

Undergraduate Curriculum Assessment Plan and Report

Department of English

The Department of English promotes an integration of the areas of English (literature, writing, and language study), producing strong teachers and scholars who can draw, as needed, on multiple perspectives to analyze contexts and create new knowledge. We are committed to the notions that research and teaching are fundamentally interrelated and that strong teaching depends on bringing new knowledge into the classroom. In our model, multiple and interdisciplinary perspectives are used to inquire how texts communicate to various English speaking audiences: How do cultures shape language and how does language shape culture? How do intersections of cultures affect communication across borders? What forms can we create to enter into dialogue with each other? Our areas of inquiry include Children's Literature, Creative Writing, English Education, Linguistics, Literary and Cultural Studies, Publishing Studies, Rhetoric and Writing (including New Media Studies, Technical Writing, Rhetoric and Composition, and Teaching Writing), and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

As reported in our recent Undergraduate Program Review (2002-2010), "the first priority of the department following this program review will be to devise an assessment plan that can be implemented without additional funding" (28). The Department is currently, during the 2011-2012 academic year, building a plan based on the goals, outcomes, and methods we have and will continue to identify. A preliminary plan has been drafted, below, but it has not been formally approved by the shared governance of our Department members.

The Assessment Plan builds upon the following activities:

- During the spring and fall of 2011, the Undergraduate Studies Committee (UGC) synthesized the previously approved "Goals of the Major" to create a more concise yet flexible set of goals that can apply to any of the subdisciplines of English Studies. The goals provide the foundation for the Assessment Plan;
- A pilot project was conducted over the summer of 2011 that reviewed sample student portfolios from our department's senior capstone course (ENG 300: Senior Seminar). The findings were compiled and presented to the UGC to help us determine whether and how ENG 300 and the Senior Portfolio reflect the revised Goals of the Major and, in addition, whether and how the portfolios might be integrated into regular assessment practices. The committee found that the Goals and the Pilot results do indeed align, and the following Assessment Chart integrates most of the Pilot results as outcome measures.

Data To Be Collected

The following Assessment Chart reveals that our Department has done a better job than we may think at conducting ongoing assessment and keeping records of our results. There are a few types of data that we have not diligently collected or analyzed, however:

- An alumni survey is needed that asks our postgraduates how they are using their English Studies skills, knowledge, and research methodologies;
- The Director of Undergraduate Studies should be soliciting assignment prompts from instructors (not all prompts but those that instructors feel showcase what their students are capable of or that most challenge students, revealing potential weaknesses);
- The Director of Undergraduate Studies should be soliciting copies of successful (or less successful as well) student papers as examples of skills, knowledge, and methodologies *before* students are seniors in ENG 300. This might include an emphasis on collecting first-year and transfer English major work in ENG 100/102 as well;
- The Director of Undergraduate Studies should be working more closely with the Director of the Writing Program and the Director of English Education to share data in those areas;
- Copies of Undergraduate Research Symposia programs and student presentations should be collected and organized;
- The Director of Undergraduate Studies should work with advisors Mark Vegter and Ryan Gray, and via the student listserv, to identify students who are presenting at conferences or doing other public work with their skills and knowledge;
- More effort is needed to collect and organize all student publications and student-run publications;
- More effort is also needed to centralize samples of student electronic/multimodal work, either as links from a central database/website or as digital photos/thumbnails.

Where Will Data be Stored?

As we know as researchers, collecting data and even analyzing it cannot create big-picture assessment unless that data is centralized, accessible, and viewable from multiple perspectives. We would like to create a password-protected database that could potentially become a national model for humanities and liberal arts disciplines. The database will organize collected information, such as student projects, surveys and survey results, focus group reports, assignment prompts, syllabi, etc. and will be accessible to English Studies faculty and staff for the purposes of assessment. External stakeholders will have access only to data that can be appropriately shared publicly. What can and should be shared publicly, however, should be decided collectively by Department faculty. Instructors will be able to post their syllabi, prompts, and sample student projects to the site,

or they will have the option of sending materials directly to the Director of Undergraduate Studies. Not only will a database like this provide transparency and allow us to better share our innovative practices, but it will also be a *research* resource --a searchable database that will allow us to look for trends according to skill, method, or data type. If one wants to search for all syllabi or assignment prompts that teach primary research methods, for example, one could quickly access a sample of our Department efforts to do that, along with some anonymous student samples, focus group records of student perceptions of primary research, records of library liaison class visits, etc.

Syllabus Collection: Using a Resource We Have But Do Not Yet Study

Since 1999, course syllabi from all English department instructors have been collected, at first in print and more recently in electronic form. These syllabi have been stored but never mined for data about what and how we are teaching and for more information about how our courses are tangibly demonstrating the goals we value as a Department. It is the goal of the Director of Undergraduate Studies that these syllabi are examined to find and compile lists of assignment types, including paper types (researched, close reading, types of analyses, multimedia, presentations, etc.), reading types and quantity, stated course goals, sample civility statements, course schedule trends, etc. Survey of the syllabi will be investigative and summative only, for the purposes of collecting data and identifying trends. The purpose is not intended to be evaluative.

Data Types Not Yet Included in the Assessment Plan:

- Student-run events in service, research, and teaching;
- Student-run campus organizations;
- English major eligibility for and participation in the University Honors Program;
- Student performance in internships (student, internship director, and employer evaluations and student written reflections);
- Other? What else can we be drawing from to measure the goals?

Goal Assessment Metric Evaluation (GAME)

Program Goal: The program teaches students how to critically read, speak, write, and revise across an extensive range of texts and technologies appropriate to the disciplines of English Studies.						
Outcome Measures	Data Needed	Data Already Available	What group(s) will be assessed?	Assessment Methods	Who will conduct assessment?	Timeline
Students will be able to comprehend a familiar or unfamiliar text in any of several genres with knowledge of its cultural and historical contexts.	Archived and current Senior Portfolios from ENG 300.	Yes	Outgoing senior English majors.	Direct Methods: Summer 2011 Pilot Study of ENG 300 Portfolios; student texts; juried reviews of student work	Undergraduate Studies Director	ENG 300 is offered every semester
Students will demonstrate awareness of the historical and generic contexts of texts and their traditions.	Syllabi from courses teaching historical and generic subject matter, instructor writing prompts, student sample papers, published student texts.	Yes: syllabi are archived each semester. No: writing prompts are not archived; Yes/No: student papers from ENG 300 are available but not habitually collected from other courses; Yes: undergraduate publications are on file.	Students who have taken coursework in historical or generic approaches to English Studies.	Direct Methods: ENG 110 exam results; juried reviews of student work; student projects available online; review of relevant student work in ENG 300 portfolios.	Undergraduate Studies Director, ENG 110 student enrollment and student projects.	Ongoing. ENG 300 and ENG 110 are offered every semester.

Students will be able to read and demonstrate familiarity with a variety of texts from a culturally diverse range of historical periods and national origins.	Syllabi from courses teaching historical and generic subject matter, instructor writing prompts, student sample papers, published student texts.	Yes: syllabi are archived each semester. No: writing prompts are not archived; Yes/No: student papers from ENG 300 are available but not habitually collected from other courses; Yes: undergraduate publications are on file.	Students who have taken coursework in historical, global, multiethnic, transnational, and other approaches to the diversity of English Studies.	Direct Methods: ENG 110 exam results; juried reviews of student work; student projects available online; review of relevant student work in ENG 300 portfolios.		
Students will be able to critically reflect upon their readings of a range of texts.	Many sections of ENG 300 regularly require reflective essays in the portfolio.	Yes.	Outgoing senior English majors.	Direct Method: review of ENG 300 Portfolios/Summer 2011 Pilot Study Indirect Method: student reflective essays in ENG 300	ENG 300 Pilot Study Coordinators	The dept. will decide how often the portfolio study can be feasibly be conducted.
Students will be able to identify and analyze themes, issues, etc. across texts and genres with knowledge of their cultural and historical contexts.	Instructor assignment prompts, sample student papers and projects, student presentations and publications.	No: instructor assignment prompts and sample student work needs to be collected; Yes: student publications have been saved but not organized.	English majors at all levels of coursework.	Direct Methods: student work.	Course instructors.	Ongoing.
Students will be able to identify rhetorical strategies.	Student access to rhetoric coursework and # of rhetoric courses offered each semester; student sample papers/projects and publications/presentations.	Yes. Yes. No. Yes but not organized.	English majors who have taken courses in rhetoric.	Direct Methods: review of scheduling, student work Indirect method: reflective essays.	Undergrad Director, Rhetoric faculty.	Ongoing.

<p>English Education students will be able to design and present effective lesson plans, assignment prompts, and other classroom documents.</p>	<p>Signature assessments in English 296 and English 297 document lesson design. In the Student Teaching Semester, a Teacher Impact Lesson and the midterm and semester evaluations document lesson design and presentation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>English Education majors.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: student work in methodology classes and observations, and evaluations of student teaching. Indirect Methods: NCATE review (continuing cycle) and Illinois Board of Education (annual).</p>	<p>English Ed instructors, other English instructors with pertinent assignments, the clinical coordinator for student teaching, the Eng Ed Director, and external assessors.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>
<p>Students will be able to perform effectively in spoken situations, such as in the classroom, during presentations, during meetings, class discussions, etc.</p>	<p>Instructor Coffee Hour reports, student presentations at symposia and conferences, archived recordings of student presentations, evaluations of Eng Ed student teaching.</p>	<p>Yes. Yes. No.</p>	<p>Students at all levels of coursework.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: student presentations, English Ed student teaching evaluations. Indirect Methods: Faculty Coffee Hour reports, Student Focus Group reports,</p>	<p>Course instructors, English Ed Director, Undergrad Studies Director</p>	<p>Every semester. Coffee Hours and Focus Groups began to be conducted and reported during fall 2011.</p>

<p>Students will be able to think imaginatively, innovatively, originally, and with attention to absence as well as presence.</p>	<p>Student poetry/CW readings, multimedia projects, publications, and ENG 300 portfolios.</p>	<p>Yes, but we need to do better at collecting records of all student work. Portfolios: yes.</p>	<p>Students at all levels of coursework.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: student publications, student multimedia projects, ENG 300 Portfolio Review. Indirect Method: Student focus groups.</p>	<p>Undergrad Studies Director, course instructors.</p>	<p>ENG 300 is offered every semester; portfolio review frequency is yet to be determined; Undergrad Dir. will begin collecting student work spring 2012. Focus groups are ongoing.</p>
<p>Students will be able to comprehend instructor feedback and revise accordingly.</p>	<p>Records of student papers with instructor feedback, which may be provided in ENG 300 portfolios. Instructor Coffee Hour reports; relevant data from Writing Program.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Students at all levels of coursework.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: student papers, ENG 300 portfolio review, Writing Program grad assistant training and records. Indirect Methods: Coffee Hour and Focus Group reports.</p>	<p>ENG 300 instructors, Writing Program Dir., Undergrad Studies Director.</p>	<p>Portfolio review frequency to be determined; Writing Program records and Coffee Hours/Focus Groups are ongoing each semester.</p>

Students will be able to demonstrate bold, substantive revision, which may entail changing genre, organization, argument, topic, and medium.	Student publications, admission to conferences, senior theses, ENG 300 portfolios, course projects.	Yes, though more effort is needed to collect student course projects and keep records of publications/conferences.	Students at all levels of coursework.	Direct Methods: student coursework, student publications, student conference papers, review of ENG 300 portfolios. Indirect Methods: success rate of publication and conference proposal attempts, data which could be solicited via survey.	Course instructors, faculty editors of student-run publications, Undergrad Studies Dir.	ENG 300 and ENG 100/102 are offered each semester. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.
--	---	--	---------------------------------------	--	---	--

Program Goal: The program will teach students how to understand and be able to apply practically the research methodologies appropriate for the disciplines of English Studies.

Outcome Measures	Data Needed	Data Already Available	What group(s) will be assessed?	Assessment Methods	Who will conduct assessment?	Timeline
Students will understand the features of credible sources, including timeliness, authorship expertise, peer-review process, topicality, publisher status, and appropriateness of medium.	ENG 300 requires the completion of at least one substantial researched paper. ENG 100/102 also discusses library resources and connects beginning majors to the library.	Yes.	Outgoing senior English majors.	Direct Methods: review of ENG 300 portfolios, student coursework, course trips to library, ENG 100/102 library/research methods session; student research projects	300 Pilot Study coordinators, English dept. library liaison; Undergrad Studies Dir.	ENG 300 and ENG 100/102 are offered each semester. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.

Students will be able to demonstrate familiarity with the ways in which texts are produced, with particular attention to the cultural and historical contexts of production.	Class projects that demonstrate production knowledge. Student publications. Student-run publications.	No, except for those projects represented in ENG 300 portfolios. Yes. Yes.	Students at all levels of coursework.	Direct Methods: review of student coursework, publications, and journals/publications run by students.	Undergrad Studies Dir.	Annually.
Students will be able to find the kinds of information that are relevant to the problem or issue being addressed.	ENG 100/102 research methods results, ENG 300 portfolios.	No, but advisor Mark Vegter can provide assignment prompts and indicators of student performance; No. Yes.	Beginning majors, outgoing majors, and majors in 200-level coursework.	Direct Methods: ENG 100/102 student projects, other student course and published work, ENG 300 portfolio review, independent and honors thesis numbers. Indirect Method: Student Focus Groups on Research.	Independent study and honors thesis advisors, Undergrad Studies Dir.	ENG 300 and ENG 100/102 are offered each semester. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.
Students will be able to use the various methods of English Studies disciplines in connection or juxtaposition with one another.	Records of student participation in and paper copies from the department's annual Research Symposium.	Yes, but better effort should be made to collect the student presentation papers.	Students at all levels of coursework.	Direct Methods: Undergrad Symposium Program, student work Indirect Methods: symposium attendance rates	Honors Program Dir, Undergrad Studies Dir.	Annually.

Students will demonstrate the research methodologies of specific disciplines during coursework as articulated in individual faculty syllabi.	Syllabi across all of the disciplines of English Studies, including assignment overview and specific course goals.	Yes - all undergraduate syllabi are electronically collected by Irene Taylor and stored each semester.	Students at all levels of coursework.	Direct Methods: student projects.	Course instructors.	Each semester.
Students will be able to articulate a reasoned position about the social and philosophical value of the disciplines of English Studies and their unique and shared research methodologies.	Alumni surveys, ENG 300 portfolios, Undergraduate Symposium presentations.	No. Yes. Yes.	Alumni, ENG 300 students, students at all levels of coursework,	Direct Methods: ENG 300 Study, Symposium presentations. Indirect Method: alumni survey.	ENG 300 Study Coordinators, Alumni Office in collaboration with Undergrad Studies Dir. and Dept. Alumni Board.	ENG 300 is offered each semester. Portfolio study frequency to be determined. Symposium is annual. Alumni survey would be conducted perhaps bi-annually.
Students will demonstrate knowledge of citation practices appropriate for the disciplines of English Studies (MLA, Chicago, APA, LSA, etc.)	Student coursework, instructor syllabi, First-Year Writing syllabi, student publications, ENG 300 portfolios.	No - sample course papers need to be collected. Yes. Yes - coordinate with Writing Program Dir. Yes.	Students at all levels of coursework, especially incoming and outgoing majors and published student authors.	Direct Methods: student course and published work, portfolios and portfolio study.	Course instructors.	Each semester.

Alumni use of English Studies disciplinary methodologies in the work place.	Alumni survey	No.	Alumni.	Direct Method: Alumni Survey	Alumni Office in collaboration with Undergrad Studies Dir. and the Department Alumni Board	Bi-annually?
---	---------------	-----	---------	---------------------------------	--	--------------

Program Goal: The program will teach students how to evaluate and synthesize ideas and information from a range of sources relevant to English Studies and to use that knowledge productively.

Outcome Measures	Data Needed	Data Already Available	What group(s) will be assessed?	Assessment Methods	Who will conduct assessment?	Timeline
In their design of lessons and unit plans, English Education students will be able to evaluate and synthesize appropriate instructional materials, teaching practices, and acquired practitioner knowledge.	Signature unit plan assessments in English 296 and English 297. In the Student Teaching Semester, a Teacher Impact Lesson and unit-based lessons.	Yes	English Education students.	Direct Methods: observations and evaluations of student teaching, student work in methodology classes. Indirect Methods: NCATE review (continuing cycle) and Illinois Board of Education (annual).	English Education Dir.	Annually.

<p>Publishing Sequence students and English majors with interests in publishing and/or creative writing will be able to oversee the publication of a student-run journal, including researching, editing, designing, proofing, and producing the publication. websites, etc.</p>	<p>Student-run publications, publishing sequence course projects, syllabi, assignment prompts.</p>	<p>Yes. Yes – all syllabi are available. No – more effort should be made to collect copies of student work in publishing courses and assignment prompts.</p>	<p>Publishing sequence majors.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: Student-run publications, student work.</p>	<p>Publishing sequence instructors.</p>	<p>Each semester.</p>
<p>Students will be able to integrate secondary information into their own written and oral work in a manner that both supports their rhetoric and honors the source of information.</p>	<p>Student presentations in coursework and at conferences and dept. symposium.</p>	<p>No – more effort should be made to keep records of student presentation, but syllabi already collected should indicate frequency and nature of presentation assignments. Yes – symposium program is available.</p>	<p>Students at all levels of coursework.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: student work, symposium presentations.</p>	<p>Course instructors.</p>	<p>Each semester and annually.</p>
<p>Students will be able to be familiar with the kinds of technology that will allow them to produce, engage, and manage electronic and printed texts.</p>	<p>Student coursework, ENG 300 portfolios, student publications and presentations, student-run publications/projects, and other student-created artifacts. Also, syllabi and assignment prompt articulations of technology use.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Students at all levels of coursework.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: Student-run publications, student work.</p>	<p>Course instructors and Undergrad Studies Dir.</p>	<p>Ongoing and annually.</p>

Program Goal: The program will teach students how to understand the social and cultural effects of language and use language rhetorically.

Outcome Measures	Data Needed	Data Already Available	What group(s) will be assessed?	Assessment Methods	Who will conduct assessment?	Timeline
Students will be able to use vivid descriptions and (re)create sensory experiences using examples, narrative, data, and emotional appeals.	Copies of <i>Euphemism</i> and any and all publications produced by students during coursework or independently. ENG 300 portfolios.	Yes. Copies of <i>Euphemism</i> and <i>Polyglossia</i> are collected each semester, though they need to be centralized and organized. No - more effort is needed to collect student coursework	Students at all course levels.	Direct Methods: student course and published work. ENG 300 Pilot Study results.	Course instructors, ENG 300 Study Coordinators.	Annually. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.
Students will be able to demonstrate clarity at both the micro and macro levels of discourse.	Student coursework, ENG 300 portfolios.	No/Yes	Students at all levels of coursework.	Direct Methods: Student work and ENG 300 Portfolio study	Course instructors, ENG 300 Study Coordinators.	Annually. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.
Students will be able to demonstrate a lively and effective prose style using literary, linguistic, and rhetorical techniques, showing knowledge of rhythm, diction, syntax, structure, and transitions.	Student coursework, publications, and ENG 300 portfolios.	No/Yes	Students at all levels of coursework.	Direct Methods: Student work and ENG 300 Portfolio study	Course instructors, ENG 300 Study Coordinators.	Annually. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.

Students will understand the linguistic concepts of “correct” usage, usage levels, and the dialects that make up American English and the social and cultural implications of language differences.	Student coursework, publications, and ENG 300 portfolios. Also, successful completion of linguistics courses with a grade of C or better.	No/Yes. Yes.	Students at all levels of coursework, particularly those who have completed linguistics courses.	Direct Methods: Student work and ENG 300 Portfolio study	Course instructors, ENG 300 Study Coordinators, Linguistics instructors.	Annually. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.
Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of the history and structure of the English language.	Student coursework, publications, and ENG 300 portfolios. Also, successful completion of linguistics courses with a grade of C or better.	No/Yes. Yes.	Students at all levels of coursework, particularly those who have completed linguistics courses.	Direct Methods: Student work and ENG 300 Portfolio study	Course instructors, ENG 300 Study Coordinators, Linguistics instructors.	Annually. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.
Students will understand the complexity of grammar.	Student coursework, publications, and ENG 300 portfolios. Also, successful completion of linguistics courses with a grade of C or better.	No/Yes. Yes.	Students at all levels of coursework, particularly those who have completed linguistics courses.	Direct Methods: Student work and ENG 300 Portfolio study	Course instructors, ENG 300 Study Coordinators, Linguistics instructors.	Annually. Portfolio study frequency to be determined.

Students will be able to effectively employ multi-media material and visual rhetoric/poetics.	Student projects, student-run publications, visual rhetoric and multimodal composition and other relevant course syllabi and assignment prompts.	No - we need to collect this information from course instructors.	Students at all levels of coursework, particularly those in visual rhetoric and multimodal composition courses.	Direct Methods: multimedia student projects.	Course instructors.	Each semester.
Students will understand rhetorical situation, rhetorical appeals, theories of invention, audience and forum analysis, and elements of style and argumentation.	Student coursework, publications, and campus and national awards and scholarships that entail writing a rhetorically persuasive application and understanding the audience and genre of awards and scholarship applications.	Course examples need to be collected, but we do have records of student awards and scholarships.	Students at all levels of coursework, particularly those in visual rhetoric and multimodal composition courses.	Direct Methods: Student work, , rhetoric and other pertinent course student projects. Indirect Methods: records of student awards/scholarships, rate of passing rhetoric courses with a C or better.	Course instructors, particularly rhetoric instructors.	Each semester.
Students will demonstrate awareness of civility and incivility in and outside the English Studies classroom and adopt effective verbal and written communications with instructors and peers.	Disposition Concerns records for English Ed students; records of (in)civility for English Studies students; Coffee Hour and Focus Group Reports from Incivility Workshop conducted in fall 2011.	Disposition forms, coffee hour and focus group reports.	Students at all levels of coursework.	Direct Methods: records of student cases and disposition forms. Indirect Methods: coffee hour and focus group reports.	English Ed Dir., Undergrad Studies Dir., Writing Program Dir., Dept. Chair	Ongoing.

Graduates will articulate how an understanding of the cultural and social effects of language have helped them post-graduation and in the work place.	Alumni survey, alumni presentation during Homecoming week.	No. Yes - the Department invites a distinguished alumnus to campus every fall to give a presentation and talk with students and faculty.	Alumni.	Direct Methods: Alumni Survey, Alumnus Presentation.	Alumni Office in collaboration with Undergrad Studies Dir. and the Department Alumni Board.	Bi-annually?
---	--	---	---------	--	---	--------------

Additional Goals for the Teacher Certification Sequence in English at ISU

Abilities

1. The ability to improve students' comprehension and appreciation of a range of verbal and visual texts.
2. The ability to implement writing and reading as processes that must be adapted for diverse students.
3. The ability to implement technologies that foster students' development of multiple literacies (reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing).
4. The ability to teach skills in the context of authentic learning experiences (e.g., grammar in the context of writing, vocabulary development in the context of reading).
5. The ability to design instruction that supports students' awareness of cultural diversity.

Knowledge

1. An understanding of rhetorical conventions that characterize visual and verbal texts across genres, literary periods, and cultures.
2. An understanding of the role of drama, young adult literature, and multiple literacies in an inclusive curriculum.
3. An understanding of best practices for the teaching of literature and writing.
4. An understanding of how to engage all learners in active exploration of the texts they read, write, and create.

5. An understanding of how policies, assessments, and standards at the state and federal level influence the design of student-centered English Language Arts instruction.

Revised Assessment System Content

Students seeking Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degrees in English Education are subject to four culminating assessments aimed at evaluating their content and procedural knowledge. Assessments administered during the final year of study include the following: (1) the evaluation of a unit plan completed in English 297 (The Teaching of Writing), (2) the evaluation of a “Teacher Impact Lesson” during student teaching, (3) the joint evaluation of student teaching by the cooperating teacher and clinical supervisor, and (4) the Assessment of Professional Teaching required for state licensure.

Outcome: Documentation for the assessments noted above is monitored and reported to National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education in a cycle of continuing review. On an annual basis, across these assessments, satisfactory completion surpasses 95%.

Feedback from Key Stakeholders

Efforts to gather feedback from current students, faculty, alumni, employers of graduates, and graduate schools are ongoing. The ENG 300 portfolio assignment has always allowed current students in their final year of study to provide feedback in the form of a reflective statement, which the pilot study conducted during the summer of 2011 began to analyze in addition to the course materials also present in the portfolios. During the fall of 2011, current students were also gathered for three focus groups, which provided rich preliminary findings about their engagement with the curriculum, coursework, and faculty. Periodic focus groups will continue to be conducted by the Director of Undergraduate Studies in the coming semesters. Focus group reports are generated after each meeting and will be compiled as annual or bi-annual documents available to faculty. English Advisors Mark Vegter and Ryan Gray also conducted a survey of current students during the 2010/2011 academic year.

A Department of English Alumni Board has recently been formed, which will help the Department better keep in touch with and potentially survey our graduates. The Department already actively recruits successful graduates for alumni speeches and visits, but

more effort is needed to locate graduates and communicate with them about their experiences and accomplishments. The Assessment Office conducts a general alumni survey each academic year that can accommodate special questions for particular graduates, so the Director of Undergraduate Studies would like to generate a small set of questions that can be integrated with surveys sent to English alumni.

Faculty are already involved in feedback in a number of ways. The Undergraduate Studies Curriculum meets weekly or bi-weekly to discuss ongoing assessment concerns during the year, and Department faculty meet bi-weekly, or more often, to discuss Department issues and concerns. Though those meetings have not recently been dedicated to assessment or curriculum because of ASPT document revision and hiring discussions, it is hoped that the spring of 2012 will allow more time for the UGC to share its assessment plan, revised goals, and ideas for ongoing curriculum evaluation and revision. The Department has also met – and will meet much more – to discuss our current vision for ENG 300 and ENG 100. Faculty are also invited to periodic discussions, facilitated by the Director of Undergraduate Studies, that mirror the issues and questions discussed by current students during focus groups. Faculty responses are also documented and included with the annual focus group report.

Finally, employers also need to be contacted for information about the strengths and weaknesses of our graduates. We are able to do this already, for current students, through the Internship Program. Student interns write reflections and assessments of their internship experiences, and the employers also evaluate the performance of the interns. This data is collected by the Internship Director and could be shared with the Director of Undergraduate Studies in a centralized data warehouse.

Use of Results

We have already begun analyzing assessment data. The ENG 300 Pilot Study conducted during the summer of 2011 was an exciting first step in our assessment plan. Professor Bob Broad, facilitator of the study, drafted a detailed report of the study results and answered questions during a fall 2011 meeting with the Undergraduate Studies Committee. That study then became the basis for many of the outcome measures of the new assessment plan, above. Broad's work will also provide the foundation for the first curriculum meetings of the spring 2012 semester. The spring 2012 semester will also be the beginning of a series of meetings about the undergraduate curriculum that will focus on researched, creative, problem solving approaches to our courses and goals. In addition to the report that the Director of Undergraduate Studies will generate as she compiles focus group outcomes and curriculum discussion

results, a formal annual report is also written at the end of each year (in December), which also provides response to assessment data and identifies actions to be taken during the next year.