

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

Program Student Learning Outcomes	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		

1. Select Your Department	English
2. Has the program's purpose, SLOs, or program review year changed from the above document?	Yes
Upload the edited Purpose/SLO doc here.	
3. Will/did the department submit a program review this year? If yes, please attach the final review as a pdf document.	No
Upload program review pdf.	app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=bd7812a74acca5116c7f3803badde56b
1. Please select the type of direct evidence of student learning that was gathered THIS YEAR.	
-Artistic exhibition/performance	no
-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
-Exam created by department or external agency	no
-Exit exam created by the program	no
-Oral performance (e.g. oral presentation, conference presentation)	no
-Portfolio of student work	no
-Supervisor or employer evaluation of student performance outside the classroom (internship, field experience, practicum, student teaching)	no
Please describe any other direct evidence gathered this year	
2. Please select the type of indirect evidence of student learning that was gathered THIS YEAR.	
-Interviews or focus groups that contain self-reports of SLO achievement	no
-Employer meetings/discussions/survey interview of student SLO achievement	no
-Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement	no
-Alumni survey that contains self-reports of SLO achievement	no
-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:	
3. Please select how the evidence was evaluated, analyzed, or interpreted.	
-Used a rubric/scoring guide	yes
-Scored exams/quizzes	no
-Used qualitative methods on interview, focus group, open-ended response data	no
-External organization/person analyzed the data (e.g. external accrediting/licensure organizations, standardized exam company)	no
-Compiled survey results	no
Please describe any other methods not listed:	
4. Enter the number of students assessed for each SLO.	13
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.	See uploaded file
6. Please upload any supporting documentation (i.e. rubrics, data analysis, charts/tables, department minutes, etc.)	app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=822a54ce225b8a0d13e9642ec83d20e1
7. What describes how the program plans to use the results?	
-Assessment procedure changes (SLOs, curriculum map rubrics, evidence collected, sampling, communications with faculty, etc.)	yes
-Course changes (course content, pedagogy, courses offered, new course, pre-requisites, requirements)	no
-Personnel or resource allocation changes	no
-Student's out-of-course experience changes (advising, co-curricular experiences, program website, program purpose or SLOs)	no
-Results indicated no action needed because students met expectations	no

-Use is pending (typical reasons: insufficient number of students in population, evidence not evaluated or interpreted yet, faculty discussions continue)	no
Please describe any other uses not listed:	Department will discuss revising question #2 on the student course evaluation. "This course helped me understand how literature both presents and challenges traditional gender roles". Any changes will be incorporated into the fall course evaluation administration. In our fall meeting, program faculty will discuss how to be more deliberate in defining terms relevant to gender in class.
1. The department will submit a program review NEXT YEAR.	No
2. SLO(s) the department will assess NEXT YEAR is/are:	
3. Please select the type of direct evidence of student learning the department plans to use NEXT YEAR.	
-Artistic exhibition/performance	no
-Assignment/exam paper completed as part of regular coursework and used for program-level assessment	no
-Capstone work product (e.g. written paper, presentation, research)	yes
-Exam created by department or external agency	no
-Exit exam created by the program	no
-Oral performance (e.g. oral presentation, conference presentation)	yes
-Portfolio of student work	no
-Supervisor or employer evaluation of student performance outside the classroom (internship, field experience, practicum, student teaching)	no
Please describe any other direct evidence planned for next year:	
4. Please select the type of indirect evidence of student learning that was gathered NEXT YEAR.	
-Interviews or focus groups that contain self-reports of SLO achievement	no
-Employer meetings/discussions/survey interview of student SLO achievement	no
-Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement	yes
-Alumni survey that contains self-reports of SLO achievement	no
-Student surveys (course evaluation additional questions, program created, from institutional student survey data) contain reports of SLO achievement	no
Please describe any other indirect evidence planned for next year:	
5. Based on previous assessment data, what percentage of students does the department expect to meet or exceed the SLO(s)?	90
6. Is the department interested in learning how to apply for an assessment grant?	No

ENGLISH PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT: 2016-2017 (June 2017)

(The Communication and Spanish program assessment reports will be submitted separately.)

1. Goals. In fall 2016, English program faculty revised the second bullet in the program goal statement. Below is the new bullet point.

The department achieves this purpose when its graduates

- demonstrate an understanding of ways in which aspects of culture such as history, religion and social norms are reflected in literature.

Our assessment plan for 2016-2017 was to focus on assessing this revised goal.

2. Assessments. To assess the revised goal, program faculty used one direct and one indirect assessment:

- Direct assessment: faculty revised the rubric for the literature aspect of the English portfolio to reflect the revised goal, and English majors who took one of the targeted courses were assessed according to the new rubric. The assessment point was an analytical essay in each of the courses. The target was that at least 90% of English majors assessed would be rated at least Basic, according to the rubric.
- Indirect assessment: faculty added three questions to the IDEA course evaluations for the targeted courses.

Results of these assessments are discussed below.

3. Student Learning Outcomes. Most of our courses count for the major as well as for general education credit, so most students in our literature courses are non-majors. The revised goal is part of assessment of the major, so it does not apply to most students in the general-education literature courses. For the direct assessment below (the rubric), only majors are assessed. However, for the indirect assessment, majors could not be isolated from the entire roster, so the indirect assessment results include the entire class.

Direct assessment: literature portfolio rubric (scores are converted to numbers here).

Course	Unsatis.	Basic	Profic.	Disting.
EN250 American Lit. I		3	1	2
G-EN255 American Lit. II			1	2
G-EN210 Masterpieces of World Lit.	1		1	1
G-EN220 Contemporary World Lit.			1	
Totals/Percentages	1/7.7	3/23	4/30.8	5/38.5

English majors averaged 3 (Proficient) on the literature portfolio score this year. Our goal was for 90% of the majors to score at least Basic (2); 92.3% scored Basic or above. The one student whose score is Unsatisfactory failed the course and is no longer an English major. Of the 3 who scored Basic, one has left the college and one has changed her major.

➔ In the fall meeting of program faculty, we need to consider raising our goal for majors on this rubric.

Indirect assessment: IDEA questions. Questions were added only in courses offered in spring 2017; they will be added to the other target courses in the next semester that they are offered. Here are the three questions:

1. This course helped me understand how culture influences different genres of literature.
2. This course helped me understand how literature both presents and challenges traditional gender roles.
3. This course helped me explore how different societies deal with ethnic and cultural diversity

Course	Ques. 1	Ques. 2	Ques. 3
G-EN255 American Literature II	4.5	4.2	4.4
G-EN220 Contemporary World Literature	4.71	3.95	4.62

In both courses, for all three questions, the lowest score was 3 (“neither agree nor disagree”), except for one student in G-EN255, who rated all three questions 1 (“disagree strongly”). The mean scores are all good; in both courses the lowest mean is for question 2, regarding gender. It may be that students don’t understand the question.

→ In our fall meeting, program faculty will discuss how to be more deliberate in defining terms relevant to gender in class.