

**English Department Assessment Plan
2004-2005**

<i>English Department Mission Statement</i>	<i>Program Intended Outcomes</i>	<i>Means of Program Assessment</i>	<i>Summary of Data Collected</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
<p>The English Department provides a strong and diverse liberal arts education in literature and writing for majors, minors, and general education students</p> <p>Goal Statement:</p>	<p>1. Graduates in English will compare favorably in their knowledge of literature with those students completing a similar program nationally.</p>	<p>1. The average score of the MFAT or GRE of graduating seniors will be at or near the 50th percentile compared to national results; no subscale score will be lower than the 30th percentile.¹</p>	<p>1. Six graduating seniors took the MFAT in 2002-2003. We administer this test every third year. In spring 2006, graduating seniors in literature will take the test again.</p>	<p>1. N/A for 2004-2005. The chair of the assessment committee will order the MFAT exams from ETS and organize an efficient way of getting student participation.</p>

To provide courses, instruction, advising, mentoring, and experiential opportunities for students in an atmosphere that encourages and supports free inquiry, critical thinking, creativity, and clear and honest communication.

2. Students will understand departmental and professional goals related to English study.

2. All English majors will evaluate the program as part of the English Department's exit interview.

2. Eight of the 23 graduating English majors completed and returned a Senior Exit Interview Form (a return rate of 35%, slightly better than the return rate of 33% for AY 2003-2004, when only five out of 15 returned the form). Though the forms went out in early April and though a student worker (Tanya Roundy) devoted considerable effort to follow-up, the return rate remained low. Perhaps a shorter and more tightly focused form would elicit more responses.

Though it is difficult to form firm conclusions when only slightly more than one-third of the students respond, the completed forms do indicate a generally high level of overall satisfaction with the department (evident in six scores of 10 out of 10 on the item "I would recommend the SUU English department to someone seeking an English degree"). The six highly satisfied students particularly praised the faculty and staff.

2. Recommendations:

1. English must find a way to obtain a larger response rate on exit interviews. Assessment committee will make that issue a priority for the coming year.

2. English faculty will create a "What Can you Do with a Degree in English" forum and publicize it highly. The forum in 2004-2005 had small attendance.

3. The department should continue developing opportunities for student/faculty mentoring in professional publishing and presenting through Sigma Tau Delta and other organizations.

5. Fine-tune the instrument and conduct statistical analysis.

6. Find ways in which student teachers can complete the exit interview.

¹ Major field Achievement Test (ETS) . For means of program assessment, I suggest requiring test of graduating seniors every third year.

3. Students will demonstrate a capacity to create diverse texts that reflect the program's mission statement and goals relative to critical thinking and clear and honest communication.

3.a. A committee of 4000-level instructors will review random samples of papers written in capstone courses offered during the academic year.

3.b. English Department faculty from institutions comparable to SUU will assess random samples of papers written in 4000-level (capstone) courses.

3.a. As of August 2005, internal reviews of capstone courses are still being conducted.

3.b. The outside readers' assessment of capstone courses for AY 2004-2005 were Prof. Tanner of Brigham Young University for the lit courses and Prof. Marcia Douglas of the University of Colorado, Boulder for the creative writing courses

Prof. Tanner's assessments of the nine randomly-selected capstone essays he received were generally favorable, with five of the nine receiving A's and one receiving a B. .

Prof. Douglas's evaluations of the four randomly selected novellas she received are mixed: only one is identified as likely to receive favorable attention from a graduate school application committee in its present form, though Prof. Douglas indicates that with revision a second could be used as a graduate writing sample and that the author of a third has outlined excellent ideas for making the very revisions that it

3. a. To be provided at a later date.

3.b. The fact that three of the nine randomly selected capstone essays only received C's from Prof. Tanner should perhaps be a matter of concern. Literature faculty we meet to assess . Literature faculty will examine closely the comments made by Prof. Tanner.

Creative Writing faculty will address Prof. Douglas's concerns and recommendations.

	<p>4. In English, Secondary Teaching Emphasis, students will demonstrate knowledge of methodology in teaching composition, grammar, and literature,</p>	<p>4. Secondary teaching majors will score favorably on the PRAXIS content area exam and on the PLT methodology exam before entering into student teaching.²</p>	<p>4. The Education Department has provided the English Department with English major scores. English majors score well above the cutoff score for content area knowledge</p>	<p>4. Continue to monitor PRAXIS scores of English Secondary Education majors.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

² Required by the Education Department. The English Department will receive results of these tests.

5. In creative writing, students will be capable of writing a creative work acceptable for publication or admission into graduate school.

5. Create writing students will submit senior portfolios that comprise a collection of their work while in the program. Portfolios will be evaluated by departmental and outside creative writing faculty.

5. Portfolios not collected

5. Creative Writing faculty must revisit their commitment to require portfolios.

Faculty will also address recommendation from internal reviewer:

- that creative writing teachers reach a consensus on a standard creative writing text for 2020 that will better prepare students for advanced work; (accomplished)**
- that the faculty consider offering a 3000-level creative nonfiction class and eventually an interim playwriting class; (dependent upon resources)**
- that the creative writing program do more to education students as to how to apply for graduate school and how to submit work for publication; (faculty-led seminars specifically created for students.**
- that the creative writing faculty consider requiring a 3000-level portfolio as a requirement for enrolling in 4000-level creative writing**

6. Dependent upon funding, students will learn in a variety of experiential circumstances such as course assistants, reading series assistants, interns, writing center tutors, and literary magazine editors.

6. An English Department committee will conduct a self-study to determine means of evaluating experiential learning in the Department. This evaluation will include Writing Center tutors.

6. Writing Center tutors were evaluated by the students they tutored and by the director of the Writing Center. All tutors receive high marks from students. We are looking at a more reliable instrument to evaluate tutors, however. Students tend to be so effusive with their evaluations that we would like to fine-tune the instrument so that we could identify any problem areas. We did not evaluate our student workers otherwise.

6.
a. Fine-tune evaluative instrument for Writing Center tutors.
b. Create instrument to evaluate student workers.