**Annual Assessment Report for 2021-2022 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2021-2022 AY will be due September 30th 2022 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. For purposes of this report, you should only report on two or three student learning outcomes (department’s choice) even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: \_\_\_English/Creative Writing MFA\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Degree \_MFA\_\_

Assessment Coordinator: \_\_\_\_\_Brynn Saito\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

We attempted to assess SLOs 2.1 and 3.1.

Goal 2: Students will gain an enhanced understanding of the forms, genres, and aesthetic principles of literatures in English.

SLO 2.1 Students will apply their knowledge in order to create a body of publishable poetry, fiction, or creative non-fiction prose

Goal 3: Students will gain an enhanced understanding of the practices, procedures, and aesthetic principles of literary publishing.

SLO 3.1 Students will identify, assess, and apply for publishing opportunities

1. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

We used a modified version of the Exit Survey to assess the above SLOs.

We were not able to gather and assess data collected from the Spring 2022 exit survey in time for this report. But, in preparation for our program review, we sent a modified version of the exit survey to all graduates of the MFA program from 2015 through 2022. This survey, called the “MFA Program Review: 2015-2022” survey, received 44 responses and we used that data to assess the above mentioned SLOs.

1. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient. Also indicate your benchmark (e.g. 80% of students will be designated as proficient or higher) and indicate the number of students who met that benchmark.

The “MFA Program Review: 2015-2022” survey was sent to graduates of the MFA program from the past seven years. An indirect tool of assessment, the survey doesn’t directly assess student performance. Rather, it invites program alums to provide feedback on their experience in the MFA program. As such, it is a valuable tool for helping faculty understand how the various aspects of the MFA are working to support student goals.

The survey invites reflection/feedback on three primary areas:

1. How effective was the MFA program in meeting the students’ objectives
2. How effective was the MFA program in preparing students to achieve their career/long-term goals
3. How satisfied were students with the main aspects of the curriculum (academic mentoring, thesis advising, the contextualizing narrative, the thesis showcase reading, and the thesis defense)

The survey also gathers data in regards to which extracurricular programs students were involved in.

Our benchmark goal was that at least 80% of respondents noted “mostly” or “highly” effective to areas one and two; and “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in area three.

In area one, 87% of respondents noted that the MFA program was “mostly” or “highly” effective in meeting program objectives of assisting with writing skill development and helping students understand writing craft and technique.

In area two, 78% of respondents noted they were “mostly” or “highly” prepared to meet their career goals after the MFA program.

In area three, 90% were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the advising they received; 89% were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the thesis mentoring they received; 93% were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the thesis defense and showcase reading; 84% were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the contextualizing narrative culminating assignment.

What was most valuable about the survey was an opportunity to read the comments. 93% of respondents reported that they would “recommend the program” unconditionally; the remaining 7% would recommend with conditions. Two respondents commented that, while the program prepared them well for post-graduate teaching opportunities, it was not as effective in preparing them for the other aspects of building a life as a professional writer (non-teaching jobs, writing a book proposal, etc.). In the last year, the MFA program has created a new professional development component that’s integrated into the required 299 thesis advising courses. It is our hope that future graduates will feel better prepared for all aspects of post-MFA life, with the support of this intentional professional development. The survey’s written feedback in the area of post-MFA career goals will help faculty shape the 299 curriculum. One participant noted that the program needs to improve its accommodations for disabled and neurodivergent writers. This valuable feedback will be shared with the department.

1. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?

Based on the data, we will continue implementing robust professional development resources in our 299 courses, as this is an area students expressed a desire for more teaching and training. As coordinator, I will discuss with faculty how to better educate and address the needs of our neurodivergent and disabled students.

Additionally, there are changes that can be made in the coming year to refine our assessment processes.

*First: Update the MFA exit survey.*

The original MFA exit survey includes the following questions for self-reflection:

1. How would you self-assess your own proficiency in understanding and explaining literary history?
2. How would you self-assess your own proficiency in understanding the history of scholarship in your chosen genre?
3. How would you self-assess your own proficiency in understanding the forms, genres, styles, and aesthetic principles of creative writing in English?
4. How would you self-assess your own proficiency in applying your knowledge in order to create a body of publishable poetry, fiction, or creative nonfiction?
5. How would you self-assess your own proficiency in analyzing and evaluating written creative work, including the work of other students?
6. How would you self-assess your own proficiency in gaining an enhanced understanding of the practices, procedures, and aesthetic principles of literary publishing?

These questions more directly connect to Goal 2, SLO 2.1 and Goal 3 and SLO 3.1. For the current academic year, faculty will update the exit survey to include the above questions, and integrate the questions from the “MFA Program Review” survey. We will also add questions to directly address students’ successes (publications, contracts signed, etc.) in navigating the publishing world, which will help us assess Goal 3 and SLO 3.1.

*Second: Update direct tools of assessment.*

As a relative newbie to the assessment coordinator role, I have been working on assessing our program’s assessment tools. Thus far, we have been utilizing three assessment forms that students’ thesis committees complete after reading and discussing the thesis. My goal this year is to ensure that each of the assessment forms are updated by faculty and completed by all committee members before the end of the spring 2023 semester. The three tools are: the thesis assessment survey, the contextualizing narrative assessment survey, and the thesis defense assessment survey. We will also send the updated exit survey to all students graduating this academic year.

1. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in your 2020-21 assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

In last year’s report, we noted that we will update our SOAP document. This has been completed.

1. What assessment activities will you be conducting during AY 2022-23?

We will assess SLOs 1.2 and 2.2 using the contextualizing narrative assignment.

 NOTE: For the AY 2021-22 Report, due September 30, 2022, there is no Question 7 pertaining to program review. For future Department/Program Annual Assessment Reports, there will be a question about how your Department/Program has planned to incorporate Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion into your assessment practices. We will discuss JEDI at assessment workshops in fall 2022 and resources will be available in the Department Coordinators Google Drive.