PROGRAM REPORT SUMMARY

Department: English	Report Type: SUMMARY
Program Name: English	Program Award Level: BA/BSED
Report Preparer: English Department Assessment Committee	Academic Year: 2019-20
Program Structure (Choose One): Accredited Non-Accredited ==Combination==	Date Report Completed: October 15, 2019
Accreditation Agency (If Applicable): CAEP/NCATE	Date Next Self Study Due to Agency:

Program Assessment Question	Response
1) **URL**: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://www.ccsu.edu/english/umdergrad/programOutcomes.html
2) **Assessment Instruments**: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education Objective/Outcome? e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	We use a literature rubric consisting of six categories (rated on a scale of 1-5) to assess the last piece of untimed writing in the following courses: 298 and 398, 300-level English literature courses, and 400-level English literature courses.
3) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).	The English Department Assessment Committee
4) **Results**: Since the last submitted report, list: *a.* The conclusion(s) drawn, noting strengths and weaknesses. *b.* The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s).	a. We saw slight dips in the average score on three of the six categories since the last report, namely, thesis, use of quotes, and reading of literature. These dips are counterbalanced by significant increases in the average score for the remaining three categories on the rubric: demonstration of thesis, context, and secondary materials. b. Continue encouraging faculty in literature courses to offer assignments which strengthen skills in refining a thesis, using quotes, and critical reading.
5) **Strengths**: What about your assessment process is working well?	We assess students at every level of their progress through the degree. We separate out the results from our two core courses in the major. The assessment process enjoys support across our large department.

6) **Improvements**: List ways in which your assessment process needs to be improved based on student data. (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here)	We have discussed beginning norming efforts to ensure consistency across different course levels.

Appendix: English Department BA and BS Ed Literature Assessment Data

Thesis	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% > 3
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**			
Spring 2018 Literature	2	7	14	23	5	51	3.43	82%
Spring 2019 Literature	2	10	17	17	0	46	3.06	74%
Grand Total	4	17	31	40	5	97	3.25	78%

Reading of Lit	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% > 3
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**			
Spring 2018 Literature	1	5	19	10	18	53	3.74	89%
Spring 2019 Literature	6	9	8	18	15	56	3.48	73%
Grand Total	7	14	27	28	33	109	3.61	81%

Use of Quotes	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% > 3
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**			
Spring 2018 Literature	3	7	14	15	14	53	3.56	81%
Spring 2019 Literature	2	7	12	18	7	46	3.46	80%
Grand Total	5	14	26	33	21	99	3.52	81%

Demonstration of Thesis	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% ≥ 3
	1	2	3	4	5			
Spring 2018 Literature	2	7	13	15	16	53	3.68	83%
Spring 2019 Literature	2	5	9	13	16	45	3.80	84%
Grand Total	4	12	22	28	32	98	3.78	84%

Rel. between lit. work and its context	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% ≥ 3
	1	2	3	4	5			
Spring 2018 Literature	0	10	11	16	15	52	3.69	81%
Spring 2019 Literature	0	1	4	6	8	19	4.11	95%
Grand Total	0	11	15	22	23	71	3.80	85%

Secondary Material	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% ≥ 3
	1	2	3	4	5			
Spring 2018 Literature	2	4	4	5	5	20	3.35	70%
Spring 2019 Literature	2	3	4	10	6	25	3.60	80%
Grand Total	4	7	8	15	11	45	3.49	76%

GENERAL EDUCATION SUMMARY

GENERAL EDUCATION SUMMARY:

1. All departments contribute to the general education foundation of CCSU students (i.e., the CCSU General Education Learning Objectives/Outcomes) and must submit the General Education Summary below.

2. If your department participated in the General Education Assessment initiative (Multi-State model), complete Section 1 below.

3. If your department assesses GenEd Learning Objectives/Outcomes at the department-level, complete Section 2 below. Complete one Summary table for each LO assessed.

4. URL for the list of CCSU Learning Objectives/Outcomes, click **here**.

Department: English	Report Type: GenEd Summary
Program Name and Level: BA in English Literature; BS in Elementary and Secondary Education	Academic Year: 2019-20
Report Preparer: English Department Assessment Committee	Date Completed: October 20, 2019

Participation in General Education Assessment Initiative (Multi-State Collaborative model)	Section 1 Responses
1) Our departmental faculty participated in the assessment of the GenEd Learning Objectives/Outcomes by contributing to the GenEd Assessment Initiative (Multi-State Collaborative model). *Please list the participating faculty and General Education Learning Objective/Outcome(s) for which faculty have provided student artifacts.*	Faculty member(s): GenEd Learning Outcome(s)/Objective(s): Course(s):

Complete one Summary table below for each Learning Outcome assessed.

Participation through Department-level GenEd Assessment	Section 2 Responses
1) Courses: List course(s) and the CCSU General Education Learning Objective/Outcome with which the course is aligned. (These include courses across all schools and departments and are not limited only to designated GenEd Study and Skill Area courses.)	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. Gen Ed Objective 4: Define a Problem
2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education Objective/Outcome? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The English Department's literature/writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in 200-level General Education literature courses. The English Writing Rubric Anchor for Thesis (#1) measures student achievement in Objective 4, Define a Problem.
3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).	The English Department Assessment Committee interprets the evidence.
4) Results: Since the most recent full report, list: *a.* The conclusion(s) drawn, noting strengths and weaknesses. *b.* The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s).	a. Students in our gen ed classes perform relatively well on the objective of defining a problem, with average scores above 3 on the 1-5 scale. b. This score has been consistent over five years and no major changes need to be made as the result of this conclusion. Encourage focused exercises related to defining a problem.

5) **Strengths in your Assessment Process**: List ways in which your assessment process is working well.	This assessment process is working well in that it looks directly at student writing and measures it with a nuanced rubric. The assessment focuses directly on students' written work from towards the end of the end of the semester. The new tables showing averages and percentage of students scoring at or above the mean are useful for seeing patterns at a glance.
6) **Improvements**: List ways in which your GenEd assessment process needs to improve based on student data (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here).	Increase numbers of students assessed. We have begun to prepare and distribute assessment rosters earlier in the semester and to work with faculty, especially adjunct members, to increase reporting.

Participation through Department-level GenEd Assessment	**Section 2 Responses**
1) **Courses**: List course(s) and the CCSU General Education Learning Objective/Outcome with which the course is aligned. (These include courses across all schools and departments and are not limited only to designated GenEd Study and Skill Area courses.)	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. Gen Ed Objective 4: Assemble Evidence
2) **Assessment Instruments**: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education Objective/Outcome? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The English Department's literature/writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in 200-level General Education literature courses. The English Writing Rubric Anchors Use of Quotations (#3) and Demonstration of Thesis (#4) measure student achievement in Objective 4, Assemble Evidence to Support a Conclusion

3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).	The English Department Assessment Committee interprets the evidence.
4) Results: Since the most recent full report, list: *a.* The conclusion(s) drawn, noting strengths and weaknesses. *b.* The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s).	a. Students in our gen ed classes perform quite well on the objective of assembling evidence for an argument. b. This score has been consistent over many years and no changes need to be made as the result of this conclusion.
5) Strengths in your Assessment Process: List ways in which your assessment process is working well.	The rubric which we use to assess the ability of students to marshal evidence in support of a thesis is detailed and nuanced. It finely captures well how students are performing in this regard.
6) Improvements: List ways in which your GenEd assessment process needs to improve based on student data (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here).	Increase numbers of students assessed. We have begun to prepare and distribute assessment rosters earlier in the semester and to work with faculty, especially adjunct members, to increase reporting.

Participation through Department-level GenEd Assessment	Section 2 Responses
1) Courses: List course(s) and the CCSU General Education Learning Objective/Outcome with which the course is aligned. (These include courses across all schools and departments and are not limited only to designated GenEd Study and Skill Area courses.)	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. Gen Ed Objective 4: Assess the Validity of a Sustained Argument
2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education Objective/Outcome? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The English Department's literature/writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in 200-level General Education literature courses. The English writing rubric anchor for Secondary Material (#6) measures student achievement in Objective 4, Assess the Validity of a Sustained Argument.
3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).	The English Department Assessment Committee interprets the evidence.
4) Results: Since the most recent full report, list: *a.* The conclusion(s) drawn, noting strengths and weaknesses. *b.* The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s).	a. We had no data for this writing rubric anchor for Spring 2019 or Fall 2018. The last results, however, showed a dip in average scores from 3.68 to 3.2. The average score is still in a good range. b. Assignment of secondary materials for research-based papers can be suggested. Discussions about whether to continue assessing this learning outcome for our gen ed classes will begin in the department. Most of the literature survey courses are not conducive to assignments which require assessing the validity of a sustained argument, or using secondary material, their primary focus being on primary literary sources.
5) Strengths in your Assessment Process: List ways in which your assessment process is working well.	The rubric works well to ascertain how well students use secondary materials in reviewing the arguments of others in a field.

6) **Improvements**: List ways in which your GenEd assessment process needs to improve based on student data (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here).	Faculty can be encouraged to assign secondary sources and teach skills associated with assessing their validity, including paraphrasing, summarizing, and synthesizing. Alternatively, this particular outcome may no longer be assessed for these courses, based on feedback from the faculty.

Participation through Department-level GenEd Assessment	Section 2 Responses
1) Courses: List course(s) and the CCSU General Education Learning Objective/Outcome with which the course is aligned. (These include courses across all schools and departments and are not limited only to designated GenEd Study and Skill Area courses.)	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. Objective 4, Analyze Information to Uncover Underlying Meanings, Structures and Patterns; Objective 1, Engage in Literary Analysis
2) Assessment Instruments: What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education Objective/Outcome? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The English Department's literature/writing rubric is used to assess the last piece of untimed writing in 200-level General Education literature courses. The English writing rubric anchor Reading of Literature of Literature (#2) measures a student's ability to uncover underlying meanings and structures through close analysis of literary form; it therefore addresses Objective 4 (Analyze Information) and Objective 1 (Literary Analysis) simultaneously.
3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).	The English Department Assessment Committee interprets the evidence.
4) Results: Since the most recent full report, list: *a.* The conclusion(s) drawn, noting strengths and weaknesses.	a. Students in our gen ed classes perform relatively well on the objectives of analyzing information and engaging in literary analysis.

	b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s).	b. This score has been consistent over many years and no changes need to be made as the result of this conclusion.
5)	**Strengths in your Assessment Process**: List ways in which your assessment process is working well.	Students' abilities to interpret and analyze material with appropriate guidance; Practice exercises for students to distinguish plot from specific literary elements; Focus on students' overall writing standards.
6)	**Improvements**: List ways in which your GenEd assessment process needs to improve based on student data (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here).	Practice exercises and close reading assignments to be suggested.

End of Report

Appendix: English Department General Education Assessment Data

Thesis (Obj 4: Define a Problem)	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% > 3
	1	2	3	4	5			
Fall 2013 Literature	2	15	26	21	14	78	3.38	78%
Fall 2015 Literature	4	16	32	40	17	109	3.46	82%
Fall 2016 Literature	1	8	16	23	11	59	3.59	85%
Fall 2017 Literature	2	6	17	23	14	62	3.66	87%
Fall 2018 Literature	3	13	33	19	13	81	3.32	80%
Grand Total	12	58	124	126	69	389	3.50	82%

Reading of Lit (Obj 4: Uncover Meaning; Obj 1: Literary Analysis)	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% > 3
	1	2	3	4	5			
Fall 2013 Literature	1	18	19	26	13	77	3.42	75%
Fall 2015 Literature	3	17	36	33	20	109	3.46	82%
Fall 2016 Literature		10	18	15	16	59	3.63	83%
Fall 2017 Literature	0	4	20	24	14	62	3.77	94%
Fall 2018 Literature	5	15	34	22	5	81	3.09	75%
Grand Total	9	64	127	120	68	388	3.45	81%

Use of Quotes (Obj4: Assemble Evidence)	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% ≥ 3
	1	2	3	4	5			
Fall 2013 Literature	3	21	21	24	8	77	3.17	69%
Fall 2015 Literature	6	17	25	37	14	99	3.36	77%
Fall 2016 Literature	2	10	17	14	16	59	3.54	80%
Fall 2017 Literature	0	6	20	27	8	61	3.61	90%
Fall 2018 Literature	3	18	26	24	10	81	3.25	74%
Grand Total	14	72	109	126	56	377	3.37	77%

Demonstration of Thesis (Obj 4: Assemble Evidence)	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% ≥ 3
	1	2	3	4	5			
Fall 2013 Literature	3	18	16	24	15	76	3.39	72%
Fall 2015 Literature	3	21	30	36	19	109	3.43	78%
Fall 2016 Literature	1	14	12	15	17	59	3.56	75%
Fall 2017 Literature	1	5	21	24	11	62	3.63	90%
Fall 2018 Literature	2	11	35	23		71	3.11	82%
Grand Total	10	69	114	122	62	377	3.42	79%

Secondary Material (Obj 4: Assess Validity of Arguments)	Rating					Grand Total	Avg Score	% > 3
	1	2	3	4	5			
Fall 2013 Literature	0	1	3	5	1	10	3.60	90%
Fall 2015 Literature	1	8	11	10	10	40	3.50	78%
Fall 2016 Literature	1	2	7	9	6	25	3.68	88%
Fall 2017 Literature	0	1	2	2	0	5	3.20	80%
Grand Total	2	12	23	26	17	80	3.55	83%

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