

Annual Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department: English Studies
 Department Chair: Lisa Gim
 Department Assessment Committee Contact: Ben Railton

*Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NECHE 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.

In May 2019, the English Studies Assessment Committee assessed 12 final papers from Approaches to English Studies and 12 portfolios from English Studies Capstone. We assessed all those materials for four objectives: Use and cite primary texts (Objective 1); Use and cite secondary texts (2); Critical engagement with primary texts (3); Critical engagement with secondary texts (4). They were assessed on a scale of NA, 1 (Does not meet standard), 1.5, 2 (Meets), 2.5, and 3 (Exceeds). We assessed each document twice, and the data below represent averages of the two scores.

PLO #	PLO – Stated in assessable terms.	Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)	When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?
1.	Use and cite primary texts (Objective 1)	Every semester:	
2.	Use and cite secondary texts (2)	ENGL 2999 in fall	
3.	Critical engagement with primary texts (3)	ENGL 4999 in spring	
4.	Critical engagement with secondary texts (4)		in Spring 2019

5.			
6.			

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.

Data breakdown:

Approaches ENGL 2999 papers:

Objective 1: 2.25, 2.25, 2, 2, 1, 2.75, 1.75, 1.75, 2.75, 2.75, 2, 1.75

Objective 2: 1, 2.75, 1.75, 2.25, 2.25, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2.25, 2.25, 1.75

Objective 3: 2.5, 2, 2, 2, 1.75, 2.25, 2, 1.75, 3, 2.75, 2.25, 2

Objective 4: 1.5, 2.5, 2.25, 1.75, 2.25, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2.5, 2, 1.75

Capstone ENGL 4999 portfolios:

Objective 1: 2, 2, 1.5, 1.75, 2.75, 2.25, 2, 2.5, 2.25, 2, 1.75, NA

Objective 2: 2, 2, 1.75, 2.75, 2.25, 2, 1.75, 2, 2, 1.5, 1.75, NA

Objective 3: 2, 2, 1.5, 1.75, 2.75, 2.5, 2.25, 2.5, 2, 2, 1.75, NA

Objective 4: 2, 2, 1.75, 2.75, 2.5, 2, 1.75, 2, 1.75, 1.5, 1.75, NA

Approaches ENGL 2999 averages:

Objective 1: 2.08

Objective 2: 2.10

Objective 3: 2.19

Objective 4: 2.13

Capstone ENGL 4999 averages:

Objective 1: 2.07 with one NA

Objective 2: 1.98 with one NA

Objective 3: 2.09 with one NA

Objective 4: 1.98 with one NA

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”?
PLOs 1-4	English Studies Assessment Committee assessed 12 final papers from Approaches to English Studies, ENGL 2999.	1 st year	All	Assessed on a scale of NA, 1 (does not meet standard); 1.5 and 2 (meets standard); 2.5 and 3 (exceeds standard).	Students performed well on average with scores of over 2. The assessment indicates that they are learning the program objectives.
PLOs 1-4	English Studies Assessment Committee assessed 12 portfolios from English Studies Capstone, ENGL 4999. We assessed all those materials for four objectives	4 th year	All	Assessed on a scale of NA, 1 (does not meet standard); 1.5 and 2 (meets standard); 2.5 and 3 (exceeds standard).	Students performed well on PLOs 1and 3, but performed slightly below the desired level on PLOs 2 and 4. This indicates a gap we need to address, improving their facility with use and citation of secondary texts (PLO2) & their engagement with secondary texts PLO4secondary texts (PLO4).

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”?

<p>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)</p>	<p>Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)</p>	<p>What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence? (close the loop)</p>
<p>Analysis of 12 papers from initial class Approaches to English Studies for PLOs.</p> <p>ENGL 2999</p>	<p>Assessment Committee – then reported to whole department (Will move to having initial review by Curriculum Committee and then will be reported to the whole department for discussion & recommendations)</p>	<p>Need for Approaches to begin conversation done summarily in Capstone about preparing students for professionalization, graduate work and employment in related fields to English as well as to do the academic preparation (introduction to theories, analytical and research methods) that it does currently in order to bring students into the discipline of English Studies.</p>
<p>Portfolio review</p> <p>ENGL 4999</p>	<p>Assessment Committee – then reported to whole department. (Will move to having initial review by Curriculum Committee and then will be reported to the whole department for discussion & recommendations)</p>	<p>Need for Capstone to become more content-centered to redress deficits in PLO scores above, concerning use of secondary texts: use and citation (PLO 2) and also engagement with secondary texts (PLO 4). Also address nature of the discipline of English in addition to the</p>

		skills it emphasizes. Find measure to assesses leaning outcomes in this class re: professionalization, resume creation, job letters, applications to graduate work and preparation for exit portfolio for professional employers employment in writing related fields.
Licensure- Middle and Secondary Education (Done in cooperation with Education department and MTEL	Secondary-Middle Education faculty in English; MTEL examiners; practicum supervising teachers in High and Middle schools, as well as Secondary-Middle education faculty.	Assessment of teacher preparation programs by English and Education faculty; and now, by the newly created Program for Middle and Secondary and Middle School Education

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

I. Insert the program or department:

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. Work from this class is analyzed in the fall semester. 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. Work from this class is analyzed in the spring semester.

I. Our assessment of these two courses focuses on evaluating students’ skills in analyzing literary works, as well as their demonstration of research writing 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. Our English Studies Assessment Committee assesses final papers from Approaches to English Studies and portfolios from English Studies Capstone. We assessed all these materials, looking for four objectives from students: Use and citation of primary texts (Objective 1); Use and citation of secondary texts (Objective 2); Critical engagement with primary texts (Objective 3); Critical engagement with secondary texts (Objective 4). These are assessed on a scale of NA, 1 (Does not meet standard), 1.5 or 2 (Meets the standard),; 2.5 and 3 (Exceeds the standard). Each document is assessed twice, and the data gathered represents the averages of those two scores. 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.

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.

Our PLOs have been made more specific. (Also, see Draft Plan, with potential Assessment revisions, provided above. As noted, our potential new Assessment Plan for our Department was designed in an Assessment Workshop 5/23/19, but it still needs to be reviewed, adapted and approved for discussion in Fall 2019 by the whole department. It is attached below but is only a DRAFT PLAN since it has not been approved or reviewed by the department.)

III. If you do not have a plan, would you like help in developing one?

We do have a current Assessment Plan and a possible future Assessment Plan. (See draft plan below, created in an Assessment Workshop on 5/29/2019

----- DRAFT PLAN FOR ENGLISH STUDIES:-----

ENGLISH STUDIES DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:

The English Studies program provides students: a) knowledge of the variety of literary and cultural texts in English; b) in-depth understanding of diverse cultural, literary, rhetorical, and pedagogical traditions; c) skills in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, and research; and d) ample opportunity for hands-on experience in literary analysis, professional and creative writing, teaching, and scholarship to prepare students for personal and professional success.

ENGLISH STUDIES DEPARTMENT VISION STATEMENT:

English Studies trains students to become empathetic, innovative, and critical thinkers, readers, writers, creators, and teachers.

English Studies outcomes:

Students will be able to read and understand texts across genres, cultures, and periods.

Students will be able to write in various forms.

Students will be able to critically analyze texts and contexts.

Students will be able to communicate their perspectives and ideas.

Students will be able to apply their skills in distinct settings.

Literature Concentration outcomes:

Students will be able to closely read and interpret diverse texts.

Students will be able to exchange critical viewpoints about literary and cultural topics.

Students will be able to produce scholarly papers that include critical readings and the use and citation of sources.

Professional Writing Concentration outcomes:

Students will be able to develop writing skills needed to address diverse audiences

Students will be able to engage with the process and the products of other writers

Students will be able to analyze rhetorical situations

Students will be able to create and edit professional products in various genres

Middle and Secondary Education Concentration outcomes:

Students will be able to communicate and reflect on their pedagogical philosophy and practice in teaching Middle and Secondary School English.

Students will be able to develop curricula and lesson plans for Middle and Secondary School English.

Students will be able to develop subject matter expertise for teaching literature in the Middle and Secondary Classrooms.

Students will be able to receive initial licensure in Middle and Secondary School English.

DRAFT OF POSSIBLE CURRICULAR MAPPING:

Values included only for the two course that we have currently assessed.

English Studies Common CORE

<u>Core Courses</u>	<u>ENGSTUD1</u>	<u>ENGSTUD2</u>	<u>ENGSTUD3</u>	<u>ENGSTUD4</u>	<u>ENGSTUD5</u>
<u>ENGL 2999 - Approaches to English Studies</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

<u>ENGL 4999 - English Capstone</u>	<u>3A</u>	<u>3A</u>	<u>3A</u>	<u>3A</u>	<u>3A</u>
<u>ENGL 2000ish--Literature Survey</u>					

Literature CONCENTRATION

<u>Core Courses</u>	<u>ENG STUD 1</u>	<u>ENG STUD 2</u>	<u>ENG STUD 3</u>	<u>ENG STUD 4</u>	<u>ENG STUD5</u>	<u>LIT 1</u>	<u>LIT 2</u>	<u>LIT3</u>
<u>ENGL 2000ish-- Literature Survey</u>								
<u>ENGL 4400 - Junior/Senior Seminar</u>								

Professional Writing CONCENTRATION

<u>Core Courses</u>	<u>ENG STUD 1</u>	<u>ENG STUD 2</u>	<u>ENG STUD 3</u>	<u>ENG STUD 4</u>	<u>ENGSTUD5</u>	<u>PW 1</u>	<u>PW 2</u>	<u>PW3</u>	<u>PW4</u>
<u>ENGL 2005 - News Reporting and Writing</u>									
<u>ENGL 2006 - Foundations of Professional Writing</u>									
<u>ENGL 3890 - Creative Nonfiction</u>									

Initial Licensure CONCENTRATION

<u>Core Courses</u>	<u>ENG</u> <u>STUD</u> <u>1</u>	<u>ENG</u> <u>STUD</u> <u>2</u>	<u>ENG</u> <u>STUD</u> <u>3</u>	<u>ENG</u> <u>STUD</u> <u>4</u>	<u>ENGSTUD5</u>	<u>LICS</u> <u>1</u>	<u>LICS</u> <u>2</u>	<u>LICS</u> <u>3</u>	<u>LI</u> <u>C</u> <u>S</u> <u>4</u>
<u>ENGL 2800 -</u> <u>Introduction to</u> <u>Secondary</u> <u>Education</u>									
<u>ENGL 4400 -</u> <u>Junior/Senior</u> <u>Seminar</u>									
<u>ENGL 4700 -</u> <u>Teaching Reading</u> <u>and Writing</u> <u>Across the</u> <u>Content Area</u>									
<u>ENGL 4850 -</u> <u>Special Methods</u> <u>in English</u>									
<u>ENGL 4860 -</u> <u>English Practicum</u> <u>in Secondary</u> <u>School I</u>									
<u>ENGL 4870 -</u> <u>English Practicum</u> <u>in Secondary</u> <u>School II</u>									

ENGL 4012 -
Practicum
Seminar

- 0 - Not Discussed
- 1 - Introduced
- 2 - Broadened
- 3 - Fulfilled
- A - Assessed for program

DRAFT OF POSSIBLE DIRECT ASESSMENT:

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.

<u>PLO #</u>	<u>Assessment description (written project, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)</u>	<u>Timing of Assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)</u>	<u>When assessment is to be administered in student program (internship, 4th year, 1st year, etc.)</u>	<u>To which students will assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)</u>	<u>What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)</u>
<u>ENG STUD 1</u>	<u>Portfolio</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above 2 (on 3-point scale)</u>

<u>ENG</u> <u>STUD</u> <u>2</u>	<u>Portfolio</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above</u> <u>2 (on 3-point</u> <u>scale)</u>
<u>ENG</u> <u>STUD</u> <u>3</u>	<u>Portfolio</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above</u> <u>2 (on 3-point</u> <u>scale)</u>
<u>ENG</u> <u>STUD</u> <u>4</u>	<u>Presentation</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above</u> <u>2 (on 3-point</u> <u>scale)</u>
<u>ENG</u> <u>STUD</u> <u>5</u>	<u>Pre-professional</u> <u>materials</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above</u> <u>2 (on 3-point</u> <u>scale)</u>
<u>LIT 1</u>	<u>Seminar Paper</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>3rd or 4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above</u> <u>2 (on 3-point</u> <u>scale)</u>
<u>LIT 2</u>	<u>Panel Presentation</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>3rd or 4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above</u> <u>2 (on 3-point</u> <u>scale)</u>
<u>LIT 3</u>	<u>Seminar Paper</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>3rd or 4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above</u> <u>2 (on 3-point</u> <u>scale)</u>

<u>PW 1</u>	Final portfolio or in-depth investigative work	<u>Annual</u>	<u>3rd or 4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above 2 (on 3-point scale)</u>
<u>PW 2</u>	<u>Final paper or portfolio or polished piece of writing</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>1st year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above 2 (on 3-point scale)</u>
<u>PW 3</u>	<u>Final portfolio or polished piece of writing</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>3rd or 4th year</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Average above 2 (on 3-point scale)</u>
<u>LICS1</u>	To be determined	TBA	<u>1st year</u>	All	<u>2 (on 3-point scale)</u>
<u>LICS 2</u>	TBA	TBA	<u>2nd year</u>	All	<u>2 (on 3-point scale)</u>
<u>LICS 3</u>	TBA	TBA	<u>3rd year</u>	All	<u>2 (on 3-point scale)</u>
<u>LICS 4</u>	TBA	TBA	<u>4th year</u>	All	<u>2 (on 3-point scale)</u>

DRAFT OF INDIRECT ASSESSMENTS:

<u>PLO #</u>	<u>Assessment description (survey, focus group, interviews, etc.)</u>	<u>When assessment is to be administered</u>	<u>Who will give indirect feedback</u>	<u>Criteria for Success or Goal to be Achieved</u>

<u>ENG STUD 1</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>ENG STUD 2</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>ENG STUD 3</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>ENG STUD 4</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>ENG STUD 5</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>LIT 1</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>LIT 2</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	

<u>LIT 3</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>PW 1</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>PW 2</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>PW 3</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>LICS 1</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>LICS 2</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
<u>LICS 3</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	

<u>LICS 4</u>	<u>Graduating Student Feedback Survey / Alumni Surveys</u>	<u>Yearly</u>	<u>Graduates / Alumni</u>	
---------------	--	---------------	---------------------------	--

DRAFT OF FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN

<u>Program or Concentration Learning Outcome</u>	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Year 3</u>	<u>Year 4</u>	<u>Year 5</u>
<u>ENG STUD 1</u>	<u>X</u>			<u>X</u>	
<u>ENG STUD 2</u>	<u>X</u>			<u>X</u>	
<u>ENG STUD 3</u>		<u>X</u>			<u>X</u>
<u>ENG STUD 4</u>		<u>X</u>			<u>X</u>
<u>ENG STUD 5</u>			<u>X</u>		<u>X</u>
<u>LIT 1</u>	<u>X</u>			<u>X</u>	
<u>LIT 2</u>		<u>X</u>			<u>X</u>

<u>LIT 3</u>			<u>X</u>		
<u>PW 1</u>	<u>X</u>			<u>X</u>	
<u>PW 2</u>		<u>X</u>			<u>X</u>
<u>PW 3</u>			<u>X</u>		
<u>LICS 1</u>	<u>X</u>				<u>X</u>
<u>LICS 2</u>		<u>X</u>			
<u>LICS 3</u>			<u>X</u>		
<u>LICS 4</u>				<u>X</u>	

-----END OF DRAFT ASSESSMENT PLAN CREATED IN ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP-----

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)
Retention for incoming majors (students cannot take this class as freshmen; they must be sophomores). ENGL 2999 is a solid predictor of our students' success in our major.	ENGL 2999: Not all students complete this class successfully, according to the SSC. We would like to reduce the W 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.	Although we are satisfied with our program learning objectives, standards, assignments and assessments for student skills in this courses, we plan through better advising and attempted interventions with students, to try to improve the W D/F rates in ENGL 2999 in particular.

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 Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
ENGL 4999 should be reflective of students; overall success in the majors success in the major, and there should ideally not be any W or D/Fs.	ENGL 4999 Senior 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 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, but it still needs to be rigorous. We do not want to see potentially graduating students withdrawing from or failing this Capstone class.	We would like to see all students in this class complete the Capstone successfully. However, averages in the. PLOs were low: PLO 1: 2.07with one NA; PLO 2: 1.98 with one NA; PLO 3: 2.09 with one NA; PLO 4: 1.98 with	Yes. In addition, however, we would like to raise the PLO scores. One reason why they may be lower than desired is because students were not aware enough that this class serves as a “bookend” to Approaches. Also,

			one NA. Outcomes should be between 2.-3	because the class integrates all students from 3 different concentrations, not all students responded equally well to, due to their different and divergent training over their previous 3 years of study.

b. What will your focus be for the upcoming year?* Retention and graduation rates.

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? Retention and graduation.

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)
Retention rates: trend data reveals a decline in retention rates from 2017 to 2018. (Possibly this is because	Attempt to retain majors through: mentoring; recruiting students from freshman classes we teach; better	Not completely satisfied.

enrollments have also declined in the numbers of our majors.)	articulation of what paths exist in and what careers may result from the major.	(Although we cannot control declining enrollments, we can improve our retention.)
The numbers of graduates have basically held relatively steady, showing a slight improvement although possibly because the enrollments overall have declined.	Work more closely with majors to help them finish and to determine and advise them on careers; changes in Senior Capstone’s articulated goals and further focus on career preparation skills in this class (i.e., resume writing; application letters; portfolio improvement and internship emphasis) will help this effort. Recruit majors as we teach classes.	Somewhat satisfied. We will work to improve retention, through closer mentoring of students We will work to recruit majors and minors through closer mentoring of students.

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 Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
ENGL 4999 should be reflective of students; overall success in the majors success in the major, and there should not be any W or D/Fs.	ENGL 4999 Senior 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 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, but it still needs to be rigorous. We do not want to see potentially graduating students withdrawing from or failing this Capstone class.	We would like to see all students in this class complete the Capstone successfully. However, averages in the PLOs were low: PLO 1: 2.07with one NA; PLO 2: 1.98 with one NA; PLO 3: 2.09 with one NA; PLO 4: 1.98 with	Yes. In addition, however, we would like to raise the PLO scores. One reason why they may be lower than desired is because students were not aware enough that this class serves as a “bookend” to Approaches. Also,

			one NA. Outcomes should be between 2.-3	because the class integrates all students from 3 different concentrations, not all students responded equally well to, due to their different and divergent training over their previous 3 years of study.

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 (yes/no)
Retention rates	Data trend reveals need to improve	Mentoring	60-70% retention in the major	Yes
Graduation rates	Key goal for dept.'s success	Mentoring and recruitment	Would like to see an improvement in the overall graduates – improve to 3-4%	No

			of our university numbers	
--	--	--	---------------------------	--

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

III. 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)
Retention rates: trend data reveals a decline in retention rates from 2017 to 2018. (Possibly this is because enrollments have also declined in the numbers of our majors.)	Attempt to retain majors through: mentoring; recruiting students from freshman classes we teach; better articulation of what paths exist in and what careers may result from the major.	Not completely satisfied. Although we cannot control declining enrollments, we can improve our retention.
The numbers of graduates have basically held relatively steady, showing a slight improvement although possibly because the enrollments overall have declined.	Work more closely with majors to help them finish and to determine and advise them on careers; changes in Senior Capstone’s articulated goals and further focus on career preparation skills in this class (i.e., resume writing; application letters; portfolio improvement and internship emphasis) will help this effort. Recruit majors as we teach classes.	Somewhat satisfied. We will work to improve retention, through closer mentoring of students We will work to recruit majors and minors through closer mentoring of students in first year English Studies classes. However, changes from BHE will impact numbers of minors

		negatively. (Education majors in Massachusetts no longer need to have two minors for licensure./)
--	--	---

IV. What will your focus be for the upcoming year?* Retention and graduation rates.

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 (yes/no)
Retention rates	Data trend reveals need to improve	Mentoring	60-70% retention in the major	Yes
Graduation rates	Key goal for dept.'s success	Mentoring and recruitment	Would like to see and improvement in the overall graduates – improve to 3-4% of our university numbers	No

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

Campus Climate

Each department was asked to review the Campus Climate Survey information distributed by the Leading for Change Committee and determine what your department has been doing to contribute to the positive outcomes identified.

The survey data may be found through this link: <https://www.fitchburgstate.edu/offices-services-directory/institutional-research-and-planning/office-of-assessment/campus-climate-survey/>

Our department is very diverse and is involved in many of our university's interdisciplinary minors: African Studies, Women and Gender Studies, Asian Studies, Disability Studies, and Film Studies, among others. Our English curriculum and courses offer many classes related to world cultures, women and gender studies, newly LGBTQ issues, and disability studies. Our curriculum is very attentive to diversity, social justice and equity issues. Our classes encourage diversity and diverse perspectives.

In addition, our department is probably the most diverse department on campus. It is true that students are encouraged by seeing diverse faculty in leadership roles, and having teachers as models. Our faculty are often also mentors of student groups and clubs, for example, for the Latin American Students Union, the Black Students Union, and Feminist Conversations. Our faculty are engaged in mentoring initiatives across campus and our department models a good campus climate.

Please list the feedback and recommendations that your department provided to the Leading for Change Committee, along with any additional plans that you might have to further explore this data.

We believe that there is room to develop a more diverse and encouraging campus climate. Several of our department's faculty have participated on the climate survey and contributed to the overall survey. Our department believes that there is more that remains to be done in terms of encouraging and recognizing other kinds of diversity, especially in relation to disability and gender issues. We hope that our university will move to address climate campus issues that relate to gender, sexuality, and disability as well.

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: 2015-16; table included from last year’s Annual Report.
- 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
Professional Writing Concentration restructure	Departmental impetus; 2016 Program Review; Students’ preparation for job market	Department	Passed through AUC this academic year	Can use existing Resources	Current English Assessment plan and student feedback	Professional Writing concentration restructure successfully completed and passed through governance; we will begin curricular implementation in Fall 2019
Enrollments	Declining numbers	Department And Admissions	Over the next 4 years	Can use existing Resources	Outreach to local high schools	Little progress
Student Completion	As soon as possible	Department	Over the next 4 years	Existing	Advising and mentoring students	Some progress

Community Outreach	Numbers	Department	As soon as possible	Promotional materials and a pamphlet	Arrange Internships	Plans made – some progress with internships
English Studies' key Role in Writing across the university	External Program Review and University need.	Department and Dean,	As soon as possible	University and Academic Affairs' assistance as well as Departmental	Placement discussions Writing center collaboration Campus workshops	Some progress Plans for Future directions an discussions
Internships Across the major	Department and External Program Reviewer.	Department	Discuss for next year	Department		Future

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 Performance, Graduation rates (Undergraduate, Graduate, Secondary-Middle Education, in particular)	External Program Review (with Secondary Education MTEL Exams and State Licensure)	In Progress
2) Improve Capstone class	Cited by students to External Program Reviewer and identified by Department.	In Progress
3) Improve Assessment measures	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	In Progress

<p>4) Hiring replacements for faculty retirements</p> <p>5) Lead the campus in Writing Initiatives</p>	<p>“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 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>Speech faculty member hire completed.</p> <p>Needs still exist for faculty hires in Film Studies and Literature in order to replace two faculty lines vacated due to faculty leaving and retiring.</p> <p>Discussions begun in Department and also with our Dean.</p> <p>Role of English Studies in teaching Writing was reaffirmed --included in LA&S revision and new core curriculum, but implementation and increase of action will be continued in plans for next 2-3 academic years.</p>
---	--	--

UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

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 OR are not measurable.	PLOs not provided.	
<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	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment	Used evidence other than PLO	No summary utilizing	

	incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary.	incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.	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 expectations.	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not reasonable.	No Assessment Plan provided.	
<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,	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment,	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	

	targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.		
<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 implemented.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<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</i>	Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with some	Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas	Key issues and/or performance standards are either not	

<i>Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.</i>		discussion of on-going progress stated.	regarding on-going progress plans stated.	provided or there has been no progress or plans stated for progress.	
Comments:					

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.