



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
PULASKI TECH

Assessment Report:
2019-2020

**Due to Chair/Program Director
and Assessment Coordinator
by August 12**



Course-Level Learning Outcomes

1. What are the Course-Level Outcomes (CLOs)?

The student will:

1. Generate creative writing projects in both prose and verse.
2. Learn techniques, styles, and forms for imaginative writing.
3. Participate constructively in a workshop environment.
4. Explore structures and techniques used in published fiction and poetry.

2. Which CLOs were addressed for this academic year? (2018-2019)

The above were addressed; however, the exact wording for assessment this academic year were as follows:

1. Students will create thoughtful, creative, and sophisticated original works of both poetry and prose (on the rubric referred to as “Genres”).
2. Students will demonstrate an ability to use details and descriptions in original works of both poetry and prose to express and convey complex ideas and concepts and/or for aesthetic effect (on the rubric referred to as “Use of Description and Sensory Details”).
3. Students will demonstrate an ability to utilize diction and syntax in original works of both poetry and prose to express and convey complex ideas and concepts and/or for aesthetic effect (on the rubric referred to as “Use of Diction and Syntax”).
4. Students will display the ability to work collaboratively and use feedback in revising, editing, and proofreading original works of both poetry and prose (on the rubric referred to as “Collaborative Writing Processes”).

Students were also graded on clarity of their original compositions (“Clarity”) and their ability to use metacognition on their own writing processes and progress (“Self-Reflection”).

3. Which CLOs are being addressed in your assessment plan next academic year? (2020-2021)

All CLOs in numbers one and two are being addressed in 2020-2021.

4. Explain the assessment cycle.

Assessment cycles run for three years; the current cycle is 2019-2022.

The 2019-2020 cycle focused on measuring both the final product of the creative writing portfolio as well as the progress students showed from earlier works in the semester to the corresponding final drafts showcased in the creative writing portfolio. Students' abilities to reflect on their own processes and progress were also assessed.

5. What are the assessment methods? Are they direct or indirect?

Both indirect and direct assessment methods are used in Creative Writing. Indirect assessment is made as students read, analyze, and discuss assigned readings and the techniques used to compose literature. Indirect assessment is made as students are expected to write every time an assignment is given, regardless of quality of said writing, in order to experiment in a judgement-free environment as well as buy into writing as a process. Additionally, indirect assessment is made as each student is required to, at some point in the semester, share a piece of writing aloud, in order to create a collegial writing workshop environment as well as being able to develop confidence in their work.

Direct assessment is made through workshop, where both the students' peers and their instructor complete a structured feedback form designed to lead to improved writing; students are also assessed for completing these forms, as it is important to read with an eye for critique and to phrase feedback positively. Students are also directly assessed through the final portfolio and self-assessment.

6. What are the assessment goal(s)?

The assessment goals are a minimum success rate of 75%--at least 75% of students assessed Developing proficiency or higher on all assessed CLOs.

7. What were the findings for this academic year? (2019-2020)

There were four creative writing classes offered this academic year (three Creative Writing I—2330—and one Creative Writing II—2331). One of the Creative Writing I classes in the fall semester used an outdated rubric for the final assessment, so these results have been discarded. Of the remaining three creative writing classes this academic year, 20 out of 23 students displayed Developing proficiency or higher on ALL assessed CLOs, an 87% success rate—12% higher than the minimum desired success rate. The individual success rates for each assessed CLO were as follows:

Genres	97% (22 out of 23)
Use of Description and Sensory Details	97% (22 out of 23)
Use of Diction and Syntax	97% (22 out of 23)
Clarity	97% (22 out of 23)
Collaborative Writing Processes	91% (21 out of 23)
Self-Reflection	87% (20 out of 23)

8. What is your analysis of the findings?

Firstly, we need to insure that all instructors are using the correct final assessment rubric. With the class that was discarded, we lost 18 results, almost the amount equal to the number that were used in this report (meaning we lost about 50% of our student data). Hopefully with the addition of a Creative Writing assessment lead who also teaches the course and is a full-time instructor, the consistency of the assessment program will improve. Additionally, it is my opinion that some of our measured CLOs can be a little too subjective, as the results between instructors varied greatly (some classes received 100% top marks with no variation in perfect scores while others were more evenly distributed).

9. What is the action plan for the next academic year? (2020-2021) Explain.

Ideally the proper faculty would meet in order to do some micro changes in the wording of the common assessment rubric in order to make grading more consistent.

Additionally, I would LOVE to look at resurrecting the student creative writing journal to increase co-curricular involvement in Creative Writing and so students could have a place to publish the results of their efforts in class.

DRAFT