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| --- | --- |
| **Unit/Program Name** | English |
| **Office of Primary Responsibility** | English Program Major/Minor Curriculum CommitteeMisty L. Jameson - Chair, Sean Barnette, Lillian Craton, James Anderson, Lloyd Willis |
| **Assessment Coordinator** | Misty L. Jameson |
| **Submission Date of this Report** | May 10, 2017 |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: To demonstrate an ability to analyze and interpret texts. (See Standard I. (Content Knowledge) Element 1 of the English Language Arts Standards for NCTE/NCATE at http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CEE/NCATE/ApprovedStandards\_111212.pdf.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY2012-13  | AY2013-14  | AY2014-15  | AY2015-16  | AY2016-17  |
|  | **1.** | Average Writing Portfolio Subscore (# students meeting standard/total number of students) measuring student ability in textual analysis and interpretation | 2.9 (12/18)  | 3.3(10/12)  | 3.4(6/8)  | 3(7/8)  | 3(9/15) |
|  | **2.** | Average Major Field Test Subscore (# students meeting standard/total number of students) measuring student ability in literary analysis and interpretation | 45 (5/16)  | 48(6/12)  | 58(8/8)  | 54(4/8)  |  40(3/15) |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
|  | **1.** | Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill 1: To demonstrate an ability to analyze and interpret texts.) | Submitted by graduating English majors in ENGL 499 each spring semester |
|  | **2.** | ETS Major Field Test Literary Analysis (Subscore 3)  | Administered to graduating English majors in ENGL 499 each spring semester (beginning in spring 2010) |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
|  | **1.** | Average portfolio subscore is greater than or equal to 3.0 | Average portfolio subscore is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive | Average portfolio subscore is less than 2.5 |
|  | **2.** | Average Major Field Test subscore is above 45  | Average Major Field Test subscore is 40-45, inclusive  | Average Major Field Test subscore is below 40  |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | Spring 2017: This is the average (mean) score for Spring 2017 Senior Writing Portfolios. This goal is scored based on the following scale: Does Not Meet Expectations (1): Creates few accurate observations about texts; Partially Meets Expectations (2): Creates some accurate observations about texts; Meets Expectations (3): Creates many accurate observations about texts; Exceeds Expectations (4): Creates many accurate and insightful observations about texts.COMMENTS: We are pleased that our student portfolio scores remained steady this year despite a large and diverse graduating cohort. Spring 2016: This is the average (mean) score for Spring 2016 portfolios.  |
|  | **2.** | Spring 2017: This is the average (mean) of Spring 2017 MFT subscores. COMMENTS: Students taking the MFT encountered a technical problem with campus internet during test administration, and we believe that this negatively impacted student performance. Spring 2016: This is the average (mean) of Spring 2016 MFT subscores. |
|  | **Sum** | While overall portfolio scores met our expectations, we noticed a marked discrepancy in individual scores. We are planning on incorporating more critical analysis and interpretation into our ENGL 200 course, Introduction to the English Major, to help our majors improve in this particular skillset.  |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
|  | **1.** |  |  |
|  | **2.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: To demonstrate an ability to understand texts within context, such as history, politics, genre and/or culture. (See Standard I. (Content Knowledge) Element 1 of the English Language Arts Standards for NCTE/NCATE at http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CEE/NCATE/ApprovedStandards\_111212.pdf .)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY2012-13  | AY 2013-14  | AY 2014-15  | AY2015-16  | AY2016-17  |
| **1.** | Average Writing Portfolio Subscore (# students meeting standard/total number of students) measuring student ability to understand texts within various contexts | 3.1 (15/18)  | 3.3(9/12)  | 3.3(7/8)  | 3(6/8)  | 3(10/15)  |
| **2.** |  Average Major Field Test Subscore (# students meeting standard/total number of students) measuring student abilities to understand texts within various contexts | 45 (5/16)  | 56(8/12)  | 56(6/8)  | 51(4/8)  | 40(3/15)  |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** | Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill 2: To demonstrate an ability to understand texts within context, such as history, politics, genre and/or culture.) | Submitted by graduating English majors in ENGL 499 each spring semester |
| **2.** | ETS Major Field Test Literary History and Identification (Subscore 4) | Administered to graduating English majors in ENGL 499 each spring semester (beginning in spring 2010) |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** | Average portfolio subscore is greater than or equal to 3.0 | Average portfolio subscore is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive | Average portfolio subscore is less than 2.5 |
| **2.** | Average Major Field Test subscore is above 45  | Average Major Field Test subscore is 40-45, inclusive  | Average Major Field Test subscore is below 40  |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | Spring 2017: This is the average (mean) score for Spring 2017 Senior Writing Portfolios. This goal is scored based on the following scale: Does Not Meet Expectations (1): Makes no clear connections between works and their contexts; Partially Meets Expectations (2): Makes general connections between works and their contexts; Meets Expectations (3): Makes specific connections between works and their contexts; Exceeds Expectations (4): Makes frequent specific and insightful connections between works and their contexts.COMMENTS: We are pleased to see that our efforts to emphasize context in our upper-level courses has continued to help students connect texts to various contexts--rhetorical, sociohistorical, and literary.Spring 2016: This is the average (mean) score for Spring 2016 portfolios.  |
| **2.** | Spring 2017: This is the average (mean) of Spring 2017 MFT subscores.COMMENTS: Students taking the MFT encountered a technical problem with campus internet during test administration, and we believe that this negatively impacted student performance. Spring 2016: This is the average (mean) of Spring 2016 MFT subscores. |
| **Sum** | We will continue to monitor this subscore for future trends and also continue to emphasize the teaching of context in our classrooms. We are encouraged by the fact that, over the last few years, student scores have remained steady in this area of the portfolio. |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: To demonstrate familiarity with textual criticism and the ability to integrate sources. (See Standard VI. (Professional Knowledge and Skills) Element 2 of the English Language Arts Standards for NCTE/NCATE at http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CEE/NCATE/ApprovedStandards\_111212.pdf .)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY2012-13  | AY 2013-14  |  AY2014-15  | AY2015-16  | AY2016-17  |
| **1.** | Average Writing Portfolio Subscore (# students meeting standard/total number of students) measuring student familiarity with textual criticism and ability to integrate sources  |  2.9 (10/18)  | 3.2(9/12)  | 3.3(7/8)  | 3(6/8)  | 2.6(5/15)  |
| **2.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **3** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** | Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill 3: To demonstrate familiarity with textual criticism and the ability to integrate sources.) | Submitted by graduating English majors in ENGL 499 each spring semester |
| **2.** |       |       |
| **3.** |       |       |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** | Average portfolio subscore is greater than or equal to 3.0 | Average portfolio subscore is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive | Average portfolio subscore is less than 2.5 |
| **2.** |       |       |       |
| **3.** |       |       |       |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | Spring 2017: This is the average (mean) score for Spring 2017 Senior Writing Portfolios. This goal is scored based on the following scale: Does Not Meet Expectations (1): Shows signs of plagiarism or uses no outside sources or ideas; Partially Meets Expectations (2): Cites some outside sources or ideas; Meets Expectations (3): Correctly cites some outside sources or ideas and explains their meaning within the student’s argument; Exceeds Expectations (4): Correctly cites some outside sources or ideas and explains their meaning within the student’s argument in a clear and insightful way.COMMENTS: We saw a slight dip in this subscore that may reflect the number of students who transferred into the English program from other disciplines, thus giving them less time to develop this particular skill. This may also point to a need for more reinforcement in the use of sources in our upper-level English classes. We will increase this emphasis in the coming year. Spring 2016: This is the average (mean) score for Spring 2016 portfolios.  |
| **2.** |       |
| **3.** |       |
| **Sum** | Aside from emphasizing source and citation usage in our upper-level English courses, we intend to implement more instruction in this area in our ENGL 200 course as well.  |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
|  | **1.** |  |  |
|  | **2.** |  |  |
|  | **3.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: To demonstrate the conventions of American grammar and organization through student-produced texts. (See Standard II. (Content Knowledge) Elements 1 and 2 of the English Language Arts Standards for NCTE/NCATE at http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CEE/NCATE/ApprovedStandards\_111212.pdf .)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY2012-13  | AY2013-14  | AY2014-15  | AY2015-16  | AY2016-17  |
| **1.** | Average Writing Portfolio Subscore (# students meeting standard/total number of students) measuring student ability to write following the conventions of American grammar and organization  | 3.0 (10/18)  | 3.1(9/12)  | 3.7(8/8)  | 3(5/8)  | 2.7(7/15)  |
| **2.** | Average ETS Proficiency Profile Writing Subscore (# students meeting standard/total number of students) measuring student writing competencies  | 115(7/12)  | 117(8/11)  | N/A  | 119(5/8)  | 112(5/15) |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** | Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill #4: To demonstrate the conventions of American grammar and organization through student-produced texts.) | Submitted by graduating English majors in ENGL 499 each spring semester |
| **2.** | ETS Proficiency Profile Writing Skills subscore  | Administered yearly to all incoming freshmen and all graduating seniors by Lander University  |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** | Average portfolio score is greater than or equal to 3.0 | Average portfolio score is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive | Average portfolio score is less than 2.5 |
| **2.** | Average writing subscore is at or greater than 115 | Average writing subscore is between 111-114, inclusive  | Average writing subscore is less than 110 |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | Spring 2017: This is the average (mean) score for Spring 2017 Senior Writing Portfolios. This goal is scored based on the following scale: Does Not Meet Expectations (1): Contains repeated serious errors in grammar and organization; Partially Meets Expectations (2): Contains some errors in grammar or organization but communicates ideas clearly; Meets Expectations (3): Contains few errors in grammar and organization. (May contain a few errors that do not interfere with clarity.); Exceeds Expectations (4): Contains very few, if any, errors in grammar and organization.COMMENTS: As with Goal III, the slight dip in this subscore may reflect the number of students who transferred into the English program from other disciplines, thus giving them less time to develop the necessary skills for proper grammar and organization. This may also point to a need for more reinforcement of grammar in our upper-level English classes. We will increase this emphasis in the coming year. Spring 2016: This is the average (mean) score for Spring 2016 portfolios.  |
| **2.** | Spring 2017: This is the average (mean) of Spring 2017 Writing Skills subscores. COMMENTS: While previous years have shown an improvement in this area of the ETS Proficiency Profile, this year's cohort failed to meet our expectations both in ability and commitment. Spring 2016: This is the average (mean) of Spring 2016 Writing Skills subscores. |
| **Sum** | As we stated last year, we hope that the recent courses added or modified to our program (ENGL 344, 350, 450) will help our students improve in this area. However, one year is not enough time for us to see such improvement, and because of staffing issues, we may not be able to teach these courses as often as we would like. Additionally, at least one of these courses (344) from academic year 2016-17 had a high failure rate among this cohort, and this may also factor into student performance for this goal.  |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: Comply with program productivity standards as defined by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported****Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** |  |
| Indicator/Learning Outcome | 2005-2009 Rolling Average | 2006-2010 Rolling Average | 2007-2011 Rolling Average | 2008-2012 Rolling Average | 2009-2013 Rolling Average |
| **1.** | English: Degrees Conferred | 8.8 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 8.4 | 10.0 |
| **2.** | English: Major Headcount | 47.8 | 49.6 | 50.8 | 49.8 | 54.4 |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** | South Carolina Commission on Higher Education Management Information System (CHEMIS) and the Commission's Academic Degree Program Inventory (Lander University Fact Book)  |  Annually |
| **2.** | South Carolina Commission on Higher Education Management Information System (CHEMIS) and the Commission's Academic Degree Program Inventory (Lander University Fact Book)  |  Annually |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** | Degrees Awarded (Baccalaurate) is greater than or equal to 5 | N/A  |  Degrees Awarded (Baccalaurate) is less than 5 |
| **2.** | Major Enrollment (Baccalaurate) is greater than or equal to 12.5 | N/A | Major Enrollment (Baccalaurate) is less than 12.5 |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** |       |
| **2.** |       |
| **Sum** |       |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Summary**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Unit/Program Goal** | **Strategic Goal Supported** | **Unit/Program Goal Outcome** | **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** |
|  |  | **Score** | **Evaluation****Met: 3.00 – 2.01****Partially Met: 2.00 – 1.01****Not Met: 1.00 – 0.01****Not Evaluated: 0.00** |  |
| 1. To demonstrate an ability to analyze and interpret texts.
 |  | 2.50 |  | $0.00 |
| 1. To demonstrate an ability to understand texts within context, such as history, politics, genre and/or culture.
 |  | 2.50 |  | $0.00 |
| 1. To demonstrate familiarity with textual criticism and the ability to integrate sources.
 |  | 2.00 |  | $0.00 |
| 1. To demonstrate the conventions of American grammar and organization through student-produced texts.
 |  | 2.00 |  | $0.00 |
| 1. Comply with program productivity standards as defined by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
 |  |      |  | $0.00 |
| **UNIT/PROGRAM TOTALS** | **2.25** |  | **$0.00** |
| **Unit/Program Summary:** After many years (2010-2017) of using the MFT for assessment and attempting to make it fit our students' needs, we have come to realize that it is not useful for our assessment process. We contacted and researched some peer institutions to see whether the MFT or other standardized testing methods had been useful for their assessment and found that none of these institutions actually used a standardized assessment instrument. While we appreciated that the MFT provided some nationally-normed data, we found that its questions did not correspond to our curriculum and were essentially literary trivia. We will not be using the MFT next year, and we will consider using the ETS Proficiency Profile (for Goal IV) depending on its roll within assessment for the university. Because the portfolios have always been our best measure of student success and student needs, they will most likely be the sole instrument for our major assessment moving forward. This change will provide our ENGL 499 students with more time to focus on developing their senior portfolio and thesis and less time memorizing the kind of information needed only to succeed in taking the MFT.   |