

English Studies 2016-17 and 2017-18 Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department: *English Studies*

Department Chair: Lisa Gim

Department Assessment Committee Contacts: Lisa Gim; Joseph Moser (previous); Ben Railton, Kisha Tracy.

*Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NEASC requirements and this report will help with your next Program Review or aid with your external accreditation. This file is to be kept in the department and an electronic file is due to the Director of Assessment by **May 31** each academic year.*

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Educational Objectives)

I. List all PLOs and the timeline for assessment.

PLO #	PLO – Stated in assessable terms.	Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)	When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?
1.	Students will demonstrate knowledge of the broad field of literature in English.	Once a semester in two courses: 1) ENGL 2999: Approaches to English Studies each fall (Sophomore level course in English Studies Methods); 2) ENGL 4999 Senior Capstone	Previous fall/spring

		each spring	
2.	Students will demonstrate in-depth knowledge of diverse aspects of literature which includes: knowledge of genres, literary theories, methods of analysis and research, and forms of writing.	Once a semester in two courses: 1) ENGL 2999: Approaches to English Studies each fall (Sophomore level course in English Studies Methods); 2) ENGL 4999 Senior Capstone each spring	2016-17
3.	Students will demonstrate skill with the reading, writing, and research tools for exploring the field of English studies and its boundaries.	Once a semester in two courses: 1) ENGL 2999: Approaches to English Studies each fall (Sophomore level course in English Studies Methods); 2) ENGL 4999 Senior Capstone each spring	2016-17
4.	Students will have ample opportunity for hands-on experience in related fields. 1) ENGL 2999: Students must demonstrate skill in utilizing literary toolbox of skills and theories in reading, understanding analyzing a piece of literature. They must produce readings of texts written as analytical critical pieces the short and long that demonstrate comprehension and application of the full range of literary theories applicable to English Studies.	Once a semester in two courses: 1) ENGL 2999: Approaches to English Studies each fall (Sophomore level course in English Studies	Revised annually

	<p>2) ENGL 4999: Students demonstrate totality of skills The Senior Capstone class facilitates scholarly exchange from students in English Studies' various different concentrations, serving as a place where students engage one another thoughtfully and intellectually. Designed to move into their next professional and educational stages, it has greatly strengthened the senior portfolio process in which student prepare job applications and portfolios, and graduate school applications. As a result, it has become an important vehicle for enhanced, useful program assessment. In this class, instructors invite alumni and professionals in all the concentrations to present to current students, work with them on projects, and share their experiences and advice.</p>	<p>Methods); 2) ENGL 4999 Senior Capstone each spring</p>	
--	--	---	--

II. PLO Assessment (Please report on the PLOs assessed and/or reviewed this year, programs should be assessing at least one each year.)

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the **direct method(s)** used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

PLO #	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)	When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4 th year, 1 st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)	What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)	Reflection on the results: How was the “loop closed”?
1.	Literary Analysis presentations, papers and projects—for ENGL 2999 & Capstone Portfolio—for ENGL 4999; performance in workshops, presentations and professional preparation	Sophomore year—ENGL 2999 & Senior year—ENGL 4999	All students in two complete course sections as representative samples—ENGL 2999, our gateway course to the E.S. major, and in ENGL 4999 our English Studies Senior Capstone course.	Students’ competency in writing, expressed understanding in readings, presentations, papers, and exams.	The Assessment Committee and Dept. Chair discuss and prioritize actions department faculty could take to coordinate and improve the teaching of fundamental skills.
2.	Literary Analysis presentations, papers and projects—for ENGL 2999 & Capstone Portfolio—for ENGL 4999; performance in workshops, presentations and professional preparation	Sophomore year—ENGL 2999 & Senior year—ENGL	All students in two complete course sections as representative samples—ENGL 2999, our gateway course to the E.S. major, and in ENGL 4999 our English Studies Senior Capstone course.	Students’ competency in writing, expressed understanding in readings, presentations, papers, and exams.	The Assessment Committee and Dept. Chair discuss and prioritize actions department faculty could take to coordinate and improve the teaching of fundamental skills.

3.	For ENGL 2999: Papers, presentations and exams & ENGL 4999: performance in workshops, presentations and professional preparation	Sophomore year—ENGL 2999 & Senior year—ENGL	All students in two complete course sections as representative samples—ENGL 2999, our gateway course to the E.S. major, and in ENGL 4999 our English Studies Senior Capstone course.	Students’ competency in writing, expressed understanding in readings, presentations, papers, and exams.	The Assessment Committee and Dept. Chair discuss and prioritize actions department faculty could take to coordinate and improve the teaching of fundamental skills.
4.	For ENGL 2999: Papers, presentations and exams & ENGL 4999: performance in workshops, Capstone portfolio and professional preparation	Sophomore year—ENGL 2999 & Senior year—ENGL	All students in two complete course sections as representative samples—ENGL 2999, our gateway course to the E.S. major, and in ENGL 4999 our English Studies Senior Capstone course.	Students’ competency in writing, expressed understanding in readings, presentations, papers, and exams.	The Assessment Committee and Dept. Chair discuss and prioritize actions department faculty could take to coordinate and improve the teaching of fundamental skills.

III. Summary of Findings: Briefly summarize the results of the PLO assessments reported in Section II above combined with other relevant evidence gathered and show how these are being reviewed/discussed. How are you “closing the loop”?

Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence? (close the loop)
--	--	---

<p>Seniors' completion of the Capstone Portfolio and departmental Assessment Committee's evaluation of the Capstone Portfolios.</p> <p>In the Capstone class, students also write a self-reflection as part of their Capstone Portfolio. (Although this is not used in our Assessment, perhaps it should be.)</p>	<p>--Assessment Committee and Dept. Chair --Assessment work is carried out every semester and interpretation of results is normally carried out every year.</p>	<p>--The Dept. Chair and Assessment Committee, in consultation with department faculty, are planning a professional development workshop for 2018-19. This workshop will likely be focused on assignment design and teaching information literacy skills, as our assessment data indicates our majors often exhibit lower performance of these skills than other skills/outcomes we assess.</p>

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

- I. Insert the program or department Assessment Plan:
 Each academic year, the English Studies Assessment Committee evaluates student work from two key courses in our curriculum: ENGL 2999: Approaches to English Studies and ENGL 4999: Capstone. ENGL 2999 is our gateway course to the English major and enables sophomore-level students to learn and apply fundamental theories to the analysis of literature. In ENGL 4999, senior-level students create and synthesize a Capstone Portfolio of their work in the English Studies major, showcasing the breadth and depth of their knowledge of the field; the portfolio also includes their metacognitive writing on their learning and growth as they have progressed through their studies. Additionally, it prepares students for their next steps in professional

Our assessment of these two courses focuses on evaluating students' skills in analyzing literary works, as well as their demonstration of research and information literacy skills. Each year, we analyze a set of papers from a complete section of ENGL 2999 and all the Capstone Portfolios from one section of ENGL 4999. With this approach, we are able to draw some tentative conclusions about the degree to which English Studies students' skills progress in the course of our curriculum. We are also able to target skills that should be focused on as areas for improvement.

March 2018

II. Explain any changes in the assessment plan including new or revised PLOs, new assessments that the program/department plans to implement and new targets or goals set for student success.
 --No recent changes have been made to our PLOs.

III. If you do not have a plan, would you like help in developing one?
 We have a plan but are open to suggestions.

University Data

I. SSC Data

Indicate **at least one** Student Success Performance Measure that the department/program has identified for planned change or improvement.

Freshman retention, bottleneck courses, graduation rates, at risk student retention etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
ENGL 2999 is an excellent predictor of our students' success in the major, standing at number 1 in the Predictive Course Ranking of the University Courses listed in the SSC.	ENGL 2999: There is a 22% drop or failure rate in this course with 10% being the withdrawal rate. We would like to reduce the D/F rate, although it is documented that most students who do not complete either fail to attend class or do not complete the work. I	Although we are satisfied with our standards and assignments and assessments for student skills in these courses, we plan through advising and attempted interventions and consultation with students, to try to improve the D/F rates in ENGL 2999 in particular.

b. What will your focus be for the upcoming year?*

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program
	ENGL 4999 Senior			

In ENGL 4999 not a significant predictor of students' success in the major.	Capstone was identified by the department and by the External Program Reviewer as a course in which students felt there should be more articulated direction re; job direction and portfolio building.	Although ENGL 4999 is not a significant predictor of students' success, it has a current drop rate of 2.9%. It is a senior level class and we do not want it to be an obstacle to graduation.	We would like to see all students in this class complete the Capstone successfully.	Review or Accreditation (yes/no) Yes

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

II. Trend Data

Indicate **at least one** Department Performance Measure that the program/department identified for change or improvement. Number of graduates, number of majors, credit production, substitutions etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
Enrollments	Orientation approach	Will continue and expand
Secondary and Graduate programs	Keep programs healthy	In progress; enrollments are an issue.

b. What will be the focus next year?*

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation

March 2018

				(yes/no)
Enrollments	Slight improvement noted in SSC	Orientation; outreach to area high schools; improve promotional materials		

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

Program Review Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report

Annual Reflection/Follow-up on Action Plan from last Program Review or external accreditation (only complete the table that is appropriate for your program)

I. Programs that fall under Program Review:

- i. Date of most recent Review: 2017-18
- ii. Insert the Action Plan table from your last Program Review and give any progress towards completing the tasks or achieving targets set forth in the plan. (Please see attached.)

Specific area where improvement is needed	Evidence to support the recommended change	Person(s) responsible for implementing the change	Timeline for implementation	Resources needed	Assessment Plan	Progress Made this Year
Enrollments	Declining numbers	Department	Over the next 5 years	Can use existing resources	Outreach to local high schools	Some progress
Student Completion	As soon as possible	Department	Over the next 5 years	Existing	Advising students	Plans made
Community Outreach	Numbers	Department	As soon as possible	Promotional materials and a pamphlet		Plans made

<p>English Studies 'key role in Writing across the university</p>	<p>External Program Review and University need.</p>	<p>Department Dean, Admissions</p>	<p>As soon as possible</p>	<p>University and Academic Affairs' assistance as well as Department</p>		<p>Future direction</p>
<p>Internships Across the major</p>	<p>Departmental and External Program Reviewer.</p>	<p>Department</p>	<p>Discuss for next year</p>	<p>Department</p>		<p>Future</p>

iii. If you do not have an action plan, would you like help in developing one based on your last program review and needs of the program? Yes, we are open to help and advice.

II. Programs with external Accreditation:

- i. Accreditor: English Studies Department Secondary Education and Licensure Program (Must comply with State Educational guidelines and regulations; handled under Education Dean Bruno Hicks)
- ii. Date of last review: 2016-17 English Studies Program Review; Reviewer: Dr. Ann Brunjes, Bridgewater State
- iii. Date of next review and type of review: 2022-23 Program Review

iv. List key performance indicators:

List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.)(If required.)	Update on fulfilling the action letter/report or on meeting the key performance indicators.
1) Improve Enrollments (Undergraduate, Graduate, Secondary Education, in particular)	External Program Review (with Secondary Education MTEL Exams and State Licensure)	In Progress
2) Improve Capstone class 3) Improve Assessment measures	Cited by students to External Program Reviewer and identified by Department. External Evaluator cited need for attention “to be paid to returning to curricula and teaching practices in order to improve learning outcomes. How are/are department faculty engaging in the kinds of high impact practices advocated by AAC&U (https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips) shown by research to improve learning outcomes? What kinds of institutional resources are needed to develop faculty and modify curriculum to achieve better outcomes.?” She cited a need for “both departmental or institutional structures – as opposed to informal discussion and individual exploration, of which there are plenty – to help the department implement ideas that will lead to	In Progress In Progress

<p>4) Hiring replacements for faculty retirements</p> <p>5) Lead the campus in Writing Initiatives</p>	<p>better learning outcomes.”</p> <p>External Program Review and faculty vacancies.</p> <p>External Evaluator stressed that the ongoing need for the university to “support English Studies’ role in leading university-wide discussion and initiatives for improvement of writing effectiveness.” This may be done through the department and possibly using the resources of the Center for Teaching and Learning.</p>	<p>Needs still exist.</p> <p>Discussions begun in Department and with our Dean and in LA&S discussions but will be continued in plans for next year.</p>
---	---	---

UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

*****Lisa, this rubric is for department’s reference only. Nothing needs to be completed in the following section.***]**

Program: _____ Date of Review: _____

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</i>	All or almost all PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	Most of the PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	PLOs written in general, broad or abstract statements	PLOs not provided.	

			OR are not measurable.		
<i>Expected Timing of Assessment</i>	All or almost all PLOs have a timeline stated.	Most PLOs have a timeline stated.	Very few PLOs have a stated timeline.	No timelines are given or are To Be Determined (TBD).	
<i>Assessment Tool Quality</i>	Assessment tool(s) is/are strong: very good quality and appropriate.	Assessment tool(s) are acceptable: good quality and appropriate	Assessment tool(s) are a good start but could use some strengthening or changes.	Assessment tool(s) are either not appropriate or not discussed.	
<i>PLO Assessment</i>	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assessed and information is complete in chart.	At least one PLO assessed, information is not complete in chart.	No assessments completed during the academic year reported.	
<i>Criteria for Success</i>	The criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but not clearly stated or is not appropriate.	Criteria for student success not provided.	
<i>Summary of Findings</i>	Measures used in from PLO assessment fully incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary.	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	Used evidence other than PLO assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.	No summary utilizing assessment data is evident.	
Assessment Plan for Program/Department					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Department or Program Assessment Plan</i>	Assessment Plan provided. Has clearly stated process with reasonable	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear	No Assessment Plan provided.	

	expectations.	and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	and/or the expectations are not reasonable.		
<i>Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan</i>	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are clearly stated and decision(s) are appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are described in general terms and may be appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are vague and lack clarity.	No changes are discussed.	
University Data					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>SSC Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one SSC data point. No plan implemented.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one Trend data point. No plan	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	

			implemented.		
<i>Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	Trend data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Action Plane or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Only for those under Program Review Annual Reflection on Program Review</i>	Full Action Plan provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Full Action Plan provided with some discussion of on-going progress plans stated.	Full Action Plan provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Action Plan is either not provided or there no progress or plans stated for progress discussed.	
<i>Only for those under External Accreditation Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.</i>	Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with some discussion of on-going progress stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Key issues and/or performance standards are either not provided or there has been no progress or plans stated for progress.	
Comments:					

March 2018



NOTE: This rubric is NOT an evaluation of the program/department. It is simply a tool for UARC to use as an aid in reviewing and providing constructive feedback to each program.