

English Department BA/BS Interim Assessment Report, Fall 2015

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://web.ccsu.edu/english/undergraduatePrograms/files/English_BA_Learning_Outcomes.pdf http://web.ccsu.edu/english/undergraduatePrograms/files/English_BS_Learning_Outcomes.pdf |
| 2) LO Changes: Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings) | There are no changes. |
| 3) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | Our assessment process has led the department to make important curricular changes and to continue to discuss the rationale for our rubric. |
| 4) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here) | We continue to strengthen the reliability of our assessment data by making sure the measurements for each learning outcome are consistently made regardless of class level. The English department faculty have worked together to assure the accuracy of our data. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 5, 6 and 7 (you may add more rows if you have more than 5 LOs): | |
| 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? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, , etc.) | The source of the data is the literature rubric. |
| 6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO. | The 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 improve their skills in this area. Thesis stands as one of our students strongest areas. After a dip in 2013-2014, students scored highly in Spring 2015. |
| | Evidence: This conclusion is based on the data from the literature rubrics. See appended |
| | Changes: The English department created two courses to improve students' understanding and writing in the major: 298 Introduction to Literary Theory and 398 : Topics in Literary Theory and Research. We also clarified our expectations for each level of study and completed curricular reform. We continue to hold periodic discussions on curricula and evaluations. "Thesis" is among our most important areas of focus. |
| LO #2) _Reading | |
| 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? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The literature rubric is the source of this data. |
| 6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO. | The Assessment Committee. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>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).</p> | <p>Conclusion: Our Ba and BS students continue to improve their skills as close, analytical readers. “Reading” is probably our most consistent areas. The modeling our faculty do of close-reading methods and the work students do at home and in class to practice these methods clearly influences their writing.</p> <p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): This conclusion is based on data from the rubric.</p> <p>Changes: See #7 under LO #1</p> |
| <p>LO #3) __Quotes__</p> | |
| <p>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? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p> | <p>The literature rubric is the source of this data.</p> |
| <p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p> | <p>The Assessment Committee</p> |
| <p>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).</p> | <p>Conclusion: Our BA and BS students show inconsistency here. Although our last data, from Spring 2015, shows a high number of students meeting or surpassing what is acceptable, faculty will focus on this critical and practicable skill in the coming semesters.</p> <p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): The conclusion is based on data from the rubric.</p> <p>Changes: See #7 under LO #1</p> |

| 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? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The data comes from the literature rubric. |
| 6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO. | The 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 demonstrating their theses in written work. |
| | Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): The data in the rubric. |
| | Changes: See #7 under LO#1. |
| 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? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The data comes from the literature rubric. |
| 6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO. | The 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 steady improvement in LO “Context” over the past 3 semesters, a trend we will work to continue. We plan improvements and increased standardization in our surveys of historical periods, which should reinforce the success our students are enjoying in this area. |
| | Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): The data in the rubric. |
| | Changes: See #7 under LO #1. |

LO #5) LO #6 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? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The data comes from the literature rubric. |
| 6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO. | The 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 improve in their use of secondary materials, especially since the implementation of ENG 398. However, we will further refine the research requirements in our 400-level courses in the coming semesters by moving some current 400-level courses without required research to the 300 level. This will ensure that all students taking their 400-level requirements will be assigned research and the use of secondary material in their writing. Please note, in Table 4 below, the jump in students who achieve above expectations at the senior level |
| | Evidence: The data in the rubric. |
| | Changes: See #7 under LO #1. |

English Department Writing Assessment Rubric

| <u>Outcome</u> | <u>(1)</u> | <u>(2)</u> | <u>(3)</u> | <u>(4)</u> | <u>(5)</u> |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| 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 | well-chosen, well-explicated, accurate, and integrated into author's argument |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | immediate point at hand | |
| 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: English Assessment Results for Literature Courses

All results (Fall 2007 - Spring 2015) by outcome

Table 3 - Percent Scoring 3 or better (passing) by rubric category

| Outcome | Fall 2007 | Sp 2008 | Fall 2008 | Sp 2009 | Fall 2009 | Sp 2010 | Fall 2010 | Sp 2011 | Fall 2011 | Sp 2012 | Fall 2012 | Sp 2013 | Fall 2013 | Sp 2014 | Fall 2014 | Sp 2015 |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| N | 69 | 300 | 576 | 869 | 732 | 605 | 148 | 602 | 316 | 748 | 209 | 197 | 78 | 267 | n/a | 188 |
| Thesis | 62% | 68% | 70% | 72% | 76% | 85% | 68% | 72% | 72% | 81% | 77% | 86% | 78% | 79% | n/a | 85% |
| Reading | 78% | 73% | 78% | 76% | 80% | 84% | 76% | 71% | 69% | 81% | 78% | 85% | 75% | 85% | n/a | 84% |
| Quotes | 75% | 75% | 74% | 74% | 69% | 81% | 61% | 69% | 65% | 79% | 70% | 87% | 69% | 88% | n/a | 81% |
| Demonstration of Thesis | 68% | 71% | 74% | 73% | 73% | 84% | 68% | 68% | 67% | 80% | 76% | 87% | 72% | 80% | n/a | 88% |
| Context | 72% | 70% | 80% | 76% | 74% | 85% | 62% | 69% | 75% | 79% | 72% | 83% | 74% | 82% | n/a | 85% |
| Secondary Material | 79% | 68% | 78% | 72% | 67% | 79% | 52% | 66% | 58% | 83% | 55% | 85% | 90% | 78% | n/a | 80% |

Table 4 by Class Level

| Class Level | Thesis | | Reading | | Quotes | | Demonstration of Thesis | | Context | | Secondary Material | |
|----------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|--------|-------|-------------------------|-------|---------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| | N | % ≥ 3 | N | % > 3 | N | % > 3 | N | % > 3 | N | % > 3 | N | % > 3 |
| First Year | 552 | 74% | 559 | 75% | 548 | 70% | 551 | 71% | 500 | 74% | 336 | 72% |
| Sophomore | 1508 | 75% | 1606 | 74% | 1560 | 71% | 1505 | 72% | 1393 | 73% | 802 | 66% |
| Junior | 1883 | 74% | 1951 | 78% | 1927 | 74% | 1880 | 75% | 1666 | 76% | 960 | 71% |
| Senior | 1856 | 78% | 1899 | 81% | 1882 | 79% | 1853 | 79% | 1715 | 80% | 1030 | 79% |
| Grad/Post-Bacc | 105 | 91% | 106 | 93% | 106 | 90% | 104 | 90% | 95 | 89% | 67 | 94% |

Table 6 by English Major

| Major | Thesis | | Reading | | Quotes | | Demonstration of Thesis | | Context | | Secondary Material | |
|--|--------|------------|---------|------------|--------|------------|----------------------------|------------|---------|------------|-----------------------|------------|
| | N | % ≥ 3 | N | % ≥ 3 | N | % ≥ 3 | N | % ≥ 3 | N | % ≥ 3 | N | % ≥ 3 |
| English, BA | 1334 | 77% | 1339 | 82% | 1333 | 82% | 1333 | 79% | 1188 | 80% | 724 | 80% |
| English & Elem Ed English, Pre-BSED & BSED | 931 | 79% | 947 | 83% | 946 | 82% | 930 | 80% | 810 | 80% | 496 | 82% |

English 298 Assessments: Fall 2007 – Spring 2015

Performance in English 298 – The total number of individual students who took English 298 and were assessed in that course is shown in the table below. Also provided is the percent of students who scored 3 (satisfactory) or higher and the mean assessment score. Data are categorized by the grade received in the course.

| | | English 298 Grade | | No Assessment Score | Grand Total |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| | | C- or higher | D, F, W, or Inc | | |
| Thesis | N | 554 | 46 | 126 | 726 |
| | % Score > 3 | 77% | 65% | - | - |
| | Mean Score | 3.37 | 2.93 | - | - |
| Reading of Literature | N | 557 | 46 | 123 | 726 |
| | % Score > 3 | 81% | 61% | - | - |
| | Mean Score | 3.49 | 2.93 | - | - |
| Use of Quotes | N | 555 | 45 | 126 | 726 |
| | % Score > 3 | 82% | 69% | - | - |
| | Mean Score | 3.43 | 2.98 | - | - |
| Demonstration of Thesis | N | 553 | 46 | 127 | 726 |
| | % Score > 3 | 76% | 59% | - | - |
| | Mean Score | 3.34 | 2.83 | - | - |
| Context | N | 421 | 37 | 268 | 726 |
| | % Score > 3 | 78% | 68% | - | - |
| | Mean Score | 3.41 | 3.03 | - | - |
| Secondary Material | N | 199 | 24 | 503 | 726 |
| | % Score > 3 | 79% | 71% | - | - |
| | Mean Score | 3.55 | 3.04 | - | - |

ENGLISH DEPT GENERAL EDUCATION INTERIM ASSESSMENT, FALL 2015

Department: ENGLISH

General Education LO Assessed: CRT 4. ANALYZE INFORMATION TO UNCOVER UNDERLYING MEANINGS, STRUCTURES AND PATTERNS

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE –ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Question | Response |
|---|---|
| 1) <u>Courses</u> : General Education course(s) taught | The English courses assessed are English 105 and English 110. |
| 2) <u>Assessment Instruments</u> : What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in English 105 and English 110. LO CRT 4 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric's Item #2, Thoughtful Ideas. |
| 3) <u>Interpretation</u> : Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) <u>Results</u> : 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). | The data from 2009 to 2014 indicate that a majority of students meet this learning outcome. During this period of time, 88% of the student writing assessed was satisfactory or better. Students have performed consistently well on this learning outcome during the past five years. However, in an effort to improve our pedagogy and better articulate the curricular expectations of English 105 and 110, our departmental Composition Committee has written learning outcomes for the course that align with the general education outcomes. A training session for all faculty teaching English 105 and 110 was held in August 2015, and all instructors teaching these courses will have their syllabi reviewed by the Director of Composition each semester, beginning in the spring 2016 semester. |
| 5) <u>Strengths</u> : What about your assessment process is working well? | The English Department's Composition Rubric provides a standard way for instructors to evaluate written work in a manageable and easily understandable way. |
| 6) <u>Improvements</u> : What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes to assessment plan should be reported here) | No major changes are needed for our assessment process. However, the fall 2014 semester response rate as reported is uncharacteristically low. Data on only five student papers were reported, or a sample from one class section. We know that more sections assessed student writing, so we need to understand the cause of the reported low response rate so that it does not happen in future semesters. |

General Education LO Assessed: WC 1. DEVELOP A CHOSEN TOPIC

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE –ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Question | Response |
|---|--|
| 1) Courses: General Education course(s) taught | The English courses assessed are English 105 and English 110. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in English 105 and English 110. LO CRT 4 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric Item #1, Controlling Idea; Item #2, Thoughtful Ideas; and Item #4, Demonstration of Controlling Ideas. |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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). | The data from each item of the rubric that is used to assess this learning outcome shows student achievement at an acceptable level. The cumulative percentage of student writing rated higher than satisfactory is 88% for Rubric Item #1, 88% for Rubric Item #2, and 85% for Rubric Item #3. These percentages indicate that students effectively generate their own ideas and perspectives on complex issues, and they draw on appropriate types and amount of evidence. We are missing data from 2013 and 2014, but we note improvement in students' scores between 2011 and 2012. To continue honing effective teaching strategies for developing topics, instructors can teach writing as a process and assign papers that require students to choose their own topics and write their own thesis statements. Sample assignments that support this learning outcome are available on an Instructor Resource Blackboard site and in the Composition Instructor Handbook. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | The number of written assignments that instructors require (a minimum of three) is an appropriate number for teaching students to develop topics. Our assessment practice of scoring the last untimed writing assignment shows us what students have learned before exiting our courses. |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes to assessment plan should be reported here) | No major changes are needed for our assessment process. We might raise scores through professional development that focuses on designing assignments that teach students to develop topics, but we have already discussed this topic in our August 2015 training. As previously noted, the fall 2014 semester response rate is uncharacteristically low. Data on only five student papers were reported, or a sample from one class section. We know that more sections assessed student writing, so we need to understand why the response rate was reported as low so that it does not happen in future semesters. |

General Education LO Assessed: WC2. ORGANIZE SPECIFICS TO SUPPORT A MAIN IDEA

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE –ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Question | Response |
|---|--|
| 1) Courses: General Education course(s) taught | The English courses assessed are English 105 and English 110. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in English 105 and English 110. LO CRT 4 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric Item #3, Organization, and Item #4, Demonstration of Controlling Idea. |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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). | The results of our assessment indicate that students are able to organize specific evidence in support of a central idea. The cumulative percentages from our rubric items (86% above satisfactory for item #3 and 85% above satisfactory for item #4) are high. These results indicate that our faculty teach stages in the writing process (such as outlining, peer review, and evaluation of evidence) that aid students in building well supported arguments. We know that some of our instructors work with our librarians to support students as they search for and evaluate sources. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | This assessment works well and has provided our composition faculty with positive feedback that encourages us to continue our teaching methods. In order to continue improving our instruction, we have partnered with our librarians who are designing a composition specific LibGuide that will aid students in finding sources; our composition instructors will then teach students to organize their findings from these sources. We are missing sufficient data from 2013 and 2014, but we can report improvement in students' scores between 2011 and 2012. |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes to assessment plan should be reported here) | No major changes are needed for our assessment process. We might raise scores through professional development that focuses on designing assignments that teach students to develop topics, but we have already discussed this topic in our August 2015 training. Our assessment data is incomplete, as previously noted, because the fall 2014 semester response rate is uncharacteristically low. Data on only five student papers were reported, or a sample from one class section. We know that more sections assessed student writing, so we need to understand the reason for such a low reported response rate so that it does not happen in future semesters. |

General Education LO Assessed: WC3. USE PROPER GRAMMAR

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE –ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Question | Response |
|---|--|
| 1) Courses: General Education course(s) taught | The English courses assessed are English 105 and English 110. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Department’s Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in English 105 and English 110. LO CRT 4 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric’s Item #6, Conventions. |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department’s Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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). | The results of our assessment demonstrate that students use proper grammar in their formal writing assignments. The cumulative percentage of students who scored satisfactorily or better is 82%; while high, this percentage is slightly lower than other rubric items and learning outcomes. Faculty are advised to teach grammar in the context of students’ own writing through revision, which scholarship in composition has shown to be a more effective strategy than tests or exercises. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | This assessment works well and has provided our composition faculty with positive data. It is useful to assess students’ final untimed writing to rate their grammatical correctness because they have revised their writing multiple times prior to our faculty assessing it. |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes to assessment plan should be reported here) | This assessment works well and has provided our composition faculty with data that shows relative to other areas, we could work with students to improve their grammar. This pedagogical concern is addressed in the Composition Instructor Handbook, but continued professional development could be designed. The fall 2014 semester response rate is uncharacteristically low. Data on only five student papers were reported, or a sample from one class section. We know that more sections assessed student writing, so we need to understand the reason for such a low reported response rate so that it does not happen in future semesters. |

General Education LO Assessed: WC4. ADDRESS A PARTICULAR AUDIENCE

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE –ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Question | Response |
|---|--|
| 1) <u>Courses</u> : General Education course(s) taught | The English courses assessed are English 105 and English 110. |
| 2) <u>Assessment Instruments</u> : What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in English 105 and English 110. LO CRT 4 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric's Item #5, Style. |
| 3) <u>Interpretation</u> : Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) <u>Results</u> : 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). | Our data shows that over the past five years students are writing in an appropriate style that indicates awareness of audience. Minor fluctuation between years occurs, but our most recent complete data (between 2011 and 2012) shows that students improved. This data indicates that our faculty are teaching students to write from a rhetorical perspective, which our course outcomes require. |
| 5) <u>Strengths</u> : What about your assessment process is working well? | This assessment works well and has provided our composition faculty with positive data. Our assessment practice is sound; the best way to evaluate students' writing style and audience awareness is through direct assessment (meaning, to read their writing). To continue improving our teaching methods, we can continue sharing class materials among our instructors (on our Blackboard site and during in-person professional development meetings) to generate ideas for teaching student writers to consider audience. |
| 6) <u>Improvements</u> : What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes to assessment plan should be reported here) | No major changes are needed for our assessment process. However, compared to other rubric items, students demonstrated slightly lower levels of mastery in the area of writing in an audience appropriate style; a cumulative 83% of students were scored as satisfactory or higher, which can be addressed through faculty workshops and resource sharing. The fall 2014 semester response rate is uncharacteristically low. Data on only five student papers were reported, or a sample from one class section. We know that more sections assessed student writing, so we need to understand the reason for this low reported response rate so that it does not happen in future semesters. |

General Education LO Assessed: WC5. REVISE AND EDIT TO PRODUCE FOCUSED AND COHERENT PROSE

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE –ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Question | Response |
|---|---|
| 1) Courses: General Education course(s) taught | The English courses assessed are English 105 and English 110. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Department's Composition Rubric was used as the assessment instrument. Faculty use the Composition Rubric to assess the last piece of untimed writing in English 105 and English 110. LO CRT 4 corresponds to the English Composition Rubric's Item #1, Controlling Idea. |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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). | The data from the rubric item that is used to assess this learning outcome shows student achievement at an acceptable level. The cumulative percentage of student writing rated higher than satisfactory is 88% for Rubric Item #1. This percentage indicates that students are writing as process and improving each draft until they have an effective final draft. We are missing data from 2013 and 2014, but we have noticed improvement in students' scores between 2011 and 2012. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | This assessment works fairly well because it is a manageable way to rate the final polished prose of a student; though it does not provide insight into the students' writing and revision process, the faculty member assessing the writing has taught the student and knows his/her process. We will continue providing pedagogical support for our instructors through our training and our Composition Instructor Handbook. In addition, our course outcomes require that students write in stages, receive feedback on drafts, and revise their own writing, which supports this general education learning outcome. |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes to assessment plan should be reported here) | No major changes are needed for our assessment process. As a department, we will continue to share and discuss teaching methods/resources for coaching students to revise and edit their prose. As previously noted, the fall 2014 semester response rate is uncharacteristically low. Data on only five student papers were reported, or a sample from one class section. We know that more sections assessed student writing, so we need to understand the reason for such a low reported response rate so that it does not happen in future semesters. |

Appendix: English 110 Assessment Data

English 110 Ratings by Semester

| Thoughtful Idea | Rating | | | | | No Score | Grand Total | Avg Score | % ≥ 3 |
|-----------------|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | |
| Sp 2009 | 3 | 25 | 144 | 146 | 94 | | 412 | 3.74 | 93% |
| Fall 2009 | 3 | 41 | 133 | 163 | 101 | | 441 | 3.72 | 90% |
| Sp 2010 | 8 | 29 | 69 | 94 | 47 | | 247 | 3.58 | 85% |
| Fall 2010 | 10 | 40 | 145 | 158 | 97 | 30 | 480 | 3.65 | 89% |
| Fall 2011 | 9 | 54 | 135 | 111 | 80 | 35 | 424 | 3.51 | 84% |
| Fall 2012 | 17 | 31 | 98 | 126 | 113 | 45 | 430 | 3.75 | 88% |
| Fall 2014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 4.40 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 50 | 220 | 724 | 801 | 534 | 120 | 2449 | 3.67 | 88% |

Controlling Idea

| Semester | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | No Score | Grand Total | Avg Score | % ≥ 3 |
|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Sp 2009 | 1 | 23 | 148 | 159 | 81 | | 412 | 3.72 | 94% |
| Fall 2009 | | 24 | 164 | 163 | 89 | 1 | 441 | 3.72 | 95% |
| Sp 2010 | 8 | 28 | 79 | 95 | 37 | | 247 | 3.51 | 85% |
| Fall 2010 | 11 | 41 | 133 | 180 | 85 | 30 | 480 | 3.64 | 88% |
| Fall 2011 | 14 | 72 | 121 | 93 | 89 | 35 | 424 | 3.44 | 78% |
| Fall 2012 | 16 | 41 | 82 | 122 | 124 | 45 | 430 | 3.77 | 85% |
| Fall 2014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 5.00 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 50 | 229 | 727 | 812 | 510 | 121 | 2449 | 3.65 | 88% |

Demonstration of Controlling Idea

| Semester | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | No Score | Grand Total | Avg Score | % \geq 3 |
|----------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Sp 2009 | 5 | 37 | 158 | 158 | 54 | | 412 | 3.53 | 90% |
| Fall 2009 | 2 | 53 | 167 | 146 | 73 | | 441 | 3.53 | 88% |
| Sp 2010 | 11 | 30 | 91 | 78 | 37 | | 247 | 3.40 | 83% |
| Fall 2010 | 14 | 51 | 184 | 133 | 68 | 30 | 480 | 3.42 | 86% |
| Fall 2011 | 14 | 76 | 141 | 109 | 48 | 36 | 424 | 3.26 | 77% |
| Fall 2012 | 15 | 46 | 102 | 135 | 87 | 45 | 430 | 3.61 | 84% |
| Fall 2014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 4.40 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 61 | 293 | 843 | 762 | 369 | 121 | 2449 | 3.47 | 85% |

English 110 Ratings by Semester

Effective Organization

| Semester | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | No Score | Grand Total | Avg Score | % ≥ 3 |
|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-------------|-----------|-------|
| Sp 2009 | 3 | 32 | 154 | 155 | 68 | | 412 | 3.61 | 92% |
| Fall 2009 | 2 | 39 | 150 | 154 | 96 | | 441 | 3.69 | 91% |
| Sp 2010 | 10 | 29 | 92 | 77 | 39 | | 247 | 3.43 | 84% |
| Fall 2010 | 10 | 66 | 156 | 145 | 73 | 30 | 480 | 3.46 | 83% |
| Fall 2011 | 18 | 65 | 133 | 103 | 66 | 39 | 424 | 3.35 | 78% |
| Fall 2012 | 14 | 48 | 105 | 123 | 95 | 45 | 430 | 3.62 | 84% |
| Fall 2014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 15 | 4.60 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 57 | 279 | 790 | 759 | 440 | 124 | 2449 | 3.54 | 86% |

Mature & Effective Style

| Semester | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | No Score | Grand Total | Avg Score | % ≥ 3 |
|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-------------|-----------|-------|
| Sp 2009 | 5 | 56 | 159 | 142 | 50 | | 412 | 3.43 | 85% |
| Fall 2009 | 7 | 52 | 160 | 147 | 75 | | 441 | 3.52 | 87% |
| Sp 2010 | 10 | 43 | 82 | 79 | 33 | | 247 | 3.33 | 79% |
| Fall 2010 | 12 | 48 | 167 | 148 | 75 | 30 | 480 | 3.50 | 87% |
| Fall 2011 | 17 | 74 | 143 | 118 | 37 | 35 | 424 | 3.22 | 77% |
| Fall 2012 | 14 | 58 | 141 | 104 | 68 | 45 | 430 | 3.40 | 81% |
| Fall 2014 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 4.20 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 65 | 331 | 853 | 740 | 340 | 120 | 2449 | 3.41 | 83% |

Attention to Convention

| Semester | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | No Score | Grand Total | Avg Score | % ≥ 3 |
|----------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|----------------|--------------|-------|
| Sp 2009 | 4 | 51 | 147 | 125 | 85 | | 412 | 3.57 | 87% |
| Fall 2009 | 6 | 50 | 149 | 136 | 100 | | 441 | 3.62 | 87% |
| Sp 2010 | 4 | 48 | 80 | 83 | 32 | | 247 | 3.37 | 79% |
| Fall 2010 | 15 | 67 | 152 | 141 | 75 | 30 | 480 | 3.43 | 82% |
| Fall 2011 | 26 | 62 | 166 | 95 | 40 | 35 | 424 | 3.16 | 77% |
| Fall 2012 | 18 | 59 | 127 | 107 | 74 | 45 | 430 | 3.42 | 80% |
| Fall 2014 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 4.00 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 73 | 337 | 822 | 690 | 407 | 120 | 2449 | 3.44 | 82% |

*no data from S13, F13, S14, S15

English Department Writing Rubric

| | TARGET | CONSISTENT | SATISFACTORY | UNEVEN | UNSATISFACTORY |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Thoughtful Ideas</i> | The writer offers several thoughtful ideas that reveal a distinct analytical engagement with the topic. Writer has likely asked important “journalistic questions” (who, what, where, when, why) about the topic in order to develop and clarify it. | The writer offers several compelling ideas that shed light on the topic. There is a solid sense of intellectual engagement here, but the writer has not pushed him/herself to develop ideas to their fullest. | Although there are clear ideas in the paper, they tend to be predictable and their connection to the topic isn’t always clearly developed. It’s clear that the writer has a sense of a relationship between his/her expressed ideas and topic, but that relationship may remain implicit in part rather than being clearly explained. | Ideas may not shed light on the topic or may not be appropriate for the topic. Possible moments of clarity alongside contradiction. There is not a clear sense that the student understands the material or has thought about it at length. | No evidence of intellectual engagement with the material. Ideas, if present, may be contradictory to one another or may work against the essay’s use of evidence. |
| <i>Controlling Idea</i> | The writer has clearly indicated a controlling idea that guides and structures the essay. The C.I. is appropriately complex for the scale of the essay. The C.I. is compelling in that it is not derived from a boilerplate; it emerges from a close intellectual engagement with the material. | The C.I. is present and clear, but it may not incorporate all of the issues addressed in the essay. The C.I. is interesting and complex, but not perhaps entirely original. | The C.I. is present and clear, but it could definitely be better developed. Although there is a governing idea to the essay, it may have a tendency to be simplistic or clichéd. | The C.I. is not a C.I. Parts of the essay may diverge from the C.I. and go in an entirely different direction. It’s easy to get lost in the essay, even if it does make some sense. There may be ideas here, but the essay wanders. | No C.I. or a C.I. entirely inappropriate for the subject matter. |
| <i>Demonstration of Controlling Idea</i> | Writer offers ample, striking, and convincing evidence in support of C.I. Writer recognizes and incorporates other perspectives into the | Writer offers appropriate and convincing evidence in support of C.I. Writer acknowledges other perspectives | There is appropriate evidence offered in support of the C.I., but it may be scanty or in need of elaboration. There may not be a clear | There is evidence offered, but it is inappropriate or inadequately set forth. There is no acknowledgement of | No C.I., or no appropriate evidence offered, or no evidence at all. There is no conclusion, or merely random statements or |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| | argument. Paper arrives at a meaningful and original conclusion arising effectively from the argument in support of the C.I. | appropriately within the paper and offers a conclusion arising from the argument in support of the C.I. | acknowledgement of other views, and there may be a summary, rather than a conclusion, or the conclusion may be general or obvious. | other perspectives. The conclusion may be absent or may not arise clearly from the argument presented. | assertions that have no relationship to the C.I. or the argument. |
| <i>Effective Organization</i> | All paragraphs are coherent and unified. Logic of the argument proceeds smoothly with appropriate transitions and a clear relationship among the various points presented. | All or most paragraphs are both coherent and unified. Appropriate transitions enhance the logic of the argument. | Some paragraphs are unified and coherent, but others may need to be expanded or combined. Transitions may be inappropriate or missing. | Paragraphing is present, but erratic and problematic. There is little in the way of transitions or other landmarks to help the reader through the argument. | Little in the way of organizing structure. Sentences may be presented as paragraphs, or whole pages may be offered with no paragraph breaks. No indications that the writer is aware of the relationships among the points, or may not even articulate points. |
| <i>Mature and Effective Style</i> | Writer provides a rich variety of sentence structures, both in length and format; word choice is appropriate, precise, and avoids triteness or clichés. | Writer provides a variety of sentence structures; word choice is accurate and helps advance the writer's claim. | Sentences and word choice are predictable with occasional infelicities in sentence structure. Some terms may be over-used or may be asked to do too much of the work of the argument. | Sentences and word choice are predictable, with frequent infelicities in sentence structure that begin to interfere with the writer's ability to communicate the purpose. | Little sentence structure variety; wording is predictable or inappropriate for collegiate work. Many errors are present in sentence structure. |
| <i>Attention to Conventions and Readability</i> | Writer follows conventions for college writing, including standard forms for punctuation, spelling, verb tense, and agreement. Essay avoids such mistakes as missing words, homonym confusions, | Writer betrays few, if any, minor errors in sentence construction, usage, grammar, or mechanics. Writer betrays very few mistakes with missing words, homonym confusions, tangled sentences, unclear | Writer commits some errors in sentence construction and mechanics, but the writer generally demonstrates a correct sense of syntax. Generally, care appears to have been taken in preparing the | Writer commits many and/or major errors in sentence structure and mechanics; writers' sense of correct use of syntax is in question. Care appears not to have been taken in preparing the manuscript. | Writer commits numerous minor errors and major errors; sentence construction is below mastery and displays a pattern of errors in usage and mechanics. Care has not been taken in preparing the manuscript. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|
| | tangled sentences, unclear references, and confusing punctuation. Care was taken in preparing the manuscript. | references, and confusing punctuation. Care was taken in preparing the manuscript. | manuscript. | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|

ENGLISH DEPT. GENERAL EDUCATION INTERIM ASSESSMENT, 2014- 2015: SPRING 2015

Department: ENGLISH

General Education LO Assessed: CRT 1. DEFINE A PROBLEM

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE- ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Questions | Response |
|--|--|
| 1) Courses: General Education course (s) taught. | The English courses assessed are the following ones: ENG 203,ENG 204, ENG 205, ENG 206 ENG 210 ENG 211, ENG 212, ENG 213, ENG 214, ENG 215, ENG 220 ENG 250, ENG 260, ENG 261, ENG 262. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g. capstone course, Portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Dept.'s writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in General Education courses. LO CRT 1 corresponds to the English Writing Rubric Anchor number one: Thesis. |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g. faculty, Admin. Assistant, etc.,) If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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)? | CRT 1- Define a Problem: Overall, satisfactory levels exist based on number of students assessed. Further improvements of total assessment numbers are encouraged in this area. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | Structure of written rubric used Patterns assessed through rubric Analysis of patterns observed Focus on student's writing standards |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes in assessment plans should be reported here) | No major process improvements needed for CRT I aside from increase in number of participants per semester. |

ENGLISH DEPT. GENERAL EDUCATION INTERIM ASSESSMENT, 2014- 2015: SPRING 2015

Department: ENGLISH

General Education LO Assessed: CRT 2. ASSEMBLE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT CONCLUSION

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE- ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Questions | Response |
|--|---|
| 1) Courses: General Education course (s) taught. | The English courses assessed are the following ones: ENG 203,ENG 204, ENG 205, ENG 206 ENG 210 ENG 211, ENG 212, ENG 213, ENG 214, ENG 215, ENG 220 ENG 250, ENG 260, ENG 261, ENG 262. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g. capstone course, Portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Dept.'s writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in General Education courses, and it corresponds with the English assessment rubric anchor four- Demonstration of Thesis and six- relationship between literary work and its context |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g. faculty, Admin. Assistant, etc.,) If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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)? | CRT 2- Assemble Evidence to Support Conclusion: Acceptable average results are drawn since the most recent report. Steady improvement of mean score is noted for Spring 2015 in comparison with Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 mean scores. Written assignments intended to challenge students with stronger source documentations in line with the thesis or topic will continue to be used by instructors. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | Implementation of quality written assignments The number of written assignments suggested Specific guidelines for assessments made |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes in assessment plans should be reported here) | Scores can be improved beyond the average mean Overall number of students assessed Possible deadline extensions established within reasonable timeframe |

ENGLISH DEPT. GENERAL EDUCATION INTERIM ASSESSMENT, 2014- 2015: SPRING 2015

Department: ENGLISH

General Education LO Assessed: CRT 3. ASSESS THE VALIDITY OF A SUSTAINED ARGUMENT

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE- ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Questions | Response |
|--|---|
| 1) Courses: General Education course (s) taught. | The English courses assessed are the following ones: ENG 203,ENG 204, ENG 205, ENG 206 ENG 210 ENG 211, ENG 212, ENG 213, ENG 214, ENG 215, ENG 220 ENG 250, ENG 260, ENG 261, ENG 262. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g. capstone course, Portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Dept.'s writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in General Education courses. Learning outcomes correspond to anchor number six (use of secondary or research material) of the rubric used. |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g. faculty, Admin. Assistant, etc.) If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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)? | CRT 3- Assess The Validity Of A Sustained Argument: Current data shows only a slight improvement in this area since Spring 2014. However, some patterns of inconsistency are evident and suggest a continuing trend of satisfactory rather than above average results from previous semesters to the current one. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | Acknowledgments of areas of concern and improvements Encouragement of faculty to cover select areas: i.e. summary/paraphrasing of source materials Focus on students' collective writing standards in argumentative essays |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes in assessment plans should be reported here) | Further questioning of reliability of results based on information analyzed. Continue pattern of improvement with the number of student participants. Favorable solutions for clarity of unclear or questionable data. |

ENGLISH DEPT. GENERAL EDUCATION INTERIM ASSESSMENT, 2014- 2015: SPRING 2015

Department: ENGLISH

General Education LO Assessed: CRT 4. ANALYSIS INFORMATION TO UNCOVER UNDERLYING MEANINGS, STRUCTURES AND PATTERNS

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE- ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Questions | Response |
|--|---|
| 1) Courses: General Education course (s) taught. | The English courses assessed are the following ones: ENG 203,ENG 204, ENG 205, ENG 206 ENG 210 ENG 211, ENG 212, ENG 213, ENG 214, ENG 215, ENG 220 ENG 250, ENG 260, ENG 261, ENG 262. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g. capstone course, Portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Dept.'s writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in General Education courses. Anchor two (Reading of Literature) and Anchor six (relationship between literary work and its context) are specific rubric categories used. |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g. faculty, Admin. Assistant, etc.) If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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)? | CRT 4- Analysis Information to Uncover Underlying Meanings, Structures, and Patterns : Although a slight decrease is noted, favorable results continue to be a pattern in learning outcome. Data indicates students' abilities to cover basic patterns and meanings with relevant literary devices applied. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | Student's abilities to interpret and analyze material with appropriate guidance Practice exercises for students to distinguish plot from specific literary elements. Focus on student's overall writing standards |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes in assessment plans should be reported here) | A Continuation of practice exercises by instructors are encouraged. Close reading of various forms of fiction are supported. More Students essays for following semesters should be assessed. |

ENGLISH DEPT. GENERAL EDUCATION INTERIM ASSESSMENT, 2014- 2015: SPRING 2015

Department: ENGLISH

General Education LO Assessed: AH 3. ENGAGE IN LITERARY, PHILOSOPHIC AND ARTISTIC ANALYSIS

Report Preparer: ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE- ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

| General Education Questions | Response |
|--|--|
| 1) Courses: General Education course (s) taught. | The English courses assessed are the following ones: ENG 203,ENG 204, ENG 205, ENG 206 ENG 210 ENG 211, ENG 212, ENG 213, ENG 214, ENG 215, ENG 220 ENG 250, ENG 260, ENG 261, ENG 262. |
| 2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education outcomes? (e.g. capstone course, Portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.) | The English Dept.'s writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in General Education courses. LO AH3 corresponds to anchor three (Use of Quotes and Context) and anchor five (relationship between literary work and context). |
| 3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g. faculty, Admin. Assistant, etc.) If this differs by XX course, provide information by XX course. | The English Department's Assessment Committee interprets the evidence. |
| 4) 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)? | A solid average ranking is noted for AH 3. Although some fluctuations in previous semesters exist, means score trend is favorable for semester assessed. Based on general patterns assessed, continued favorable mean scores are expected in upcoming semesters. |
| 5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well? | Understanding of textual evidence Demonstration of textual support for ideas Increased overall performance in category for last three semesters |
| 6) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (changes in assessment plans should be reported here) | Faculty members are encouraged to continue using sound practice materials and specific content examples or references. Further encouragement of creative ideas with applied theories can help move beyond required approval standards. |

Appendix: English Department General Education Assessment Data

5= highest rating, 3= acceptable, 1=lowest rating

Table 1 General Education Outcome: CRT 1. Define a Problem

| | Fall 2008 | Sp 2009 | Fall 2009 | Sp 2010 | Fall 2010 | Sp 2011 | Fall 2011 | Sp 2012 | Fall 2012 | Sp 2013 | Fall 2013 | Sp 2014 | Sp 2015 | Cumulative |
|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Percent ≥ 3 | 64% | 73% | 71% | 88% | 68% | 64% | 72% | 79% | 77% | 85% | 78% | 78% | 81% | 75% |
| Mean Score | 3.07 | 3.21 | 3.04 | 3.68 | 2.95 | 2.93 | 3.05 | 3.32 | 3.29 | 3.28 | 3.38 | 3.53 | 3.44 | 3.23 |
| Total Assessed | 273 | 541 | 510 | 469 | 148 | 369 | 316 | 523 | 209 | 101 | 78 | 131 | 113 | 3,944 |
| Not Assessed | 58 | 0 | 113 | 28 | 1 | 26 | 29 | 47 | 17 | 59 | 12 | 23 | 57 | 470 |
| Total Students | 331 | 541 | 623 | 497 | 149 | 395 | 345 | 570 | 226 | 160 | 90 | 154 | 170 | 4,414 |

Table 2 General Education Outcome: CRT 2. Assemble evidence to support a conclusion

| | Fall 2008 | Sp 2009 | Fall 2009 | Sp 2010 | Fall 2010 | Sp 2011 | Fall 2011 | Sp 2012 | Fall 2012 | Sp 2013 | Fall 2013 | Sp 2014 | Sp 2015 | Cumulative |
|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Percent ≥ 3 | 71% | 70% | 67% | 84% | 68% | 62% | 67% | 79% | 76% | 87% | 72% | 81% | 88% | 74% |
| Mean Score | 3.13 | 3.14 | 2.95 | 3.57 | 2.94 | 2.92 | 2.96 | 3.33 | 3.17 | 3.47 | 3.39 | 3.53 | 3.62 | 3.19 |
| Total Assessed | 271 | 540 | 510 | 468 | 149 | 369 | 314 | 523 | 209 | 100 | 76 | 131 | 112 | 3,935 |
| Not Assessed | 60 | 1 | 113 | 29 | 0 | 26 | 31 | 47 | 17 | 60 | 14 | 23 | 58 | 479 |
| Total Students | 331 | 541 | 623 | 497 | 149 | 395 | 345 | 570 | 226 | 160 | 90 | 154 | 170 | 4,414 |

Table 3 General Education Outcome: CRT 3. Assess the validity of a sustained argument

| | Fall 2008 | Sp 2009 | Fall 2009 | Sp 2010 | Fall 2010 | Sp 2011 | Fall 2011 | Sp 2012 | Fall 2012 | Sp 2013 | Fall 2013 | Sp 2014 | Sp 2015 | Cumulative |
|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Percent ≥ 3 | 79% | 68% | 59% | 78% | 52% | 54% | 58% | 83% | 88% | 79% | 90% | 66% | 73% | 69% |
| Mean Score | 3.32 | 3.05 | 2.76 | 3.33 | 2.63 | 2.75 | 2.73 | 3.26 | 3.52 | 3.18 | 3.60 | 3.07 | 3.15 | 3.04 |
| Total Assessed | 131 | 338 | 325 | 393 | 130 | 155 | 150 | 280 | 25 | 61 | 10 | 41 | 41 | 2,165 |
| Not Assessed | 200 | 203 | 298 | 104 | 19 | 240 | 195 | 290 | 201 | 99 | 80 | 113 | 129 | 2,249 |
| Total Students | 331 | 541 | 623 | 497 | 149 | 395 | 345 | 570 | 226 | 160 | 90 | 154 | 170 | 4,414 |

Table 4 General Education Outcome: CRT 4. Analyze information to uncover underlying meanings, structures and patterns

| | Fall 2008 | Sp 2009 | Fall 2009 | Sp 2010 | Fall 2010 | Sp 2011 | Fall 2011 | Sp 2012 | Fall 2012 | Sp 2013 | Fall 2013 | Sp 2014 | Sp 2015 | Cumulative |
|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Percent ≥ 3 | 74% | 75% | 76% | 84% | 76% | 66% | 69% | 80% | 78% | 84% | 75% | 83% | 84% | 77% |
| Mean Score | 3.18 | 3.25 | 3.23 | 3.65 | 3.2 | 3.01 | 3.03 | 3.35 | 3.16 | 3.44 | 3.42 | 3.58 | 3.51 | 3.29 |
| Total Assessed | 329 | 540 | 623 | 496 | 149 | 395 | 315 | 522 | 209 | 101 | 77 | 131 | 112 | 4,162 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| Not Assessed | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 48 | 17 | 59 | 13 | 23 | 58 | 252 |
| Total Students | 331 | 541 | 623 | 497 | 149 | 395 | 345 | 570 | 226 | 160 | 90 | 154 | 170 | 4,414 |

Table 5 General Education Outcome: AH 3. Engage in literary, philosophic, and artistic analysis

| | Fall 2008 | Sp 2009 | Fall 2009 | Sp 2010 | Fall 2010 | Sp 2011 | Fall 2011 | Sp 2012 | Fall 2012 | Sp 2013 | Fall 2013 | Sp 2014 | Sp 2015 | Cumulative |
|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Percent ≥ 3 | 75% | 76% | 75% | 87% | 68% | 67% | 74% | 82% | 81% | 89% | 69% | 85% | 82% | 78% |
| Mean Score | 3.23 | 3.23 | 3.16 | 3.72 | 3.04 | 3.06 | 3.05 | 3.39 | 3.25 | 3.53 | 3.17 | 3.45 | 3.55 | 3.29 |
| Total Assessed | 329 | 540 | 623 | 496 | 149 | 395 | 315 | 525 | 209 | 101 | 77 | 131 | 112 | 4,165 |
| Not Assessed | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 45 | 17 | 59 | 13 | 23 | 58 | 249 |
| Total Students | 331 | 541 | 623 | 497 | 149 | 395 | 345 | 570 | 226 | 160 | 90 | 154 | 170 | 4,414 |

Note: data not available on fall 2014

English Department 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 | misassertions or misinformation about | awareness of issues of context, but may ID | ID's appropriate and helpful context; able to draw clear, | clear, valid relationships | articulates clear, valuable relationship between |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| context | context; or no attempt to contextualize | inappropriate contexts or have only rudimentary notions of connections | useful, if not necessarily sophisticated, connections in discussion of work(s) addressed | between works and context(s), makes use of relationship to craft argument and conclusion but may miss additional contexts that complicate claim | 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 |