



SAINT LOUIS  
UNIVERSITY  
Saint Louis University  
Program Assessment Plan

**Program (Major, Minor, Core):** Major (B.A.) and Minor, including concentrations (tracks) within these programs.

**Department:** Engli

**College/School:** College of Arts and Sciences

**Person(s) Responsible for Implementing the Plan:** Associate Chair, Undergraduate Director, and Other Assigned Faculty

**Date Submitted:** Approved with revisions 11/18/15

**\*Outcomes also apply to the English Minor**

**\*\*Outcomes apply to Rhetoric Writing and Technology Track only.**

**\*\*\*Outcome applies to Creative Writing Major and Minor Tracks only.**

**\*\*\*\*Outcome applies to Research Intensive English (Honors) Track only.**

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
<p><i>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</i></p> <p><b>Students who complete the undergraduate program in English will ...</b></p>	<p><i>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</i></p>	<p><i>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</i></p> <p><b>[NOTE:</b> In order to establish an adequate pool of data, the English Dept. will ask all instructors at all levels—including Madrid faculty—to save electronic copies of major assignments for courses beginning in Spring 2016. Students will be notified on syllabi that assignments may be used for program assessment. Assignments will be archived by department staff on the English Dept. T-Drive. Assessment of outcomes will draw upon this pool variously, as described below]</p>	<p><i>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</i></p>

<p><b>*Outcome #1:</b></p> <p><b><i>--produce close readings of literary texts and other media that demonstrate an ability to analyze elements such as syntax, word choice, tone, tropes and imagery.</i></b></p>	<p>Outcome #1 is introduced in our 2000 level topical literature courses, which familiarize students with techniques of close reading; students who complete a 2000-level course should be able to “generate engaged and responsive close readings of texts” (that is, readings that demonstrate awareness of how elements specific to literary language enhance meaning).</p> <p>The practice of close reading should be further developed in 3000-level courses, which pursue exercises in close reading in conjunction with specific inquiries into literary history, genre, rhetoric and cultural critique.</p> <p>By the time they reach advanced 4000-level coursework, English BA students should be able to “produce sophisticated close readings that attend to multiple dimensions of textual complexity.” 4000-level courses should present higher-order interpretive challenges that refine students’ abilities to analyze stylistic elements of texts.</p>	<p>Because this outcome is continuously developed across our entire curriculum, it will be best assessed directly by tracking students across a range of coursework: the Undergrad Committee will choose, from the <b>pool of assignments established beginning in Spring 2016</b>, a set of assignments from selected majors, including assignments from each course level (2000, 3000 and 4000). An ad hoc faculty committee will assess these portfolios using a rubric keyed specifically to the skill of literary close reading. The Undergraduate Committee will develop the rubric in consultation with faculty at Madrid. This rubric will be arranged according to a 3-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency. We project that the <b>first assessment of Outcome #1 will occur in Spring / Summer 2019</b>, and will consider assignments collected over a 3 year period.</p>	<p>The ad hoc committee for assessing Outcome #1 (close reading skills) will report the results of its portfolio assessment to the Undergraduate Committee. Depending on the results of this assessment, the Undergraduate Committee may develop recommendations for curricular change at the BA level or workshops on effectively teaching close reading. The Undergraduate Committee will make its report and recommendations to the English faculty at large at the beginning of the year faculty retreat in <b>August 2019</b>. These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
---	---	---	---

<p><b>*Outcome #2:</b></p> <p><i>---analyze the ways in which works of literature reflect and shape their historical and cultural contexts.</i></p>	<p>While some preliminary consideration of historical contexts occurs in 2000-level courses, the major place in the BA curriculum where students learn to articulate historical context together with literary texts is in <b>History and Context</b> 3000-level courses [ENGL 3250-3490]. These courses explore the difference that historical context makes to the reading of texts, attending to broad literary periods and emphasizing chronological breadth.</p> <p>After completing a 3000-level HC course, students should be able to: “<i>produce arguments that situate texts within key intellectual and aesthetic movements of literary and cultural history; produce analyses of the ways in which texts respond to and shape the cultural conditions of their moment; write with an awareness of how the present historical moment informs our understanding of the past.</i>”</p> <p>The level of historical awareness achieved in the 3000-level History and Context course is further reinforced in 4000-level coursework, where historical and cultural contexts and “literary traditions” should be included among the multiple dimensions that students bring to bear in producing analyses of texts.</p>	<p>Outcome #2 will be directly assessed in the following manner: in <b>Spring Semester 2016</b>, English Department staff will identify English majors who have submitted final assignments for the four History and Context courses offered that semester: ENGL 3260; 3280; 3340; 3380. We will also collect samples from Madrid course ENGL 3353 (and possibly 3340). The English majors in this cohort will be tracked in the following semester (<b>Fall 2016</b>). Assignments from these students will be drawn from the 4000-level courses that they subsequently take (we will need <b>one</b> 3000-level HC assignment and at least <b>one</b> additional 4000-level assignment from each student in the sample set); these assignments should be readily available in our established pool.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Committee will develop, in consultation with faculty at Madrid, a rubric for the ad hoc committee to use in assessing these assignments. This rubric will be keyed specifically to assess abilities to describe and analyze historical and contexts in relation to literary works. This rubric will be arranged according to a 3-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency.</p>	<p>The ad hoc committee will report the results of its <b>Fall 2016</b> assessment of student work to the Undergraduate Committee. Depending on the results of this assessment, the Undergraduate Committee may develop recommendations for curricular change at the BA level or workshops on successful pedagogical strategies to convey to students an awareness of the dimension of History and Context in literary texts. The first report and recommendations to the faculty at large on the History and Context Outcome should occur by the <b>January 2017</b> faculty meeting. These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
---	--	---	--

<p><b>*Outcome #3:</b></p> <p><b>-- analyze the ways in which medium, form, and/or genre create and shape meaning in a variety of works.</b></p>	<p>While some initial consideration of form and genre occurs in 2000-level courses, the major place in the BA curriculum where students focus on this outcome is in <b>Form and Genre</b> 3000-level courses [ENGL 3000-3240]. In these courses, which encompass literature, film and creative writing courses, the emphasis is on the function of form in shaping and creating meaning in literary texts and other media.</p> <p>After completing a Form and Genre course, students should be able to: “<i>articulate the ways in which generic conventions and motifs work within texts; produce analyses of the ways in which literary forms and structures inform meaning and purpose; construct clear spoken and written arguments about literary / filmic forms, structures and modes.</i>”</p> <p>The level of awareness of genre and form achieved in the 3000-level Form and Genre course is further reinforced in 4000-level coursework, where “aesthetic contexts,” which include generic conventions and motifs, should be incorporated among the multiple dimensions that students bring to bear in producing analyses of texts and other media.</p>	<p>The direct assessment method for Outcome #3 will be similar to Outcome #2: English Department staff will identify English majors who have submitted final work in a Form and Genre course in <b>AY 2018-2019</b>. Staff will draw assignments for the students from the 4000-level courses that they subsequently take (we will need <b>one</b> 3000-level FG assignment and at least <b>one</b> additional 4000-level assignment from each student in the sample set); these assignments should be readily available in our established pool.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Committee will develop, in consultation with faculty at Madrid, a rubric for the ad hoc committee to use to evaluate both critical and creative artifacts from students’ coursework. This rubric will be designed to assess students’ abilities to analyze and/or formulate the significance of medium, form and genre in literary works. This rubric will be arranged according to a 3-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency. The ad hoc committee will assess the data for this outcome during the <b>Spring 2020</b> semester.</p>	<p>The ad hoc committee will report the results of its <b>Spring 2020 assessment</b> of student work to the Undergraduate Committee. Depending on the results of this assessment, the Undergraduate Committee may develop recommendations for curricular change at the BA level or suggestions for successful pedagogical strategies to enhance student engagement with Form and Genre in literary texts. The first report and recommendations to the faculty at large on the Form and Genre Outcome should occur by the <b>August 2020</b> faculty retreat. These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
--	---	---	--

<p><b>*Outcome #4:</b></p> <p><b>-- produce written and oral arguments about literary works and other media that demonstrate facility with appropriate research methods, clear organization, and awareness of audience.</b></p>	<p>This outcome is initially addressed in ENGL 1900, an English course required for all SLU students. 2000-level coursework in English should build on strategies introduced at the 1000-level. One of the outcomes for 2000-level courses is that students will be able to “construct clear spoken and written arguments that demonstrate an awareness of purpose and audience” upon completing the course.</p> <p>English majors should develop this skill further in subsequent coursework. All 3000-level English courses should involve argumentative writing assignments, but this skill is particularly emphasized in the <b>Rhetoric and Argument 3000-level courses</b> that are a major requirement [ENGL 3750-3900]. These courses offer students a sustained focus on rhetoric and argument. Students who complete these courses will be able to: “describe and analyze rhetorical situations for specific purposes, audiences, and circumstances; use research to craft inter-textual arguments for particular contexts and audiences; produce persuasive messages through multiple modes of production and distribution, including print and digital.” Argument and research writing should also be a component of 3000-level literature courses; after completing any 3000-level literature course, students will be able to use research to craft intertextual arguments for a literary-critical audience.</p> <p>3000-level coursework prepares students to engage in higher-order research writing at the 4000-level, where they should be able to: “compose clear and original spoken and written arguments that demonstrate facility with critical approaches and research methods.”</p>	<p>Because this outcome is continuously developed across our entire curriculum, it will be best assessed directly by tracking students across a range of coursework: thus, as with Outcome #1, the Undergrad Committee will choose for assessment, from our established pool, a set of assignments from selected majors, including assignments from each course level (2000, 3000 and 4000).</p> <p>An ad hoc faculty committee will assess these paper sets using a rubric keyed specifically to the assessing argumentative research writing. The Undergraduate Committee will develop the rubric in consultation with faculty at Madrid. This rubric will be arranged according to a 3-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency. We project that the <b>first assessment of Outcome #4 will occur in Fall 2017.</b></p> <p>--</p> <p>We will also assess this outcome through the <i>indirect method</i> of focus group surveys with senior English majors. Each semester we will ask senior seminar instructors to allow undergraduate committee representative to take some class time to survey students about their experiences with writing instruction in the major.</p> <p>--</p> <p>To assess the <b>oral</b> component of this outcome, we may gather further data from exit interviews or multi-media productions (videos, podcasts, etc.). [We will likely undertake this kind of assessment at another stage of the cycle]</p>	<p>The ad hoc committee for assessing Outcome #4 (argumentative research writing) will report the results of its portfolio assessment to the Undergraduate Committee. Depending on the results of this assessment, the Undergraduate Committee may develop recommendations for curricular change at the BA level or workshops on pedagogical strategies. The first report and recommendations on Outcome #4 will be made to the English faculty at large in <b>January 2018.</b> These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
---	--	---	--

<p><b>*Outcome #5</b></p> <p><i>-- analyze the ways in which literary works represent the intersections of factors such as race, gender, class, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, environment, and / or belief.</i></p>	<p>Attention to intersections between literature and wider cultural and social concerns is a hallmark of our 2000-level literature curriculum, which introduces students to the study of literature in conjunction with urgent issues such as social justice, faith and gender and identity. One key outcome of these courses is that students who complete them will be able to “<i>describe and analyze</i> the various ways in which texts reflect and help shape wider cultural conditions.” This emphasis on literature as a way of engaging critically with wider social and cultural conflicts is subsequently reinforced for English majors in <b>3000-level Culture and Critique courses (ENGL 3500-3740)</b>. These courses pay special attention to the ways in which texts offer critiques of their cultures. In 3000-level CC courses, students gain some awareness of theoretical perspectives grounding these critiques as well as sensitivity to diverse cultural perspectives. Points at issue include gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, class, disability, religion, place, space, and their intersections. These courses may also consider our relations with the natural world and the humanly created world.</p> <p>Students who complete the 3000-level CC course will be able to: “<i>articulate the ways in which differences of identity, culture and/or discipline influence</i> textual production and reception; <i>produce analyses of</i> the ways in which texts both create and critique cultural conditions; craft written and spoken arguments that reveal a sensitivity to diverse cultural perspectives.” The 3000-level CC course prepares students to engage in higher-order analysis of such issues as among the “multiple dimensions of textual complexity” at the 4000-level.</p>	<p>The direct assessment method for Outcome #5 will be similar to Outcome #2. Department staff in consultation with the Undergraduate Committee will identify English majors who have submitted final assignments for Culture and Critique courses. Further assignments from these students will be drawn from 4000-level courses that they subsequently take (we will need <b>one</b> 3000-level CC assignment and at least <b>one</b> additional 4000-level assignment from each student in the sample set); these assignments should be readily available in our established pool.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Committee, in consultation with faculty at Madrid, will develop a rubric that is keyed specifically to gauge abilities to describe and analyze cultural diversity and intersectionality as dimensions of literary texts. An ad hoc faculty committee will assess the assignments using this rubric. This rubric will be arranged according to a 3-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency. The first assessment of Outcome #5 will occur in <b>Fall 2018</b>.</p>	<p>The ad hoc committee will report the results of its <b>Fall 2018</b> assessment of student work to the Undergraduate Committee. Depending on the results of this assessment, the Undergraduate Committee may develop recommendations for curricular change at the BA level or workshops on successful pedagogical strategies for conveying to students an awareness of the dimension of Culture and Critique in literary texts. The first report and recommendations to the faculty at large on the Culture and Critique Outcome should occur by the <b>January 2019</b> faculty meeting. These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
---	--	---	--

<p><b>Outcome #6:</b></p> <p><i>-- interpret and evaluate texts and other media through a variety of theoretical and critical lenses (e.g. formalist, Marxist, psychoanalytic, feminist, postcolonial, poststructuralist, etc.).</i></p>	<p>While theoretical and critical concepts may be introduced in 2000 and 3000-level courses, the current structure of the English major envisions that the most sustained and coherent student engagement with theory occurs in <b>4000-level courses</b>, including the English Senior Seminar, <b>ENGL 4940</b>. After completing 4000-level courses, students should be able to: “<i>generate analyses that situate texts within their historical, cultural, and aesthetic contexts, as well as within literary and <b>theoretical traditions.</b></i>”</p>	<p>Because we expect the highest level of theoretical engagement to occur among advanced students, particularly those completing their final senior seminar in English (4940), the best place to assess Outcome #6 is in the final assignments produced in these senior seminars, which should be readily available in our established pool. An ad hoc faculty committee will assess these assignments using a rubric focused specifically on the presence of theory—and the level of interaction with it—in these assignments. The Undergraduate Committee will develop this rubric in consultation with faculty at Madrid. This rubric will be arranged according to a 3-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency. We project that the <b>first assessment of Outcome #1 will occur in Spring /Summer 2018</b>, and will consider 4940 assignments collected over a 3 year period</p>	<p>The ad hoc committee to assess <b>Outcome #6 (theory)</b> will report the results of its assessment to the <b>Undergraduate Committee</b>. Depending on the results of this assessment, the Undergraduate Committee may recommend changes to the BA curriculum and/or pedagogical workshops for faculty to enhance our articulation of this theory in coursework. The first report and recommendations regarding Outcome #6 will be presented to the English faculty at large at the beginning of the year faculty retreat in <b>August 2018</b>. These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
--	--	---	--

<p><b>**Outcome #7: Rhetoric, Writing, and Technology (RWT) Track:</b></p> <p><b>Students who complete the English major with a concentration in RWT will...</b></p> <p><i>-- analyze the rhetorical functions and features of a variety of texts and media.</i></p>	<p>The RWT track offers a sustained focus on both the analysis of the rhetorical dimension of texts and the production of rhetorically sophisticated texts for a wide range of contexts and media. Students pursuing this track are required to take ENGL 3850 (Foundations in Rhetoric and Writing). After completing this course, students should be able to: “<i>describe and analyze</i> rhetorical situations for specific purposes, audiences, and circumstances; use research to craft inter-textual arguments for particular contexts and audiences; produce persuasive messages through multiple modes of production and distribution, including print and digital.” This study of rhetoric is historically deepened in required coursework at the 4000-level. RWT students must take either ENGL 4020 or 4030 (History of Rhetoric I or II). Students who complete these 4000-level courses should be able to: “<i>generate analyses that</i> situate texts within their historical, cultural, and aesthetic contexts, as well as within <i>rhetorical</i> and theoretical traditions.” Finally, students in the RWT track complete an independent capstone project (ENGL 4980). This project includes both research and production components. Senior students also submit a final portfolio of work.</p>	<p>RWT affiliated faculty will assess selected senior portfolios of RWT students.</p> <p>The Senior Portfolio asks students to collect and evaluate 4 pieces: a rhetorical analysis assignment, a historical analysis assignment, a media production, and one other project of their own choosing. The Portfolio asks students to write a reflective essay in which they analyze and evaluate the various choices they have made in their work in RWT.</p> <p>These portfolios will be assessed according to a rubric focused on assessing the level of rhetorical ability and awareness they demonstrate. This rubric will be arranged according to a three-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency. RWT faculty will develop this rubric in consultation with faculty at Madrid.</p> <p>We project that assessment of the RWT track will be undertaken during <b>Fall 2020</b> and will consider portfolios collected over a 3-year period.</p> <p>Exit interviews with the RWT Director will constitute another form of indirect assessment that may be taken into consideration in this process</p>	<p>RWT faculty will report the results of their <b>Fall 2020</b> assessment of student work to the Undergraduate Committee. Depending on the results of the assessment, RWT faculty may offer recommendations for revisions of the RWT curriculum, various course outcomes, teaching methods, and/or the structure of the Capstone Project and Senior Portfolio. The Undergraduate Committee will consider the results of this assessment and any possible recommendations for curricular revision that may result from it and formulate a report and/or recommendations regarding the track for the faculty at large. The first report on the RWT track should occur no later than the <b>January 2021</b> faculty meeting. These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
--	--	--	--



<p><b>**Outcome #8: Rhetoric, Writing, and Technology (RWT) Track:</b></p> <p><i>--produce rhetorically sophisticated texts and / or media for a range of contexts.</i></p>	<p>[See above]</p>	<p>[See above: Outcome #8 will be assessed by the same means and in the same cycle as Outcome #7]</p>	<p>[See above; both RWT outcomes will be assessed simultaneously]</p>
---	--------------------	---	---

<p><b>***Outcome #9: Creative Writing Major and Minor</b></p> <p><b>Students who complete the English major with a concentration in Creative Writing will...</b></p> <p><i>-- use appropriate craft techniques to develop multiple dimensions of textual complexity in creative compositions.</i></p>	<p>English majors with an emphasis in Creative Writing take either 1 or 2 3000-level Form and Genre Creative Writing course AND either 2 or 3 Advanced Creative Writing (4000-level) courses along with required literature coursework.</p> <p>English minors with an emphasis in Creative Writing take 1 3000-level Form and Genre Creative Writing course and 2 Advanced Creative Writing (4000-level) courses along with 2 required courses in literature.</p> <p>Students who complete 3000-level Form and Genre Creative Writing courses should be able to: “demonstrate a sense of compositional process; demonstrate an attention to craft techniques through writing; <i>demonstrate creative engagement</i> with a variety of forms, structures and/or modes.”</p> <p>Students who complete 4000-level Advanced Creative Writing courses should be able to: “<i>demonstrate an ability to</i> develop multiple dimensions of textual complexity; write with an awareness of literary traditions, aesthetics, and contexts; offer useful and sophisticated critiques of writing by fellow students.”</p> <p>Creative Writing majors are required to submit a portfolio of representative work for assessment prior to graduation.</p>	<p>Creative Writing faculty will assess senior creative writing portfolios (composed of a selection of representative work produced in SLU coursework) according to a rubric focused on the presence of and facility with creative writing craft techniques and the level of textual complexity demonstrated in the works submitted. This rubric will be arranged according to a three-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency. CW faculty will develop this rubric in consultation with faculty at Madrid.</p> <p>We project that assessment of the Creative Writing track will be undertaken during <b>Fall 2021</b> and will consider portfolios collected over a 3-year period.</p> <p>[Exit interviews with Creative Writing majors constitute another form of indirect assessment that may also be used to address this outcome]</p>	<p>Creative Writing faculty will report the results of their <b>Fall 2021</b> assessment of student work to the Undergraduate Committee. Depending on the results of the assessment, CW faculty may offer recommendations for revising the CW curriculum, various course outcomes, teaching methods, and/or the structure of the portfolio. The Undergraduate Committee will consider the results of this assessment and any possible recommendations for curricular revision that may result from it and formulate a report and/or recommendations regarding the track for the faculty at large. The first report on the CW track should occur no later than the <b>January 2022</b> faculty meeting. These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
---	---	---	--

<p><b>****Outcome #10: Research Intensive English (Honors):</b></p> <p><b>Students who complete the English major with a Research Intensive concentration will...</b></p> <p><i>--pursue original research questions that demonstrate advanced awareness of theoretical, historical and interpretive contexts in sustained discipline appropriate written arguments.</i></p>	<p>Research Intensive students must take at least 2 Research Intensive Seminars (while maintaining a 3.75 or higher GPA in English) and must complete a Senior research project in either the fall or the spring semester of their senior year.</p> <p>To graduate with a BA in English with the Research Intensive designation, all RIE students must complete a Senior Honors Project. This requirement asks RIE students to craft, over one semester, a scholarly, polished and dynamic piece of critical or creative writing of substantial length (25-30pg). Senior Honors Projects must display original scholarly research beyond the immediate primary texts under study, and must engage with appropriate secondary works to craft a critically-informed yet distinctive essay or creative / digital media project. In consultation with a full-time member of the English Department faculty, all RIE students will formally propose a senior honors project topic in the semester prior to writing the thesis. Faculty mentor permission must be obtained prior to signing up for ENGL 4990; the student will be enrolled in this course under his or her faculty mentor.</p> <p>Given they pass examination, each submitted Senior Honors project will be assigned one of three designations: "Pass"; "Distinction" or "High Distinction"</p>	<p>The Senior Honors project is the logical place to assess the outcome of the RIE track directly. Senior Honors projects have been collected and archived since the track was inaugurated in 2013. Therefore, we already have a substantial body of data to assess. After we collect the next round of Honors Projects in <b>Spring 2016</b>, an ad hoc faculty committee will be convened to assess these projects according to a rubric specific to the RIE track. This rubric will be arranged according to a 3-part scheme: competency, proficiency, and high proficiency. The Undergraduate Committee will develop this rubric in consultation with faculty at Madrid.</p> <p>The first assessment of the RIE track will consider projects collected between Spring 2013 and Spring 2016.</p> <p>[Exit interviews with the RIE class of 2016 constitute another form of direct assessment that may be added to this process]</p>	<p>The ad hoc committee for assessing <b>Outcome #9</b> will report the results of RIE project assessment to the Undergraduate Committee. The Undergraduate Committee will take into consideration the ad hoc committee's report, as well as retention and completion rates in the RIE track overall as it considers whether to recommend changes to the RIE track structure. The Undergrad Committee will report on the results of the assessment and any recommendations for curricular change in the RIE track to the English faculty at large at the beginning of the year faculty retreat in <b>August 2016</b>. These recommendations will also be communicated by email to Madrid.</p>
--	---	--	---

- 1. It is not recommended to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.**

*The timeline and process for implementing this assessment plan will be as follows:*

AY 2015-2016:

*Spring 2016: Ad Hoc Committee assesses RIE / Honors Projects (Outcome #10) and reports results to Undergrad Committee*  
*Spring 2016: English Department staff will begin collecting assignments from all courses to establish a pool for a continuous, sustainable assessment process. Assignments will be archived by English department staff for use in assessment exercises. Faculty will provide (by email or other means) electronic copies of final student coursework to department staff; staff will archive these electronic copies on the department T-Drive according to course number and semester. Students will be notified on all course syllabi that major assignments will be archived and possibly assessed anonymously for program assessment purposes.*

AY 2016-2017:

*Fall 2016: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcome #10 (RIE program) to English Faculty at August 2016 Retreat.*  
*Fall 2016: Ad Hoc Committee assesses assignments for Outcome #2 (History and Context) and reports results to the Undergrad Committee.*  
*Spring 2017: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcome #2 to English Faculty at January 2017 meeting.*

AY 2017-2018:

*Fall 2017: Ad Hoc Committee assesses assignments for Outcome #4 (Writing; Rhetoric and Argument) and reports results to Undergrad Committee.*  
*Spring 2018: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcome #4 to English Faculty at January 2018 meeting.*  
*Spring 2018: Ad Hoc Committee assesses 4940 assignments (Outcome #6) and reports results to Undergrad Committee.*

AY 2018-2019:

*Fall 2018: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcome #6 (Theory / 4940) to English Faculty at August 2018 Retreat.*  
*Fall 2018: Ad Hoc Committee assesses assignments for Outcome #5 (Culture and Critique) and reports results to Undergrad Committee.*  
*Spring 2019: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcome #5 to English Faculty at January 2019 meeting.*  
*Spring 2019: Ad Hoc Committee assesses assignments for Outcome #1 (Close Reading) and reports results to Undergrad Committee.*

AY 2019-2020:

*Fall 2019: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcome #1 (Close Reading) to English Faculty at August 2019 Retreat.*  
*Spring 2020: Ad Hoc Committee assesses assignments for Outcome #3 (Form and Genre) and reports results to the Undergrad Committee.*

AY 2020-2021:

*Fall 2020: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcome #5 (Rhetoric and Argument) to English Faculty at August 2020 Retreat.*

*Fall 2020: RWT Faculty assess RWT Senior Portfolios (Outcomes #7 and 8), and report results to Undergraduate Committee.*

*Spring 2021: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcomes #7 and 8 (RWT) to English Faculty at January 2021 meeting.*

AY 2021-2022:

*Fall 2021: Creative Writing Faculty assess Senior Creative Writing Portfolios (Outcome #9), and report results to Undergraduate Committee.*

*Spring 2021: Undergrad Committee presents report and recommendations regarding Outcome #9 (Creative Writing) to English Faculty at January 2022 meeting.*

AY 2022-2023:

*Fall 2022: Recommence assessment cycle with new assessment of Outcome #10 (RIE).*

**[See Table version of English Assessment cycle on p. 15]**

**2. Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?**

*A draft of this Assessment Plan was shared with **Andrew Power, Ph.D.**, English Programs Director, and **Anne McCabe**, Associate Dean, Arts & Sciences Programs at SLU Madrid, who shared the document with English Department faculty there. Their suggestions for revision have been incorporated into this document. In addition, all Madrid English Department faculty will save electronic copies of final assignments or written work at the end of each semester to send to the Ad Hoc Assessment Committee Chair in St. Louis to add to the pool of artifacts for assessment of outcomes. Madrid English faculty will also provide feedback to the Undergraduate Committee throughout the process of designing rubrics to assess the artifacts, and will form part of each of the ad hoc committees charged with assessing the artifacts.*

**3. The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:**

- a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)

*To be determined, depending on the efficacy of the first several years of assessment as currently projected.*

- b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.

*In Fall 2015, Undergrad Committee Student Rep. Michelle Rabe led several focus group discussions about draft English Department BA Learning Outcomes with current English majors. She has reported the results of these discussions to the Undergrad Committee (see Focus Group Notes document). As it was suggested that peer-led discussions would yield more useful results, faculty were not present for these discussions. The first session was held on Tuesday, Oct. 13 in Professor Van Den Berg's ENGL 4940. Michelle also met with the English Club during the last week of October 2015. She also met with the cohort of RIE / English Honors students in October prior to Fall Break 2015. Feedback from these sessions has been taken into consideration in the final draft Assessment Plan; specifically assessment of Outcome #4 [Writing and Argument] has received greater urgency and will occur sooner due to student concerns that emerged from these focus group sessions.*

- c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?

**Association of Departments of English. "Report of the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment." Web Publication. New York: Modern Language Association. April 2014. <https://www.ade.org/reports/adHocAssessment.pdf>**

**Heiland, Donna, "Approaching the Ineffable: Flow, Sublimity and Student Learning," *Literary Study, Measurement, and the Sublime: Disciplinary Assessment*. Ed. Donna Heiland and Laura J. Rosenthal. New York: Teagle, 2011. Print. Also available at <http://www.teaglefoundation.org>**

**Shavelson, Richard J. *Measuring College Learning Responsibly*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2010. Print.**

**Walvoord, Barbara. "How to Construct a Simple, Sensible, Useful Departmental Assessment Process," *Literary Study, Measurement, and the Sublime: Disciplinary Assessment*. Ed. Heiland and Rosenthal.**

- d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel

*Associate Chair of English Joya Uraizee will chair the ad hoc assessment committee; we project that a rotating group of faculty will participate in these assessment sessions. The Undergraduate Committee will develop the rubrics for assessment exercises (in consultation with Madrid English faculty); it also will receive ad hoc committee assessment reports and will determine curricular or policy recommendations on the basis of them. The Undergrad Committee will report these recommendations at regularly scheduled faculty meetings at the beginning of fall or spring semesters. This plan thus incorporates an existing committee structure and faculty meeting schedule. The only addition is the formation of regular ad hoc committees for assessment; we do not anticipate at this time that this additional committee will be overly onerous, particularly as it will be overseen by a current department administrator (the Associate Chair).*

	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>	<b>2019-2020</b>	<b>2020-2021</b>	<b>2021-2022</b>	<b>2022-2023</b>
<b>FALL</b>		<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #10 (RIE) to English Faculty at August 2016 Retreat.</p> <p>Ad Hoc Comm. assesses Outcome #2 (History and Context) and reports results to UG Committee.</p>	<p>Ad Hoc Comm. assesses assignments for Outcome #4 (Writing; Rhetoric and Argument) and reports results to UG Comm.</p>	<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #6 (Theory / 4940) to English Faculty at August 2018 Retreat.</p> <p>Ad Hoc Committee assesses Outcome #5 (Culture and Critique) and reports results to UG Committee</p>	<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #1 (Close Reading) to English Faculty at August 2019 Retreat.</p>	<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #5 (Rhetoric and Argument) to English Faculty at August 2020 Retreat.</p> <p>RWT Faculty assess RWT Senior Portfolios (Outcomes #7 and 8), and report results to UG Comm.</p>	<p>Creative Writing Faculty assess Senior Creative Writing Portfolios (Outcome #9), and report results to UG Comm.</p>	<p>Recommence assessment cycle with new assessment of Outcome #10 (RIE).</p>
<b>SPRING</b>	<p>English Department staff begin collecting and archiving assignments from all courses to establish a pool of assignments for assessment process.</p> <p>Ad Hoc Comm. assesses Outcome #10 (RIE); results reported to UG Comm.</p>	<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #2 to English Faculty at January 2017 meeting.</p>	<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #4 to English Faculty at Jan. 2018 meeting.</p> <p>Ad Hoc Comm. assesses Outcome #6 (Theory / 4940) and reports results to UG Comm.</p>	<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #5 to English Faculty at January 2019 meeting.</p> <p>Ad Hoc Comm. assesses Outcome #1 (Close Reading) and reports results to UG Comm.</p>	<p>Ad Hoc Comm. assesses assignments for Outcome #3 (Form and Genre) and reports results to the UG Comm.</p>	<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #7 and 8 (RWT) to English Faculty at January 2021 meeting.</p>	<p>UG Comm. presents recommendations regarding Outcome #9 (Creative Writing) to English Faculty at January 2022 meeting.</p>	