English Department Assessment Plan, Fall 2010

Departmental Assessment Committee: This committee consists of the departmental Planning Committee, the Academic Area Coordinators in the department, and the Co-Chairs of the Five Drafting Committees for our Program Review Report (Mission, SWOT Analysis, Educational Outcomes, Current Priorities and Objectives, and Action [Implementation] Plan).

This academic year, the English Department has been guided in its assessment efforts by various departmental, college, and University assessment priorities, the most important of which follow:
- In June, working first through the department heads, the College of Arts and Letters began a systematic approach to assessment for all departments, with deadlines beginning after the fall 2010 semester and following for three semesters
- In August, the department began its planning (begun with program SWOT analyses last spring) for drafting and completing its Program Review Self Study Report, due to Dean Adams on May 1
- In September, the department accelerated and expanded earlier efforts to incorporate Public Affairs Intensive Experiences in departmental majors (and these efforts are extending into our existing General Education courses and consideration for future ideal General Education courses)
- During fall semester, also, our department engaged in assessment efforts to parallel the University assessment efforts (required for departments), overseen by the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning.

Basic assessment approach used in the department: Generally, initially, assessment planning ideas will be "brainstormed" by the assessment committee described above and the department head. The best ideas agreed on will be taken to the general faculty for discussion. General charges for action will be formulated and calendars created, and the academic program areas will work through their assessment charges together (re-crafting the program mission, re-envisioning Public Affairs Intensive Experiences in their program curriculum, formulating learning outcomes and ways to assess them for their program, constructing curriculum maps for their learning outcomes, designing data collection and evaluation measures, and discussing use of assessment data to improve programs). Periodically, at three-week increments this semester, the department meets as a whole to share and discuss the assessment work done by the programs and plan and adjust the upcoming assessment calendar.

The department follows the standard assessment cycle, the one recommended, of course, by the FCTL:
1) Clearly define, identify, and plan learning outcomes
2) Select appropriate assessment measures and assess the learning outcomes
3) Analyze the results of the outcomes assessed
4) Adjust or improve programs following the results of the learning outcomes assessed

After one cycle of assessment is completed (perhaps in one year if we plan diligently), we would begin the process over again, starting with assessing our earlier assessment measures (learning outcomes, assessment measures for those outcomes, etc.).

English Department

In extremely broad overview, the English Department, began, along with all departments in the College of Arts and Letters, very careful assessment planning for the department as a whole and in every academic program. We surprised ourselves with how much good assessment work and how well we were doing, and generally we were far ahead of the other departments in the college in this work. This success continued through mid-spring 2011, when, in a panic, we generally turned all our efforts to the Program Review process (assessment with a capital A).

We sent a huge round of formal assessment work to Chantal Levesque in January 2011.

Here are the assessment steps the department and its programs (English Education, Professional Writing, Creative Writing, Literature, and TESOL [Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages] completed:
1) Mission statement
2) Assessment plans
3) Curricular maps
4) Learning Outcomes
5) Assessment measures

We got side-tracked at this point. English Education necessarily continued with its required assessments. Literature pushed ahead through the next three steps. Other program areas were generally stalled before completely any of these steps.
6) Collecting data
7) Assessing data
8) Making curricular adjustments

Generally, Program Review resulted in substantial curricular changes at both the undergraduate and graduate level for Professional Writing and English Education. Important changes also went through the curricular process for the Composition and Rhetoric track of the M.A. in Writing (Professional Writing is the other track). Developing its Publication class was an important step for the Creative Writing programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (the class is being taught, but both program changes have not yet passed the curricular process in the department).

Work on its 14 proposed classes for the new General Education program took up much of the 2012-2013 academic year, with the curricular changes prompted by Program Review occurring after the work on General Education was done, mid- to late spring 2013.

What follow are attachments to help illustrate the narrative overview above. These are mainly focused on that first half of the narrative, traditional assessment, up through summer 2012. The last two annual department reports discuss the curricular changes that resulted from Program Review (but specific class changes aren't listed, so I didn't attach those). These curricular changes basically feature new classes designed specifically for the academic program and the current needs of its students, and displace classes from other academic areas (Literature, Professional Writing, and Composition and Rhetoric, to be specific). This is true of the curricular changes in English Education, Professional Writing, Composition and Rhetoric, and Creative Writing.

Assessment: Technical & Professional Writing

3. Summary of Assessment Timeline
Our faculty agreed to evaluate ENG 422 portfolios as our first wave of program assessment. Portfolios will be evaluated each semester, with three faculty members (on a rotational basis) evaluating every fourth student on the ENG 422 roster. The team that evaluated portfolios in May will not be able to meet to discuss ratings until August; we believe we need to discuss results before we disseminate them. In general, the evaluators were pleased with the rubric we had decided to use and in general were pleased with the students' work (rating almost all aspects Proficient or Moderately Proficient). When we meet this fall, we will consider grades from this spring's classes (ENG 321, 373, 377, 421, 574) and surveys from spring and summer interns as well as possible refinements to the assessment plan and the portfolio rubric.

4. Changes (in Progress or Anticipated) Based on Assessment Results
We have created a rubric to evaluate sample ENG 422 portfolios and have also developed a process by which the portfolios can be evaluated in a manner that is not too labor-intensive for the faculty but gives a fair and accurate snapshot of work from our program. We cannot meet until August to discuss the first round of these ratings (ENG 422 has not been offered in the fall, and portfolios came in at the end of the spring semester). TPW faculty will meet the week before classes begin to discuss assessment results and program changes planned in response to assessment and the consultant's report. At this time it is too early to make sweeping changes based on assessment, but student portfolios have made us realize the need to emphasize the importance of professional layout and design in *all* assignments, and student feedback has us considering ways to increase students' proficiency with InDesign software. Student and consultant feedback have also made us anticipate making curricular changes that will strengthen our program and our students' marketable skills; we will continue that discussion in August.

B.A. Literature Program Preliminary Data on Assessment Results and Notes on Changes Already Made or In Progress in Regard to Assessment

Prepared by Jane Hoogestraat   March 12, 2012

Preliminary Data on Assessment Results

Following the Stanford Model and using as Spring 2011 graduates as a cohort for a pilot study, we were able to conclude that of the 15 students earning a BA in Literature, 55% were performing at an Exemplary Level in terms of meeting our Learning Outcomes; 26% were at a Proficient Level; 17% were at a Marginal Level; and 2% were at an Unacceptable Level. We plan to look at similar data annually, while taking steps to ensure that more students both take the MFT and submit essays for review. For details on the Stanford Assessment Rubric, and the rubric we used in evaluating essays please see pages 3-6 of this document.

Spring 2011 Graduates Assessment Results

8 of 15 submitted papers; 4 papers were rated exemplary; 3 were rated proficient; and 1 was related marginal. (Overall Paper Results: 50% Exemplary; 38% Proficient; 12% Marginal)

9 of 15 took MFT; 4 scored above 75% on MFT; 6 above 50% (2 between 50 and 75%); 3 were below 50%, but not by much. (Overall MFT Results: 44% Exemplary; 22% Proficient; 33% Marginal.)

In 235, 73% earned an A average; 20% a B average; and 7% a C average. In surveys, 53% earned an A average; 20% earned a B average; 13.5% a C average; and 13.5 % a D average. In 500 level courses, 80% earned an A average; 13% a B average; and 7% a C average.

An A average was calculated as 3.5 or above; a B average as 3.0 or above; a C average as 2.0 or above.

Changes to the Program (Based on Assessment Results) in Progress or Anticipated
The 3 categories below follow the Stanford Model (p. 30)

A. Changes to the Assessment Plan
--We have developed a rubric to evaluate sample essays.
--We changed the type of sample essay collected by specifying a min. length
and asking that the essay display the use of criticism or a critical framework. We will
also be collecting essays from all graduating seniors.

B. Changes to the Curriculum
-- In the spring of 2012, we are offering the first section of 301 (Seminar in English
Studies) to ensure that students satisfy the requirements of engagement with
the Public Affairs mission.
--We anticipate Dept. approval of a new 500 level course in Literature and Medicine.
--We continue to emphasis that Eng 235 is a writing intensive course that students
should take early in their careers with us.
--We have proposed deleting three literature courses on the 200 and 300 level,
changing one literature class (Eng 330) to "D" (Demand), and changing 6 literature
classes on the 500 to 700 level to "D."
--Beginning the fall of 2012, we may begin, in response to Program Review
recommendations, an extensive review of the literature curriculum.

C. Changes to the Academic Process
--We have created an advising check list to remind students and professors of the
following:
--the importance of taking ENG 235 and at least some of the
surveys before taking 500 level classes;
--earlier career planning support for students who lack focused career
goals;
--guidelines (and possible rewards) for collection of 500 level essay; and
--the importance (for both students and faculty) of the MFT (or, in a few
cases, the substitution of the Subject Matter GRE).
--For the spring of 2012, we have increased the number of 235 sections from 3 to 4 to
ensure access.
--We have begun sending our annual placement survey electronically and continue to
explore options to ensure a higher response rate and to collect more accurate
placement data.

B.A. Literature Program Preliminary Data on Assessment Results and Notes on Changes Already Made or In Progress in Regard to Assessment

Prepared by Jane Hoogestraat   March 12, 2012

Preliminary Data on Assessment Results

Following the Stanford Model and using as Spring 2011 graduates as a cohort for a pilot study, we were able to conclude that of the 15 students earning a BA in Literature, 55% were performing at an Exemplary Level in terms of meeting our Learning Outcomes; 26% were at a Proficient Level; 17% were at a Marginal Level; and 2% were at an Unacceptable Level. We plan to look at similar data annually, while taking steps to ensure that more students both take the MFT and submit essays for review. For details on the Stanford Assessment Rubric, and the rubric we used in evaluating essays please see pages 3-6 of this document.

Spring 2011 Graduates Assessment Results

8 of 15 submitted papers; 4 papers were rated exemplary; 3 were rated proficient; and 1 was related marginal. (Overall Paper Results: 50% Exemplary; 38% Proficient; 12% Marginal)

9 of 15 took MFT; 4 scored above 75% on MFT; 6 above 50% (2 between 50 and 75%); 3 were below 50%, but not by much. (Overall MFT Results: 44% Exemplary; 22% Proficient; 33% Marginal.)

In 235, 73% earned an A average; 20% a B average; and 7% a C average. In surveys, 53% earned an A average; 20% earned a B average; 13.5% a C average; and 13.5 % a D average. In 500 level courses, 80% earned an A average; 13% a B average; and 7% a C average.

An A average was calculated as 3.5 or above; a B average as 3.0 or above; a C average as 2.0 or above.

Changes to the Program (Based on Assessment Results) in Progress or Anticipated
    The 3 categories below follow the Stanford Model (p. 30)

A.   Changes to the Assessment Plan
      --We have developed a rubric to evaluate sample essays.
      --We changed the type of sample essay collected by specifying a min. length
      and asking that the essay display the use of criticism or a critical framework. We will
      also be collecting essays from all graduating seniors.

B.   Changes to the Curriculum
      -- In the spring of 2012, we are offering the first section of 301 (Seminar in English
            Studies) to ensure that students satisfy the requirements of engagement with
            the Public Affairs mission.
      --We anticipate Dept. approval of a new 500 level course in Literature and Medicine.
      --We continue to emphasis that Eng 235 is a writing intensive course that students
      should take early in their careers with us.
      --We have proposed deleting three literature courses on the 200 and 300 level,
      changing one literature class (Eng 330) to "D" (Demand), and changing 6 literature
      classes on the 500 to 700 level to "D."
      --Beginning the fall of 2012, we may begin, in response to Program Review
      recommendations, an extensive review of the literature curriculum.

C.   Changes to the Academic Process
      --We have created an advising check list to remind students and professors of the
      following:
            --the importance of taking ENG 235 and at least some of the
            surveys before taking 500 level classes;
            --earlier career planning support for students who lack focused career
            goals;
            --guidelines (and possible rewards) for collection of 500 level essay; and
            --the importance (for both students and faculty) of the MFT (or, in a few
            cases, the substitution of the Subject Matter GRE).
      --For the spring of 2012, we have increased the number of 235 sections from 3 to 4 to
      ensure access.
      --We have begun sending our annual placement survey electronically and continue to
      explore options to ensure a higher response rate and to collect more accurate
      placement data.

Rubric: TEMPLATE

Results

Task Description: Learning Outcomes	Spring 2011 Exemplary	Proficient	Marginal	Unacceptable
Students will know the history of literature written in English, including literary periods and generic traditions.	4 of 9 above 75% on MFT [44%]; 8 of 15 A average in Surveys [53%]	2 of 9 above 50% on MFT [22%]; 3 of 15 B average in Surveys [20%]	3 of 9 between 30% and 50% o MFT [33%]; 2 of 15 C average in surveys [13.5%]	0 of 9 below 30% o MFT [0%]; 2 of 15 D average in surveys [13.5%]
Students will locate literary texts in their historical, cultural, and rhetorical contexts.	4 of 9 above 75% on MFT [44%]; 4 of 8 exemplary on critical essay [50%]	2 of 9 above 50% o MFT [22%]; 3 of 8 proficient on critical essay [38%]	3 of 9 between 30% and 50% on MFT [33%]; 1 of 8 marginal on critical essay [12%]	0 of 9 below 30% on MFT [0%]; 0 of 8 unacceptable on critical essay [0%]
Students will employ literary terms and contemporary critical methodologies in the analysis of texts, appropriately using and citing secondary materials.	4 of 9 above 75% on MFT [44%]; 4 of 8 exemplary on critical essay [50%]; 11 of 15 A in 235 [73%]; 12 of 15 A in 500s [80%]	2 of 9 above 50% on MFT [22%]; 3 of 8 proficient on critical essays [38%]; 3 of 15 B in 235 [20%]; 2 of 15 B in 500s [13%]	3 of 9 between 30% and 50% o MFT [33%]; 2 of 8 marginal in surveys [13.5%]; 1 of 8 marginal on critical essay [12%]	0 of 9 below 30% o MFT [0%]; 0 of 8 unacceptable on critical essay [0]
Students will understand, analyze, and effectively use the conventions of the English language.	4 of 8 exemplary on critical essay [50%]	3 of 8 proficient on critical essays [38%]	1 of 8 marginal on critical essay [12%]	0 of 8 unacceptable on critical essay [0%]
Students will demonstrate how narratives lead to the discovery of cultures in their specificities and diversity, and to the understanding of human beings in their similarities and differences.	(Excellent) achievement on custom MFT questions; excellent achievement on end-of-class standard assemment in 301. **Measures not yet in place.**	(Competent) achievement on custom MFT questions	(Marginal) achievement on custom MFT questions	(Unacceptable) achievement on custom MFT questions

	(Excellent) achievement	(Competent)	(Marginal) achievement	(Unacceptable)
Students will fulfill Missouri State University's public affairs missions by analyzing how literature, writers, and literary institutions a. respond to existing leadership and provide new leadership; b. represent cultures and encounters between cultures; and c. answer the needs of existing communities and create new communities.	(Excellent) achievement on custom MFT questions; excellent achievement on end-of-class standard assessment for Eng 301. **Measures not yet in place.**	(Competent) achievement on custom MFT questions; competent achievement on end-of-class standard assessment for Eng 301	(Marginal) achievement on custom MFT questions; marginal achievement on end-of-class standard assessment for Eng 301	(Unacceptable) achievement on custom MFT questions; unacceptable achievement on end-of-class standard assessment for Eng 301

Rubric: TEMPLATE

Task Description:

Learning Outcomes	Exemplary	Proficient	Marginal	Unacceptable
Students will know the history of literature written in English, including literary periods and generic traditions.	75th percentile or above on Major Field Test; 50th percentile or above on GRE subject test; A average in English 340, 341, 350, 351	50th-75th percentile on Major Field Test; B average or above in English 340, 341, 350, 351	30th -50th percentile on Major Field Test; C average or above in English 340, 341, 350, 351	below 30th percentile on Major Field Test; D average or above in English 340, 341, 350, 351
Students will locate literary texts in their historical, cultural, and rhetorical contexts.	75th percentile or above on Major Field Test; critical essay deemed exemplary according to shared rubric	50th-75th percentile on Major Field Test; critical essay deemed proficient according to shared rubric	30th -50th percentile on Major Field Test; critical essay deemed marginal according to shared rubric	below 30th percentile on Major Field Test; critical essay deemed poor according to shared rubric
Students will employ literary terms and contemporary critical methodologies in the analysis of texts, appropriately using and citing secondary materials.	75th percentile or above on Major Field Test; critical essay deemed exemplary according to shared rubric; A average in English 235 and 500-level English literature classes	50th-75th percentile on Major Field Test; critical essay deemed proficient according to shared rubric; B average in English 235 and 500-level English literature classes	30th -50th percentile on Major Field Test; critical essay deemed marginal according to shared rubric; C average in English 235 and 500-level English literature classes	below 30th percentile on Major Field Test; critical essay deemed poor according to shared rubric; D average in English 235 and 500-level English literature classes
Students will understand, analyze, and effectively use the conventions of the English language.	Critical essay deemed exemplary according to shared rubric	Critical essay deemed proficient according to shared rubric	Critical essay deemed marginal according to shared rubric	Critical essay deemed poor according to shared rubric
Students will demonstrate how narratives lead to the discovery of cultures in their specificities and diversity, and to the understanding of human beings in their similarities and differences.	(Excellent) achievement on custom MFT questions	(Competent) achievement on custom MFT questions	(Marginal) achievement on custom MFT questions	(Unacceptable) achievement on custom MFT questions

	(Excellent) achievement	(Competent)	(Marginal) achievement	(Unacceptable)
Students will fulfill Missouri State University's public affairs missions by analyzing how literature, writers, and literary institutions a. respond to existing leadership and provide new leadership; b. represent cultures and encounters between cultures; and c. answer the needs of existing communities and create new communities.	(Excellent) achievement on custom MFT questions; excellent achievement on end-of-class standard assessment for Eng 301	(Competent) achievement on custom MFT questions; competent achievement on end-of-class standard assessment for Eng 301	(Marginal) achievement on custom questions; marginal achievement on end-of-class standard assessment for Eng 301	(Unacceptable) MFT achievement on custom questions; unacceptable achievement on end-of-class standard assessment for Eng 301

Literature Faculty
Rubric for Evaluating Critical Essay

Name of student:
Name of evaluator:

*Check the boxes below to indicate your assessment of the essay. Note that this rubric is a blunt instrument: 4, 3, 2, and 1 are the only options. Please don't write in 3.5, 2.5, etc.

	exceptional (4)	proficient (3)	marginal (2)	poor (1)
Student advances interesting central argument				
Student supports argument with careful analysis of literary texts				
Student locates texts in their historical, cultural, and/or rhetorical contexts				
Student makes productive use of secondary scholarship				
Student demonstrates mastery of conventions of academic writing and of the English language.				
OVERALL EVALUATION				

An **"exceptional"** essay will be both very well written and interesting to a college-educated audience. Accurately representing both its text and context of focus (e.g., history, theory, or form and rhetoric), it will clearly advance and thoroughly defend an insightful interpretive or evaluative claim with plentiful, relevant textual evidence and rigorous analysis. An exceptional essay will contain exceedingly few surface errors, a strategic organizational model, and consistently sophisticated syntax, style, and vocabulary and will probably engage in a confident, sophisticated way with secondary source materials.

A **"proficient"** essay will be very solidly argued and written. Accurate, thorough, and relatively free of surface errors, it may lack the insight or interest of the "exceptional" essay, but it will still clearly and coherently forward a reasonable interpretive or evaluative claim and will defend that claim in well-developed paragraphs with sufficient textual and contextual evidence. A proficient essay will demonstrate appropriate knowledge of the literary field, the specific text in question, and any relevant historical, theoretical, or rhetorical context, as well as college-level style, syntax, and vocabulary. It will probably use secondary source material unobjectionably if not to rhetorical meaningful ends.

A **"marginal"** essay will demonstrate basic competency with the text and with textual analysis in general, if it struggles to make an appropriately interpretive or evaluative claim or to defend its claim sufficiently with textual and/or contextual evidence. Its content may seem overly generalized, superficial, or slightly unclear; its representation of the text or relevant context may reveal slight inaccuracies or omissions. It may also feature some rhetorical or formal weakness, including but not limited to unfocused paragraphs, weak transitions, simplistic or awkward syntax. It will probably also contain a number of surface errors,

suggesting basic college-level writing ability but weaknesses in editing and proofreading. Its use of secondary source material will be generally correct but may not add meaningfully to the whole.

A "poor" essay will demonstrate notable weaknesses in literary understanding, textual analysis, and academic writing, or extreme difficulties with any one or two of those skills. Probably reflecting inaccuracies or gross omissions in relevant textual or contextual details, it may also fail to forward a clear or appropriate thesis, it may fail to support its thesis with evidence from the text or secondary sources, and it will likely contain many surface errors, unsophisticated vocabulary, and several moments of syntactical or stylistic awkwardness. Its use of secondary source material may be absent or significantly awkward.