

Please make any necessary changes to the department's purpose statement, goals, or student learning outcomes. Remember each SLO must be assessed between program review cycles.

English Program Purpose Statement:

The English department commits itself to developing graduates who can read critically and communicate effectively and who understand the changing nature of language.

The department achieves this purpose when its graduates

<b>Program Student Learning Outcomes</b>	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
Demonstrate an ability to accomplish various purposes through effective communication – oral, written, and electronic – and to help others achieve them	Program Review	X	Assessment Planning				Program Review-Fall
Demonstrate an understanding of ways in which aspects of culture such as history, religion and social norms are reflected in literature		X		X			
Demonstrate an ability to analyze literary texts		X			X		
Demonstrate a knowledge of research tools and strategies, especially in literature, and the critical and ethical use of appropriate documentation					X		
Demonstrate knowledge of the structure of English, of the Standard American dialect, of both traditional and modern grammars, and of the nature of language.		X			X		

<b>1. Select Your Department</b>	English
<b>2. Has the program's purpose, SLOs, or program review year changed from the above document?</b>	No
Upload the edited Purpose/SLO doc here.	
<b>3. Will/did the department submit a program review this year? If yes, please attach the final review as a pdf document.</b>	No
Upload program review pdf.	
<b>1. Please select the type of direct evidence of student learning that was gathered THIS YEAR.</b>	
-Assignment/exam paper completed as part of regular coursework and used for program-level assessment	yes
-Capstone work product (e.g. written paper, presentation, research)	yes
Please describe any other direct evidence gathered this year	
<b>2. Please select the type of indirect evidence of student learning that was gathered THIS YEAR.</b>	
-Student surveys (course evaluation additional questions, program created, from institutional student survey data) contain reports of SLO achievement	yes
Please describe any other indirect evidence gathered this year:	Please note that the type of indirect assessment has changed.
<b>3. Please select how the evidence was evaluated, analyzed, or interpreted.</b>	
-Used a rubric/scoring guide	yes
-Compiled survey results	yes
Please describe any other methods not listed:	
<b>4. Enter the number of students assessed for each SLO.</b>	4
<b>5. Summarize the results of the assessment activities including the percentage of students that met or exceeded each SLO and a list of student learning strengths and weaknesses.</b>	<p>When I clicked on "If you have supporting data please include it. (Previous department reports can be found at Step 01. Use the Previous button below.)," I lost all my summary of results submitted for this question, so I'll try again. Also, for question 4 above, only a numerical input is accepted, so I cannot show that we have 1 student for SLO (3) and 3 for SLO (4); therefore I put 4.</p> <p>For SLO (3), the 1 student who completed the assessment received a Proficient rating (according to the attached rubric). Her critical essay concerned a very contemporary YA novel about transgender issues, so little academic or professional criticism was available to her. However, she was creative in expanding her search for material to include pedagogical materials and social/philosophical materials about presenting transgender issues in the middle-high school classroom. She demonstrated respect for the ethical conventions of academic research, but could have shown more depth of understanding of the process of academic research. She incorporated research into her study clearly and fluidly, but her evaluation of source bias was at a basic level. Her writing style was clear and simple, suited to her desire to teach in the middle-secondary school.</p>

	For SLO (5), 2 students were rated Distinguished and 1 was rated Basic, according to the attached rubric. Distinguished students showed a nuanced understanding of linguistics as a science and the nature of language change and language as it exists in human society. They actively pursued an understanding of classical grammar and described its limitations, as well as the difference between it and descriptive grammars. For the Basic student, faculty were pleased at the progress she made over year of relevant assessments. Her preparation in English before college was not good, but her interest and her willingness to learn were impressive, and we have confidence that she will continue to improve.
<b>6. Please upload any supporting documentation (i.e. rubrics, data analysis, charts/tables, department minutes, etc.)</b>	<a href="http://app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=3ed70cd5a6e0c6f6d6242ebd664313c0">app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=3ed70cd5a6e0c6f6d6242ebd664313c0</a>
<b>7. What describes how the program plans to use the results?</b>	
-Use is pending (typical reasons: insufficient number of students in population, evidence not evaluated or interpreted yet, faculty discussions continue)	yes
Please describe any other uses not listed:	Clearly the 1 student assessed for SLO (3) is not a sufficient sample, and even the 3 assessed for SLO (5) are not statistically significant. For our small numbers of majors, I think only qualitative assessment is meaningful, and I understand that it doesn't go far in identifying trends.
<b>8. What program changes or modifications to improve student learning were made this year based on last year's assessment results?</b>	Faculty discussed changing the indirect assessment: of the gender question on the IDEA form. But we decided that the problem was not the question, but students' lack of vocabulary to discuss gender issues. Students' essays and essay exams indicated that they understood the gender issues presented in the courses, but that they didn't have the vocabulary to discuss such issues. Therefore we decided to make our use of terminology more intentional and use daily checks and exercises to help students practice articulating gender. (I'm afraid to add files below, because when I tried to do it, I lost what I had previously entered.)
If you have supporting data please include it. (Previous department reports can be found at Step 01. Use the Previous button below.)	
<b>1. The department will submit a program review NEXT YEAR.</b>	No
<b>2. SLO(s) the department will assess NEXT YEAR is/are:</b>	(4) Demonstrate a knowledge of research tools and strategies, especially in literature, and the critical and ethical use of appropriate documentation;
<b>3. Please select the type of direct evidence of student learning the department plans to use NEXT YEAR.</b>	
-Assignment/exam paper completed as part of regular coursework and used for program-level assessment	yes
-Capstone work product (e.g. written paper, presentation, research)	yes
Please describe any other direct evidence planned for next year:	
<b>4. Please select the type of indirect evidence of student learning that was gathered NEXT YEAR.</b>	

<p>-Student surveys (course evaluation additional questions, program created, from institutional student survey data) contain reports of SLO achievement</p>	<p>yes</p>
<p>Please describe any other indirect evidence planned for next year:</p>	
<p><b>5. Based on previous assessment data, what percentage of students does the department expect to meet or exceed the SLO(s)?</b></p>	<p>80</p>
<p><b>6. Is the department interested in learning how to apply for an assessment grant?</b></p>	<p>No</p>

## LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS PORTFOLIO: Rubric

D – The student demonstrates an active and critical understanding of (1) the historical development of theoretical and applied linguistics; (2) the social and political implications of linguistic performance; (3) the interface of linguistics with other disciplines; (4) the sound system of English; (5) the fundamentals of language acquisition (6) the structure of English, as described by classical grammar, and this system's limitations; (7) the concept of Standard English; and (8) the history of the English language. The student consistently and fluently uses the forms of Standard English in both writing and speaking

P – The student demonstrates understanding of (1) the historical development of theoretical and applied linguistics; (2) the social and political implications of linguistic performance; (3) the interface of linguistics with other disciplines; (4) the sound system of English; and (5) the fundamentals of language acquisition; (6) the structure of English, as described by classical grammar, and this system's limitations; (7) the concept of Standard English; and (8) the history of the English language. The student consistently uses the forms of Standard English in both writing and speaking

B – The student demonstrates a basic understanding of theoretical and applied linguistics, and some idea of the politics of linguistic performance, the sound system of English, and the fundamentals of language acquisition, classical grammar, Standard English, and the history of the English language. The student makes a few mistakes in using Standard English, but works to correct them.

U – The student shows no clear understanding of the history and theory of linguistics, the sounds of English, the acquisition of language, classical grammar, or the history of the English language. The student makes frequent errors in using Standard English.

## SENIOR ESSAY and PUBLIC PRESENTATION: Rubric

Purpose. The senior essay and accompanying public presentation are capstone experiences for all English majors. Students select a topic, develop a research plan, and produce a substantive essay. Public presentation of the project is required. When satisfactorily completed, the project demonstrates students' ability to discover meaning in a text, to apply critical principles to literary study, to conduct research thoroughly and responsibly, and to communicate effectively and responsibly with both the scholarly readers of the essay and the diverse audience attending the public presentation.

Content. The final products are a 15-20 page essay in MLA style and a 20-30 minute oral presentation that is open to the public. The required process includes brainstorming, exploratory writing and talk, a search strategy, a working bibliography, numerous drafts, and rehearsals for public presentation. Development of audiovisual aids for the public presentation is encouraged.

Rubrics.

### **Standard 1.**

**Distinguished** – The final products demonstrate thorough and convincing use of textual evidence to support a provocative and emphatically expressed thesis. Stages of process clearly show the student reaching to discover new meanings in texts and to create new meanings in successive, developmental drafts.

**Proficient** – The final products demonstrate adequate and persuasive use of textual evidence to support a clear and interesting thesis. Stages of process show advancement in the student's understanding of the subject text and the student's articulation of that understanding in developmental drafts.

**Basic** – The final products demonstrate thin but adequate use of textual evidence to support a thesis that is clear but perhaps somewhat obvious or inconsequential. Stages of process provide little evidence of the student's interest or ability in creating or discovering new meaning.

**Unsatisfactory** – The final products inadequately treat a thesis that is vague or confusing or so obvious that it offers no particular insight into the subject of the study. The process that might have produced new meanings has been neglected.

### **Standard 3.**

**Distinguished** - The final products demonstrate thorough knowledge of literary research tools and strategies and the ability to identify (within reason) all useful, relevant resources; strict adherence to the formal and ethical conventions of literary research; good rhetorical technique; a lively, fluent prose style; and complete mastery of Standard English. The public presentation is appropriate for and engages all audience members, regardless of background.

**Proficient** - The final products demonstrate good literary research skills and the ability to identify all essential resources; careful attention to the formal and ethical conventions of research reporting; awareness of rhetorical techniques; a fluent, readable prose style; and mastery of Standard English. The public presentation is appropriate for all audience members, regardless of background.

**Basic** - The final products suggest shortcomings in the student's awareness of literary research tools and the ability to use them to identify the best sources, merely adequate attention to the formal and ethical conventions of research, and a prose style and command of Standard English minimally acceptable for a graduating English major. The student seems aware of the need to shape the public presentation for a diverse audience, but does so with mixed results.

**Unsatisfactory** – The final products demonstrate inadequacies in the student's awareness of literary research tools and the ability to use them to identify good sources, inadequate attention to the formal and ethical conventions of research, lapses in Standard English, and a prose style that is frequently wordy and muddled. The public presentation is ineffective and dull, even for audience members with pertinent backgrounds and interests.