

E. The quality of creative work on campus was supported in two instances by faculty mentorship beyond the capstone instructor. The three other creative projects were produced without mentorship from creative-writing faculty, despite encouragement from the capstone instructor. Assessment of quality of creative projects might have been more exact had the capstone instructor specialized in creative writing.

The quality of the rhetoric/composition project might also have been higher if the capstone instructor were a specialist in that subdiscipline. Both students were mentored by specialists. The program needs to figure out how best to handle the problem of **subdisciplinary specialty in the capstone.**

II. Program Outcomes Assessment

A. *Aesthetic analysis* doesn't happen with every capstone.
1. 1It might be nice to **break this outcome** up into: aesthetic analysis, rhetorical analysis, and applied aesthetic analysis (e.g. analyzing one's own use of artistic techniques).
2. I gave 3s to projects that successfully analyzed aesthetic texts and their own creative writing and 0s to projects that didn't have an aesthetic component. The rubric should have an **n/a ranking**.
3. Also, it seems appropriate to have an **aesthetic production** outcome as a corollary to the analysis outcome.

B. It would be nice to **define** *civic engagement* and/or to break out different kinds.
1. Some students engage well with existing scholarship in that they approximate scholarly work and engage with debates in the scholarly community even if their work never gets out to that community. That real-world audience awareness seems to be an engagement with civic discourse.
2. Some students present/publish or attempt to publish their work which is a service to the community.
3. Some students research topics that are related to engaging with the community (e.g. tutoring), even if they don't engage with the community during the actual capstone process.
4. Some students employ sociological techniques like interviewing, which engages the community in their research.
5. And, some students create true community-service projects for their capstones.
6. I gave 3s to projects that were presented or submitted for publication and/or that effectively oriented toward existing scholarly dialogue. There were no true community-service projects this year although one student's project (the professional-writing capstone) had a real-world community audience.

C. *Communication* had to do with writing quality, per the individually designed project requirements.

D. *Content knowledge* had to do with project quality in relation to the subdiscipline in which the student was operating. In cases where the subdiscipline was writing, this score is the same as communication and oriented partly toward quality of revision based on feedback. It might be helpful to **define** this outcome better in terms of what content knowledge looks like when applied.

E. *Inquiry* might also be better **defined**. Projects earned 3s if they were well fleshed out based on initial questions. This outcome also seems to overlap with communication and content knowledge.

F. *Integrated learning* might be better **defined**. Projects scored better in this category if they crossed disciplinary boundaries. Such breadth is not necessarily consistent with quality and may not be appropriate for every project.

Program Learning Outcomes

Graduates with a degree in English/Writing will have demonstrated their mastery of textual analysis, interdisciplinary approaches to literacy, and creative expression. In each, students must demonstrate:

- Content Knowledge: Mastery of discipline-based content knowledge through the effective use of key terms, concepts, and approaches from the field of English Studies.
- Inquiry: Enhanced use of discipline-based inquiry through the investigation of a problem determined by the student's interest and often pursued through multiple disciplinary approaches.
- Communication: Enhanced use of discipline-based communication in writing clearly, editing carefully, developing ideas fully, and taking into consideration subject, audience, occasion, purpose, and genre.
- Critical Thinking: Enhanced use of discipline-based critical thinking in identifying discipline-based conceptions of issues, contexts, and genres, often employing multiple perspectives as defined in English Studies, while evaluating and marshaling evidence, as defined by our discipline, and synthesizing prior knowledge and research, to draw insights and inferences for a fruitful conclusion and simultaneously acknowledging the disciplinary limits of the project.
- Aesthetic Analysis: Enhanced discipline-based appreciation of aesthetics and humanities, through textual analysis, inter-disciplinary approaches to literacy, and creative expression.
- Civic Engagement: Discipline-based civic engagement by applying their English Studies to a larger civic and ethical context by means of practica, internships, service learning, or community-based research.
- Integrated Learning: Mastery of integrative learning in English Studies through a capstone that connects relevant experience and academic knowledge, making connections across disciplines, reflecting on these connections by means of confident, cogent, and original writing, intellectual agility, and tolerance for diversity.