

English Department BA/BS Interim Assessment Report, Fall 2018

Overview

Department: English

Report Preparer: English Department Assessment Committee

Program Name and Level: Undergraduate BA in Literature; BS in Elementary and Secondary Education

Program Assessment Question	Response
1) URL: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://www.ccsu.edu/english/undergrad/programOutcomes.html
2) LO Changes: Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed	There were no changes to the English BA/BS outcomes in 2017-18.
3) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well?	Our process assesses students at various stages in their careers in English, separates out results for our 2 “core” courses, and enjoys support across our large department
4) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve?	We are in the process of making changes to the tables representing our data in order to focus more on each individual outcome and to represent clearly the numbers of students achieving different scores within a given outcome (per the feedback to our full assessment report in 2017). We have made changes to our UG tables and are working on our graduate tables. We have begun processing assessment rosters earlier in the semester to ensure wider participation among faculty. We have begun norming efforts to ensure evaluation consistency across different course levels.

LO #1) Thesis	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	The literature rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in ENG 298 and 398, all 300-level English literature courses, and all 400-level English literature courses.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	The English Department Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Our students in the BA and BS programs continue to meet expectations. "Thesis" is a foundational element of written literary analysis and remains strong area for BA/BS students. Student scores in S18 dipped from S17, but that semester's results were anomalously high.
	Evidence: This conclusion is based on the data from the literature rubrics. See appended
	Changes: None
LO #2) Reading of Literature as Literature	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	The literature rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in ENG 298 and 398, all 300-level English literature courses and all 400-level English literature courses.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	The English Department Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Our BA and BS students continue to show close, analytical reading skills. "Reading" is our most consistent area and represents a critical discipline-specific practice. The modeling our faculty offer of close-reading methods and the work students do at home and in class to practice these methods clearly influence their writing.
	Evidence: This conclusion is based on data from the rubric.
	Changes: None this semester

LO #3 Use of Quotations	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	The literature rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in ENG 298 and 398, all 300-level English literature courses and all 400-level English literature courses.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	The English Department Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Our BA and BS students show inconsistency here. After 3 years of a considerable increase from scores of 3 to scores of 4 and 5, S18 saw similar numbers of students achieving 3, 4, and 5. Though students continue to meet expectations, in other words, fewer are surpassing basic competency. Since this is a specific skill taught in ENG 298, faculty can focus their efforts in that course.
	Evidence: The conclusion is based on data from the rubric.
	Changes: None

LO #4) Demonstration of Thesis	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	The literature rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in ENG 298 and 398, all 300-level English literature courses and all 400-level English literature courses.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	The English Department Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Our BA and BS students have shown consistently strong scores in supporting their theses in written work with a variety of evidence.
	Evidence: The conclusion is based on data from the rubric.
	Changes: None

LO #5) Context	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	The literature rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in ENG 298 and 398, all 300-level English literature courses and all 400-level English literature courses.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	The English Department Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Our BA and BS students continue to show the ability to relate works of literature to their cultural context. The average score dipped some from S17 but remain strong. Since this skill is most prominent in 400-level courses, where English offers fewer courses than in previous years, the data are less robust than that for the first 4 outcomes on our rubric.
	Evidence: The conclusion is based on data from the rubric.
	Changes: None

LO #6) Use of Secondary Material	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	The literature rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in ENG 298 and 398, all 300-level English literature courses and all 400-level English literature courses.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	The English Department Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Three quarters of our students met or exceeded expectations in S17, but the data here are particularly unreliable due to a drop in the number of students taking 400-level courses. This trend will continue. The English assessment committee has discussed assessing more students in each course (currently we assess 5) to improve the reliability of our data.
	Evidence: The conclusion is based on data from the rubric.
	Changes: Proposal pending to increase data collection at 400 level.

Appendix A: ENGLISH LITERATURE ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Outcome	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
thesis	no thesis or thesis not literary, or is deemed indefensible or illegitimate	rudimentary, implicit, or conceptually muddled thesis, or is merely description rather than claim	basically sound thesis—arguable, appropriate, but simplistic and perhaps not ambitious enough for assignment	solid thesis, defined, detailed, and not only appropriate but also addresses the complexity of the work(s) addressed	explicit, complex, original
reading of lit.	on the basis of textual evidence misrepresents or misunderstands work(s) addressed	only basic or general understanding of work(s) addressed—often treats plot rather than literary elements	solid understanding of literary elements observable in work(s) addressed, but may not have much authorial elaboration or may name them without integrating them into a clear reading	demonstrates some sophistication in the reading of literature; identifies and discusses appropriately with accurate vocabulary literary elements supporting claim, though may miss some implications of what has been observed	finely drawn observations/comments on work(s) addressed
use of quotes	may be missing any textual support; quoted passages may actually contradict point at hand; may quote inaccurately	may rely too heavily on quotes to make point; may not include strongest textual evidence available, may draw spurious conclusions from appropriate passages or only limited and minor points	generally appropriate, accurate use of textual evidence, but may be used to make rather simple or obvious points; may offer passages that are unnecessarily long or fail to include details necessary to support claim	appropriate, accurate, supports argument clearly, but there may be some relevant details within quotation left untreated or a failure to recognize other elements within a passage beyond the immediate point at hand	well-chosen, well-explicated, accurate, and integrated into author's argument
demonstration of thesis	missing, spurious; may not be literary; may be entirely or largely plot summary	rudimentary; may be only implicit or only indirectly tied to claim; may include unnecessary plot summary	present, addresses literature, but perhaps does not arise directly from the claim or is not particularly striking or original; may be more description rather than close reading	present, relevant, literary, arises from the claim presented but may miss opportunities to develop the nuances of the work(s) addressed	convincing, complex picture of literature and literary issues addressed; stems directly from claim presented
rel. between lit. work and its context	misassertions or misinformation about context; or no attempt to contextualize	awareness of issues of context, but may ID inappropriate contexts or have only rudimentary notions of connections	ID's appropriate and helpful context; able to draw clear, useful, if not necessarily sophisticated, connections in discussion of work(s) addressed	clear, valid relationships between works and context(s), makes use of relationship to craft argument and conclusion but may miss additional contexts that complicate claim	articulates clear, valuable relationship between work(s) and appropriate context(s) in a variety of ways; sees complexity of such relationships
use of secondary or research material	req. by assignment but missing, or no citation, or material dropped into text without any purpose or relevance	material present (if req.) but long passages may be presented without discussion or authorial contextualizing; may be poorly cited; may not be related to argument advanced	used largely appropriately in support of argument, but may not be integrated fully into the argument; may have some problems with citation	used appropriately and cited correctly; demonstrates sound understanding of sources used, and sources are relevant to topic at hand; citation practices correct	material mastered and set into clear, valuable rel. with author's perspective; technicalities of use of citation entirely correct

Appendix B: English Assessment Results for Literature Courses

All results (Spring 2013 - Spring 2018) by Outcome

Thesis	Rating					No Score	Grand Total	Avg Score	% \geq 3
	1	2	3	4	5				
Spring 2013 Literature	6	21	78	73	19	121	318	3.40	86%
Spring 2014 Literature	20	36	62	86	63	67	334	3.51	79%
Spring 2015 Literature	7	20	59	70	31	103	290	3.52	86%
Spring 2016 Literature	13	23	43	71	27	82	259	3.43	80%
Spring 2017 Literature	1	10	20	39	26	62	158	3.82	89%
Spring 2018 Literature	2	10	21	26	9	62	130	3.44	82%
Grand Total	49	120	283	365	175	497	1489	3.52	84%

Reading of Lit	Rating					No Score	Grand Total	Avg Score	% \geq 3
	1	2	3	4	5				
Spring 2013 Literature	0	29	66	68	33	122	318	3.54	85%
Spring 2014 Literature	5	35	77	87	63	67	334	3.63	85%
Spring 2015 Literature	7	21	62	55	41	104	290	3.55	85%
Spring 2016 Literature	8	23	50	58	38	82	259	3.54	82%
Spring 2017 Literature	2	4	29	33	28	62	158	3.84	94%
Spring 2018 Literature	1	8	24	15	20	62	130	3.66	87%
Grand Total	23	120	308	316	223	499	1489	3.63	86%

Use of Quotes	Rating					No Score	Grand Total	Avg Score	% \geq 3
	1	2	3	4	5				
Spring 2013 Literature	4	21	73	72	27	121	318	3.49	87%
Spring 2014 Literature	9	24	95	87	52	67	334	3.56	88%
Spring 2015 Literature	15	19	46	65	41	104	290	3.53	82%
Spring 2016 Literature	15	21	48	63	30	82	259	3.41	80%
Spring 2017 Literature	4	7	19	43	23	62	158	3.77	89%
Spring 2018 Literature	3	10	19	19	17	62	130	3.54	81%
Grand Total	50	102	300	349	190	498	1489	3.55	85%

Demonstration of Thesis	Rating					No Score	Grand Total	Avg Score	% \geq 3
	1	2	3	4	5				
Spring 2013 Literature	8	17	71	63	37	122	318	3.53	87%
Spring 2014 Literature	8	45	84	82	48	67	334	3.44	80%
Spring 2015 Literature	8	13	59	66	40	104	290	3.63	89%
Spring 2016 Literature	12	23	47	69	26	82	259	3.42	80%
Spring 2017 Literature	2	3	33	35	23	62	158	3.77	95%
Spring 2018 Literature	2	12	16	18	20	62	130	3.62	79%
Grand Total	40	113	310	333	194	499	1489	3.57	85%

Context	Rating					No Score	Grand Total	Avg Score	% \geq 3
	1	2	3	4	5				
Spring 2013 Literature	6	22	56	53	30	151	318	3.47	83%
Spring 2014 Literature	8	39	68	84	65	69	334	3.60	82%
Spring 2015 Literature	10	16	49	60	41	114	290	3.60	85%
Spring 2016 Literature	18	16	43	62	26	94	259	3.38	79%
Spring 2017 Literature	2	7	23	27	29	70	158	3.84	90%
Spring 2018 Literature		10	12	21	15	72	130	3.71	83%
Grand Total	44	110	251	307	206	570	1489	3.6	84%

Secondary Material	Rating					No Score	Grand Total	Avg Score	% \geq 3
	1	2	3	4	5				
Spring 2013 Literature	3	13	37	34	18	213	318	3.49	85%
Spring 2014 Literature	1	20	31	22	21	239	334	3.44	78%
Spring 2015 Literature	11	7	27	30	18	197	290	3.40	81%
Spring 2016 Literature	7	9	30	29	14	170	259	3.38	82%
Spring 2017 Literature	4	5	14	24	21	90	158	3.78	87%
Spring 2018 Literature	2	4	6	8	5	105	130	3.40	76%
Grand Total	28	58	145	147	97	1014	1489	3.48	82%