

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: English (B.A.)

SUBMITTED BY: Holly Karapetkova

DATE: 9/15/2017

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED: Assessment reports are stored on the Marymount S:// drive and the department chair's Marymount computer in a clearly labeled assessment folder.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: Please copy and paste the current year's catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.

The English major and minor provide preparation for entry into graduate study, professional schools, and a wide variety of career fields. English majors have the option of choosing a track in literature, media and performance studies, or writing, or a secondary teaching licensure program.

Through the literature and writing courses required for the major, students develop valuable writing, critical reading, and research skills. The study of literature provides tools of critical analysis, awareness of major authors and literary traditions, and insight into how literary developments mirror and influence major societal developments. The writing courses teach the principles of clear and effective writing for a variety of purposes and audiences.

All English majors complete an internship, which provides valuable practical experience and the opportunity to apply skills in a professional context. In addition to the required internship, seniors must successfully complete a senior research seminar.

By choosing minors in such areas as gender and society, politics, and psychology, students can prepare themselves to apply their skills in the professional world. The English major, meanwhile, is a lifelong resource in providing a broad liberal arts education.

List all of the program's learning outcomes: *(regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)*

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
1. Students will respond to a literary text in a way that reflects an awareness of aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach.	2005-06 2007-08 2009-10 2013-14	X	2022-23
2. Students will write coherent, well-organized essays that establish a clear focus, provide appropriate evidence, and are grammatically correct.	2006-07 2007-08 2008-09 2009-10		2020-21

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
	2010-11 2014-15		
3. Students will conduct appropriate research and synthesize their own original ideas with those advanced by literary critics and other scholars. (Inquiry Outcome)	2005-06 2007-08 2008-09 2010-11 2014-15		2021-22
4. Students will demonstrate a thoughtful understanding of their own writing process.	2007-2008 2012-13	X	2022-23
5. Students will analyze literary works - in all genres - with respect to structure, style, and theme.	2006-07 2008-2009 2013-14	X	2022-23
6. Students will demonstrate information and technological literacy in research and competence in MLA documentation.	2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-11 2014-15		2021-22
7. Students will deliver oral presentations that are focused, well-organized, effective, and establish a connection with the audience.	2008-09 2011-12 2013-14	X	2022-23

Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

Our learning outcomes are written to make clear connections between our program and the university’s goals regarding the liberal arts core, writing intensive courses, and student-based inquiry. Our learning outcomes stress the importance of the liberal arts tradition and offer students a foundation for understanding literary arts, providing student-centered opportunities for intellectual growth through textual analysis and writing. They emphasize critical thinking, effective written communication, scholarly research, and intellectual self-awareness. Outcomes 2 and 4 specifically support the university’s writing intensive initiative, outcomes 1, 3 and 5 focus on skills needed for the inquiry learning initiative, and outcome 6 serves the university-wide objective of information literacy. Outcomes 1 and 5 also serve the literature requirement of the Liberal Arts Core and provide skills in literary analysis needed for our majors. All outcomes work together to prepare students for either an entry-level professional position that involves research, analysis, writing, and/or presentation, or for graduate study in any research and writing based program.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:



The English department has a strong history and culture of assessment. We have a clear, confidential assessment process that engages all department faculty, and we discuss the results of our assessment process at department meetings to determine what parts of our program are working and where we might make improvements. Our process is confidential and efficient. Papers to be assessed have identifying information removed; syllabi in all classes state that student work may be used for confidential assessment; assessment ratings are put in a database generated by Institutional Assessment; and student papers are stored in a Google Docs folder shared only with tenure-track faculty and with all identifying information removed. Assessment reports are stored on the Marymount S:// drive (will move to Box this year) and the department chair's Marymount computer in a clearly labeled assessment folder.

As in past years, to assess written assignments faculty were given an assessment rubric and were asked to submit their scores after reviewing anonymous student papers. The professors of relevant courses gathered papers in electronic form, removed identifying information, and shared the papers with full-time, tenure-track members of the department via GoogleDocs, along with an online rating survey listing outcomes and score ranges. To assess presentations, department members were invited to final class presentation sessions. Faculty were given an assessment rubric and asked to submit the sheet after seeing presentations. The scores were then entered in an electronic survey generated by Institutional Assessment.

Each paper and presentation had a minimum of 2 raters. Faculty used assessment rubrics to evaluate individual papers and presentations, and we discussed standards and expectations at a department meeting prior to rating. Scores were tabulated on online surveys provided by Institutional Effectiveness. We maintained our model of evaluation from previous years which uses a 5 point scale where 1 = fails to meet criteria; 3 = meets criteria; and 5 = exceeds criteria. We agreed that a rating of 2.5-3.4 in the statistical tables provided to us by Institutional Effectiveness would indicate the basic minimum expectation of proficiency; 4.5-5 would represent true fluency. Scores falling below 2.4 would merit discussion, and any categories in which papers consistently score 1.4 or lower would be seen as problem areas to address.

As in past years, we used the work of students in our Senior Seminar course as the backbone of our assessment process. The course is required of all majors in our literature and writing tracks, and most students in the media and performance studies track also select this capstone as one of two options. Examining this course allows us to gauge the skills of outgoing seniors and to reflect upon what they have learned from their coursework in the program. This year we examined two learning outcomes in our Senior Seminar papers regarding awareness of literary contexts and genres (Objectives 1 and 5). We rated 13 papers from EN 424 Senior Seminar in fall 2015 and 5 papers from EN 424 in fall 2016. We also assessed two mid-level courses to gauge students' performance prior to the capstone experience. We examined students' oral presentation skills (Objective 7) in EN 290 Literary Theory and Practice spring 2017, a mid-level course taken by nearly all majors and minors in all tracks, and we also reviewed students' understanding of their writing process (Objective 4) in EN 301 The Writing Process, also a mid-level course taken by nearly all majors and minors in all tracks.

The English department has a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment. Our assessment process has resulted in a number of changes to individual courses and to the overall program structure. Based on assessment of our senior seminar course, for example, we instituted changes to that course, rotating faculty through instead of having the same individual teach the course year after year. The results have been positive; our students have consistently performed better on assessment in EN 424 since the changes were implemented. In addition, our assessment process lets us know where our courses are succeeding. Students perform well on the written communication rubric, and on internship evaluations both students and supervisors praise the writing skills students have gained in their English coursework. This result has encouraged us to continue to emphasize writing across all of our courses and to insist on high standards for written communication. Additionally, even when outcomes assess well, we continue to strive to find ways to improve. On our last assessment report (2014-15), for example, we noticed that while overall students in EN 424 Senior Seminar were succeeding in our outcomes, only one in 15 had achieved the outcomes at the highest level, and we decided as a department to implement several changes (see below) that have resulted in more papers this year falling into the highest category.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
<p>Students will write coherent, well-organized essays that establish a clear focus, provide appropriate evidence, and are grammatically correct.</p>	<p>We will continue to review senior seminar papers each year as a department, even if they are not being assessed for this specific outcome. We will continue to keep all faculty involved in the assessment process, and we will continue to rotate various faculty members through the instructional role in EN 424 Senior Seminar in order to maintain the department’s sense of ownership and involvement in the success of this course. In prior years we noticed as a department that EN 424 Senior Seminar tended to score lower in assessment than other courses on several of our outcomes (including this one), and our focus this year in assessing only EN 424 essays has allowed us to look closely at this course and its role within the major. The higher scores this year indicate that our changes to the course and program--rotating faculty, the introduction of WI courses and new writing courses (EN 308 Style and Revision) --are having a positive impact on our students’ abilities to construct coherent, well-written arguments. The significant increase in performance is also due to a particularly strong cohort of graduating seniors this year. Overall, there is also a strong sense that the course is challenging students to rise to rigorous standards, and students often cite the course in alumni surveys as instrumental to their learning experience at Marymount. However, we are still concerned that only one student achieved at the highest level (4.5 and above), suggesting that we could do more to help our best students excel in</p>	<p>We have continued to review senior seminar papers every year as a department, using our rating and discussion of this student work as a springboard for conversations about our curriculum. We have continued to keep all faculty involved in the assessment process and to rotate faculty members through the instructional role in EN 424. (Howe taught the course in 2015, Peebles in 2016, and Johnson will teach it for the first time in 2017.) We also had a conversation as a department about the lack of achievement at the highest level in the course and discussed how we might challenge our most advanced students to perform at the highest levels. Such methods discussed included raising the expectations for high-performing students so that they are challenged to produce work at a higher standard; working more closely with individual students in one-on-one conferences to ensure each student is achieving their best work; increasing the amount of time given to the final projects in senior seminar so that students have more time to think through their projects and perform more substantial research and revision in their work. Our students have continued to achieve strong scores in this course, and while we did not assess this same outcome in 2015-17, we did see more students in this assessment cycle achieve true fluency (4.5 and above) for the categories assessed.</p>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p>producing focused written products for the course. We plan to use this year's assessment data as a starting point for a conversation about whether this course is fulfilling our capstone learning objectives, and about whether there are any adjustments we can make to improve writing performance while still maintaining the high standards we have set for the course.</p>	
<p>Students will conduct appropriate research and synthesize their own original ideas with those advanced by literary critics and other scholars.</p>	<p>As a department, we agree upon the need to focus students on senior seminar projects that involve in-depth research and offer structure as well as opportunities for personal expression and engagement. Our senior seminar course is successful in creating a strong framework within which to engage in literary analysis, allowing students to tailor their research skills to their own interests and thus to produce projects that meaningfully engage them. In prior years we had noticed as a department that EN 424 Senior Seminar traditionally scored lower than other courses in some areas of assessment, and our focus this year in assessing only EN 424 essays has allowed us to look closely at where this course is succeeding and where it is falling short. While scores in the past three years have demonstrated an improvement across all outcomes, we have still noticed that students struggle to perform at the highest levels; only one student's work this year fell into the highest range of performance (above 4.5) on this category, and we would like to see more of our strongest students excelling in research and synthesis of their own ideas with those of scholars in the field. Obviously, our recent curriculum and delivery changes to EN 424 Senior</p>	<p>We had a discussion as a department about the achievements of our stronger students in senior seminar and how we could bring more students' work up to the highest levels. We decided that overall the structure of the course was working well to challenge students in key areas of critical thinking, information literacy, and written communication. It also succeeds in providing them opportunities to pursue their individual interests, while still maintaining a coherent structure that encourages community and exchange of ideas. Instead of altering the course curriculum, we agreed to push students to achieve higher standards. As discussed above, we raised the expectations for high-performing students, worked more closely with individual students, and increased the amount of time given to final projects. This method seems to have worked, as several students did achieve true fluency on both outcomes we assessed for this class.</p>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	Seminar have had a positive impact on student performance, but we would like to continue our discussion about whether this course is fulfilling our capstone learning objectives and about whether we should consider adjusting the curriculum or delivery for the course in order to improve performance while still maintaining the high standards we have set for the course. If we decide to make changes to the course, we will implement those changes in Fall 2016.	
Students will demonstrate information and technological literacy in research and competence in MLA documentation.	We will continue to review senior seminar papers each year as a department, even if they are not being assessed for this specific outcome. We will continue to keep all faculty involved in the assessment process, and we will continue to rotate various faculty members through the instructional role in EN 424 Senior Seminar in order to maintain the department's sense of ownership and involvement in the success of this course, particularly regarding information literacy. In the past we had noticed as a department that EN 424 Senior Seminar scored lower than other courses on several of our outcomes (including this one), and our focus this year in assessing only EN 424 essays has allowed us to look closely at where this course is succeeding and where it is falling short. It has also given us a chance to see how our curriculum changes in the course have impacted student performance. Happily, the higher scores this year indicate that the changes we made in the course delivery and content are indeed helping improve student success in information and technological literacy, even when they are performing the significant levels of research demanded in a senior	We have continued to review senior seminar papers every year as a department, using our rating and discussion of this student work as a springboard for conversations about our curriculum. We have continued to keep all faculty involved in the assessment process and to rotate faculty members through the instructional role in EN 424. We also had a conversation as a department about the lack of achievement at the highest level in the course and discussed how we might challenge our most advanced students to perform at the highest levels. Such methods discussed included raising the expectations for high-performing students so that they are challenged to produce work at a higher standard; working more closely with individual students in one-on-one conferences to ensure each student is achieving their best work; increasing the amount of time given to the final projects in senior seminar so that students have more time to think through their projects and perform more substantial research and revision in their work. Our students have continued to achieve strong scores in this course, and while we did not assess this same

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p>thesis. Overall, this year's assessment data have given us a sense that the course and the program are preparing students sufficiently in the areas of information and technological literacy and documentation. However, we would like to raise performance on these senior seminar essays, particularly in terms of the number of students performing at the level of fluency in this category. We are planning to discuss this trend as a department and work on boosting student achievement while still maintaining the high standards we have set for the course. Because of the general success of the course, we may return in subsequent years to assessing a variety of different courses in our curriculum.</p>	<p>outcome in 2015-17, we did see more students in this assessment cycle achieve the highest possible score (4.5 and above). Furthermore, because of the success of EN 424, we have broadened our assessment this year to include EN 301 The Writing Process and EN 290 Literary Theory and Practice. Both are mid-level courses that nearly all majors take, and the courses cover very different material and skill sets. Assessing student work in these varied courses allows us to look at other aspects of our curriculum for strengths and weaknesses.</p>

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:

The department was very pleased with our last assessment process and report (2014-15), as we have been for several years. (See Appendix B for full report.) We met expectations in all critical areas and few recommendations were made. The comments were positive, suggesting that we "Keep up the great work!" and stating that "The English Department provides a clear, thorough overview of how they assess, how they are all involved in the assessment process, and how they continually use their assessment process to make program changes and drive decisions that will ensure they continue to serve their students well. In response to the committee's recommendations, we have maintained our assessment process, broadening the number of outcomes assessed and the types of coursework reviewed in light of the two-year assessment period.

The committee did raise one concern with our report: "For all outcomes, we appreciate the need for data from multiple years before raising standards, but meanwhile it'd be useful to know how you have/plan to 'encourage students to excel.'" The department did have a conversation about how to "encourage students to excel" at the highest levels so that we see more student work falling into the highest ratings for the outcomes we assess. We discussed how we might challenge our most advanced students to perform at the highest levels. (See details in chart above.)

Outcomes Assessment 2016-2017

Learning Outcome 1: Students will respond to a literary text in a way that reflects an awareness of aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach.

Assessment Activity

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>Direct Measure: 13 papers from EN 424 Senior Seminar fall 2015 and 5 papers from EN 424 fall 2016, rated by multiple faculty with a shared rubric (See Appendix H)</p>	<p>A rating of "meets criteria" (2.5 or above) on the relevant section of the Outcomes Assessment Criteria form. The outcome is divided into 2 subtopics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper establishes a historical, aesthetic, and/or ideological, context for its argument. • The paper addresses issues of form (narrator, technique, imagery, etc.), when appropriate, in establishing its argument. <p>The form uses five levels of measurement, from 1-5, with a rating of 2.5 equivalent to "meets criteria." (See Appendix H)</p>	<p>EN 424 is required of all majors in the literature and writing tracks, and most students in the media and performance studies track also take the course. All students in the course are English majors, and the vast majority of students take the course in fall of their senior year. The course is taught by tenure-track faculty and runs in the fall semester. The 18 papers assessed were collected by the instructor of record for each course; identifying information was removed and they were placed in a Google docs folder shared with tenure-track faculty. Scores were entered into a database created by Institutional Effectiveness.</p>	<p>1. Multiple readers assessed papers from EN 424, with a minimum of two readers per paper. Readers used the same assessment rubric for all papers to ensure uniform criteria.</p> <p>2. This outcome rated 4.0 out of a possible 5 in fall 2015 and 3.56 out of a possible 5 in fall 2016. The combined average was 3.88, indicating that overall the sample met the Outcomes Assessment Criteria. Additionally, 100% of papers rated 2.5 and above on this outcome, which means that no paper in either of the two groups fell below our goal of 2.5. 33.3% of papers (about 4) in the first group and 20% (1) in the second group scored in the highest category, 4.5-5 on our 5-point scale. Traditionally, our students score higher on this outcome than on any of the others, which reaffirms the centrality of this outcome in our departmental curriculum. Coursework in all tracks throughout the program emphasizes analysis of literary texts, which involves a series of complex skills including critical thinking and effective written communication. Even at the level of a senior capstone course, where they are required to complete more difficult work than in other courses, they are able to rise to rigorous demands on this outcome and achieve strong results.</p>

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>Indirect Measures: Acceptance to graduate programs, hiring in careers related to program coursework, and confidence in preparedness as shown on alumni and graduating student surveys (See Appendices C, D, E and F); presentations and publications related to aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach</p>	<p>Above 50% satisfaction rate in related areas on alumni and graduating student surveys; acceptance to accredited graduate or professional programs; employment in fields related to coursework; presentations and publications related to aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach</p>	<p>Alumni and graduating student surveys coordinated by PIE.</p>	<p>The Graduating Student Surveys from this assessment period indicate that students feel prepared by their coursework as English majors; they evaluated their preparation at 87.5%+ good or excellent in all areas in 2015-16 and 80%+ in nearly all areas in 2016-17. Furthermore, the areas particularly related to this outcome scored very well. Graduating seniors feel prepared to “Pursue more education in your field” (80% good or excellent in 2016-17 and 100% in 2015-16); to “Use quantitative/qualitative techniques within your professional field” (100% good or excellent in 2016-17 and 93.8% in 2015-16); and “Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills” (100% and 87.5% respectively). 80% of students reporting on the 2015-16 survey and 100% on the 2016-17 survey plan (maybe or yes) to pursue advanced degrees after graduation.</p> <p>Students on alumni surveys from 2015 and 2016 also rate the academic quality and their major program highly (100% good or excellent in terms of overall academic quality and 75% in terms of program in 2015; 71.4% academic quality and 85.7% program in 2016). Furthermore, alumni agree that their degree prepared them to “Use quantitative/ qualitative techniques within your professional field” (50% good or excellent in 2015 and 71.4% in 2016), as well as to solve problems in your field (100% in 2015, 85.7% in 2016), both skills that correlate closely with this learning outcome. 50% of students who responded to the 2015 survey and 43% on the 2016 survey have pursued advanced degrees. These numbers indicate that students are prepared for advanced academic work after completing our program.</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
			<p>Alumni surveys report 100% employment for our graduates; nearly all are employed full-time, and most (71.4% from 2016 and 50% from 2016) are employed in a job directly related to their specialization, with the remainder (28.6% in 2016 and 50% in 2015) in a job “somewhat related” to their specialization. They also report that they found work quickly. 71.5% (2016) and 75% (2015) were employed within 3 months of graduation. They report that their education as an English major supported them with skills to pursue their post-graduation plans (83% in 2016 and 100% in 2015). As the coursework in our program centers around this outcome and outcome #5, confidence in program preparation and success in finding jobs directly related to their specialty indicate success in this outcome.</p> <p>Students also had a successful track record in publishing essays related to aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach. (See detailed list below.)</p>

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

Direct and indirect measures indicate this outcome is a strength of our program. While analysis of a literary text may seem like a narrow skill, it in fact represents a set of critical thinking and communication skills working together in a given context. This assessment cycle’s average score of 3.88 on a 5-point scale confirms that our students have a high success rate in achieving this outcome. That graduating students and alumni feel confident in their ability to read, decipher, and respond to a broad variety of source material in a given professional or cultural context also reflects positively on this outcome. One student on the 2015 alumni survey specifically credits “Critical Thinking Skills I developed in English courses” as one of the strongest aspects of her MU education, and on supplemental surveys, alumni rate their ability to “Recognize and think critically about complex information” highly (4.5 out of 5 in 2015 and 4.33 out of 5 in 2016). Students on the GSS similarly recognize literature coursework and analysis as successful aspects of the program. A student on the 2016-17 GSS cites critical thinking and literary analysis: “I feel that the strongest aspects of my MU education was gaining the ability to think critically and analyze both my work and others. Through my English major I took many classes



which focused on creative writing or the analysis of literature. The combination of such classes has built my knowledge and confidence in my ability to both write critically and think critically.”

Additionally, several students have published academic essays on literature related to aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach. Angelica Brewer’s “The Power of Voodoo” and Leticia Zelaya’s “Ethical Translation and Intertextuality in *Foe* and *Robinson Crusoe*” were published in *Magnificat* 2016 and Diana Lizotte’s “Mama’s Christian Love in *A Raisin in the Sun*” appeared in *Magnificat* 2017. Amanda Bourne presented “Imagining the Artist: Images of Virginia Woolf in Postmodern Narratives” at the regional Virginia Humanities Conference and at the International Annual Virginia Woolf Conference at Leeds Trinity University in 2016. These publications and presentations demonstrate that students are writing high-quality work related to this outcome—and that our strongest students are given ample opportunities to excel in this area.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The assessment of student work in this outcome has been very high for several assessment periods, indicating that the curriculum serves to develop this learning outcome adequately. Alumni and graduating seniors also consider literary analysis and critical thinking about texts as strengths of our program.

Alumni surveys do indicate an area for potential improvement. Many alumni (67%) on the 2016 survey say they would have liked further support in “relevant coursework” and “application of writing skills in a real-world environment,” and 50% on the 2015 survey also would like more help with “application of writing skills in a real-world environment.” Comments like “I learned a lot about how to write papers on books and interesting topics, but not so much the things I would use in a real world environment” and “Coursework don’t necessarily tie into the real world. Lacks practicality” (both 2016) suggest that while students are having real success in this outcome, they could use help seeing where this skill is applicable to other writing and career situations. One student from the 2015 survey wrote, “I would’ve liked real-world exposure to other English major related fields. I feel kinda stuck as a teacher.” The lower rating on how well their degree prepared them to “Pursue more education in your field” in 2015 (25%) also suggests that students are struggling to grasp how their academic skills apply to other scenarios.

However, the evidence here is somewhat conflicted, since alumni report high employment rates (100% in 2015 and 2016) in careers directly related (50% in 2015 and 71.4% in 2016) or somewhat related (50% in 2015 and 28.6%) to their area of specialization. The GSS report further demonstrates students’ confidence in how their courses prepared them to “Find a job in your field” (80% in 2016-17 and 93.8% in 2015-16), “Succeed in a job in your field” (100% and 100%). They also feel strongly that “Advisers explored my career options with me” (100% and 93.8%) and “Advisers discussed my future education options” (100% and 93.8%). The disconnect could indicate that students have more confidence in their abilities immediately upon graduation than they have further along in their careers, or that the program has changed substantially since some of the alumni respondents were enrolled (some graduated over a decade ago). It could also indicate that even though students are successful in finding work in their field, they still would like more help transferring their coursework to a workplace setting.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

We will continue to review senior seminar papers each year as a department, even if they are not being assessed for this specific outcome. We will continue to keep all faculty involved in the assessment process, and we will continue to rotate various faculty members through the instructional role in EN 424 Senior Seminar in order to maintain the department’s sense of ownership and involvement in this course.

As this outcome assesses well and has for the past several assessment cycles, we do not plan to implement curricular changes this year. However, we will have a discussion as a department about alumni’s sense that their coursework didn’t relate as directly to their professional experiences as they would have liked. The department plans to put together a list of “transferable skills” correlating our learning outcomes (and other skills our program imparts) with language students can use

to discuss their aptitudes in a job interview or on a resume. Such language will also hopefully help students see the applicability of skills like textual analysis in a wide range of professional settings.

In addition, a Graduate Studies representative has been invited to visit EN 424 in the fall to discuss the variety advanced degrees English majors can pursue, and this type of conversation might benefit students in terms of seeing the applicability of this outcome, which addresses key skills needed for graduate work in any discipline. We would also like to provide one or two “mini-workshops” in introductory-level courses like EN 200 and EN 290 on internships (and possibly on careers or graduate school) that would help students begin thinking about their skills beyond the classroom.

Bringing successful alums back at events like English Night to discuss their career experiences and explain how their English major helped them succeed in the workplace is also a strategy that can help address the divide students perceive between academic preparation and career performance. Furthermore, the internship reflection is a place to emphasize transferrable skills. While the reflection already asks students to connect their coursework to their internship experience, we might want to have advisors follow up with a discussion about this connection.

Learning Outcome 5: Students will analyze literary works - in all genres - with respect to structure, style, and theme

Assessment Activity

<p style="text-align: center;">Outcome Measures</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Performance Standard</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Data Collection</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Analysis</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>Direct Measure: 13 papers from EN 424 Senior Seminar fall 2015 and 5 papers from EN 424 fall 2016, rated by multiple faculty with a shared rubric (See Appendix H)</p>	<p>A rating of "meets criteria" (2.5 or above) on the relevant section of the Outcomes Assessment Criteria form. The outcome is divided into 2 subtopics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper demonstrates awareness of the genre of literature it studies. • The paper recognizes conventions of form (narrator, technique, imagery, etc.), when appropriate, in establishing its argument. 	<p>EN 424 is required of all majors in the literature and writing tracks, and most students in the media and performance studies track also take the course. All students in the course are English majors, and the vast majority of students take the course in fall of their senior year. The course is taught by tenure-track faculty and runs in the fall semester. The 18 papers assessed were collected by the instructor of record for each course;</p>	<p>1. Multiple readers assessed papers from EN 424, with a minimum of two readers per paper. Readers used the same assessment rubric for all papers to ensure uniform criteria.</p> <p>2. This outcome rated 3.89 out of a possible 5 in fall 2015 and 3.40 out of a possible 5 in fall 2016. The combined average was 3.75, indicating that overall the sample met the Outcomes Assessment Criteria. Only one of the 18 papers fell below our goal of 2.5 on this outcome, and it fell into the 1.5-2.5 category. Additionally, 25.9% of papers (about 3) in the first group scored in the highest category, 4.5-5 on our 5-point scale. Traditionally, our students perform well on this outcome, which reaffirms the centrality of this outcome in our departmental curriculum, as awareness of literary genre and conventions are a key aspect of many of our courses. Even at the level of a senior</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
		identifying information was removed and they were placed in a Google docs folder shared with tenure-track faculty. Scores were entered into a database created by Institutional Effectiveness.	capstone course, where they are required to complete more difficult work than in their other courses, students are able to rise to rigorous demands on this outcome and achieve strong results.
Indirect Measures: Acceptance to graduate programs, hiring in careers related to program coursework, and confidence in preparedness as shown on alumni and graduating student surveys (See Appendices C, D, E and F); presentations and publications related to genre, structure, style, and theme	Above 50% satisfaction rate in related areas on alumni and graduating student surveys; acceptance to accredited graduate or professional programs; employment in fields related to coursework	Alumni and graduating student surveys coordinated by PIE.	<p>The Graduating Student Surveys from this assessment period indicate that students feel prepared by their coursework as English majors; they evaluated their preparation at 87.5%+ good or excellent in all areas in 2015-16 and 80%+ in nearly all fields in 2016-17. Furthermore, the areas particularly related to this outcome scored very well. Graduating seniors feel prepared to “Pursue more education in your field” (80% good or excellent in 2016-17 and 100% in 2015-16); to “Use quantitative/qualitative techniques within your professional field” (100% good or excellent in 2016-17 and 93.8% in 2015-16); and “Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills” (100% and 87.5% respectively). 80% of students reporting on the 2015-16 survey and 100% on the 2016-17 survey plan (maybe or yes) to pursue advanced degrees after graduation.</p> <p>Students on alumni surveys from 2015 and 2016 also rate the academic quality and their major program highly (100% good or excellent in terms of overall academic quality and 75% in terms of program in 2015; 71.4% academic quality and 85.7% program in 2016). Furthermore, alumni agree that their degree prepared them to “Use quantitative/ qualitative techniques within your professional field” (50% good or excellent in 2015 and 71.4% in 2016), as well as to “solve problems in your field”</p>

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</p>
			<p>(100% in 2015, 85.7% in 2016), both skills that correlate with this learning outcome. 50% of students who responded to the 2015 survey and 43% on the 2016 survey have pursued advanced degrees. These numbers indicate that students are prepared for advanced academic work after completing our program.</p> <p>Alumni surveys report 100% employment for our graduates; nearly all are employed full-time, and most (71.4% from 2016 and 50% from 2016) are employed in a job directly related to their specialization, with the remainder (28.6% in 2016 and 50% in 2015) in a job “somewhat related” to their specialization. They also report that they found work quickly. 71.5% (2016) and 75% (2015) were employed within 3 months of graduation. They report that their education as an English major supported them with skills to pursue their post-graduation plans (83% in 2016 and 100% in 2015). As the coursework in our program centers around this outcome and outcome #1, confidence in program preparation and success in finding jobs directly related to specialty indicate success in this outcome.</p> <p>Students also had success in publishing essays related to genre, structure, style, and theme. (See detailed list below.)</p>

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

The vast majority of our students feel confident in their analytical skills and produce work that is deemed proficient by faculty and prospective employers or graduate programs. This assessment cycle’s average score of 3.75 on a 5-point scale confirms that our students have a high success rate in achieving this outcome. Students on



the 2015-16 GSS state that the strongest aspects of their MU education were “understanding different aspects of literature” and being able to “analyze written works which are central to my studies... analyzing and framing different levels of narrative [m]eanings.”

Additionally, several students have published academic essays on literature related to genre, structure, style, and theme. Ashley Tucker’s “Considering the Autobiographical ‘I’: Between Self-Narration and Fiction” (*Magnificat* 2016); Johnny Vaccaro’s “Can We Trust the Shepherd—An analysis of Christopher Marlowe’s Poem ‘The Passionate Shepherd to His Love’” (*Magnificat* 2017); Samantha Stallings’ “Utanapishtim’s Impact on the Certainty of Time’s Passing” (*Magnificat* 2017); all relate closely to this outcome. Furthermore, Amanda Bourne presented “Imagining the Artist: Images of Virginia Woolf in Postmodern Narratives” at the regional Virginia Humanities Conference and at the International Annual Virginia Woolf Conference at Leeds Trinity University in 2016. Such work demonstrates that students are writing high-quality work related to this outcome

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

Our program produces competent, marketable graduates with strong analytical skills, and we will continue to build on strategies for success that have had impact, such as scaffolding work in literary analysis throughout the curriculum—beginning in our introductory (composition and 200-level) courses, continuing through junior and senior level coursework, and culminating in EN 424 Senior Seminar. In addition, we will continue to review senior seminar papers each year as a department in order to discuss how we are preparing our graduates.

As mentioned in the discussion of Outcome #1, alumni surveys do indicate an area for potential improvement. Many alumni would like more help in making the connection between their academic coursework and their career preparation, though all are currently employed in jobs directly or somewhat related to their specialization. The department will discuss how we can better help students make the connection between their coursework and their potential careers.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

We will continue to review senior seminar papers each year as a department, even if they are not being assessed for this specific outcome. We will continue to keep all faculty involved in the assessment process, and we will continue to rotate various faculty members through the instructional role in EN 424 Senior Seminar in order to maintain the department’s sense of ownership and involvement in the success of this course.

As this outcome assesses well and has for the past several assessment cycles, we do not plan to implement curricular changes this year. However, we will have a discussion as a department about alumni’s sense that their coursework didn’t relate as directly to their professional experiences as they would have liked. The department plans to put together a list of “transferrable skills” correlating our learning outcomes with language students can use to discuss their aptitudes in a job interview or on a resume. Such language will also hopefully help them see the applicability of skills like textual analysis in a wide range of professional settings.

A Graduate Studies representative has been invited to visit EN 424 in the fall to discuss the advanced degrees English majors can pursue, and this type of conversation might benefit students in terms of seeing the applicability of this outcome, which addresses key skills needed for graduate work in any discipline. We would also like to provide one or two “mini-workshops” in introductory-level courses like EN 200 and EN 290 on internships (and possibly also on careers or graduate school) that would help students begin to think about their skills beyond the classroom.

Bringing successful alums back at events like English Night to discuss their career experiences is also a strategy that can help address the divide students perceive between academic preparation and career performance. Furthermore, the internship reflection is a place to emphasize transferrable skills. While the reflection already asks students to connect their coursework to their internship experience, we might want to have advisors follow up with more discussion about this connection.

Learning Outcome 4: Students will demonstrate a thoughtful understanding of their own writing process.

Assessment Activity

<p style="text-align: center;">Outcome Measures</p> <p><i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Performance Standard</p> <p><i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Data Collection</p> <p><i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Analysis</p> <p><i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>Direct Measure: 9 papers from English majors and minors in EN 301 The Writing Process, 7 from fall 2016 and 2 from spring 2017, rated by multiple faculty with a shared rubric (See Appendix H)</p>	<p>A rating of "meets criteria" (2.5 or above) on the relevant section of the Outcomes Assessment Criteria form. The outcome is divided into 4 subtopics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • writer reflects on the states of writing such as drafting, critical thinking, revision, research and editing • writer articulates the strengths and weaknesses of her writing and of herself as a writer • writer understands that writing conventions are dependent on genre, audience, and purpose • writer makes connections between her work and the work of published writers 	<p>EN 301 is writing intensive, capped at 20 students, and required of students in the writing track and writing minor. It is also one of two options for all majors, and most majors select this option. The course is normally taught by tenure-track faculty. The 9 papers assessed were all from English majors and writing minors and were collected by the instructor of record for each course; identifying information was removed and they were placed in a Google docs folder shared with tenure-track faculty. Scores were entered into a database created by Institutional Effectiveness.</p>	<p>1. Multiple readers assessed papers from EN 301, with a minimum of two readers per paper. Readers used the same assessment rubric for all papers to ensure uniform criteria.</p> <p>2. This outcome rated 3.86 out of a possible 5, indicating that overall the sample met the Outcomes Assessment Criteria. Additionally, none of the papers fell below our goal of 2.5 on this outcome. Only one paper (11.1%) scored in the highest category, 4.5-5 on our 5-point scale, but in a 300-level course populated mostly by sophomores and juniors, we don't expect to see true fluency.</p> <p>The overall score of 3.86 marks a significant increase in the 2.93 mean achieved the last time this outcome was measured (2012-2013). The higher scores are almost certainly a result of our selection process. This year, we only assessed one course, a course specifically focused on this outcome, and we only assessed the English majors and writing minors in the course. In 2012-13, the outcome was assessed from a random sample, which included both majors and non-majors, and it also included work from EN 308 where students do not focus as specifically on this outcome.</p>
<p>Indirect Measures: Acceptance to graduate programs and confidence in preparedness as shown on alumni and graduating</p>	<p>Above 50% satisfaction rate in related areas on alumni and graduating student surveys; acceptance to accredited graduate or professional</p>	<p>Alumni and graduating student surveys coordinated by PIE; Internship evaluations administered by Career Services</p>	<p>Students and supervisors alike name writing skills as a strength among our interns. Students often cite writing, and sometimes EN 301 in particular, as essential to their success in the internship. 11 of 12 supervisors during this</p>

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>student surveys (See Appendices C, D, E and F); Internship evaluations (See Appendix G)</p>	<p>programs; Ratings of "good" or "excellent" on the communication skills criteria from student internship evaluations</p>		<p>assessment period rated interns' "written communication" skills as good or excellent.</p> <p>On GSS surveys in 15-16 and 16-17, 100% of graduating seniors feel their education did a good or excellent job of preparing them to "Develop a coherent written argument" and two on each survey specifically mention writing as one of the strongest aspects of their MU education. One student also mentions campus publications and says "I wouldn't have been as successful as a writer without Marymount." 80% of students reporting on the 2015-16 survey and 100% on the 2016-17 survey plan (maybe or yes) to pursue advanced degrees after graduation.</p> <p>Alumni claim their education prepared them to "Develop a coherent written argument." 100% rated this category good or excellent on the 2015 survey and 85.7% on the 2016 survey. Alumni also rated their English coursework highly in terms of how it prepared them to "Write coherent, well-organized materials" (a mean of 4.5 out of 5 in 2016 and 4.0 out of 5 in 2015) and "Develop a persuasive written argument/proposal" (4.33 out of 5 in 2016 and 4.5 out of 5 in 2015). Alumni are also pursuing advanced degrees; 43% on the 2016 survey and 50% on the 2015 survey report pursuing further education since completing their degree.</p>

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

This outcome rated 3.86 out of a possible 5, indicating that overall the sample met the Outcomes Assessment Criteria. Additionally, none of the papers fell below our goal of 2.5 on this outcome. Alumni and graduating seniors, as well as interning students and their supervisors, rate written communication as one of the strengths of the program. This strength is due in part to the reflective way in which writing is taught in EN 301 and in the program more broadly, which requires students to think



through their own writing process—to reflect on how they compose written texts, to assess their strengths and weaknesses as writers, to grasp writing conventions, and to connect their writing with the work of other writers.

Knowledge of the writing process is also essential to students entering senior level courses, which demand that students work on long-term, large-scale projects independently. We are pleased that English majors and minors in EN 301 consistently performed at or above the 2.5 benchmark indicating that they are ready for the more involved, varied, and independent writing projects required of them at the senior level, during their internships, and throughout their careers.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

All of the student work sampled meets or exceeds our expected goal of 2.5 or above on this outcome, and alumni and graduating seniors feel confident about their written communication skills.

Student performance on this outcome is encouraging in that students appear to leave EN 301 with a strong ability to understand and assess their own writing and writing process. This critical self-knowledge is key to the overall success of our students, interns, and alums in the area of written communication. Overall, this course seems to give students the self-knowledge and structure that they will need to succeed in long-term independent work that is expected in 400-level classes like EN 490: Major Author and EN 424: Senior Seminar.

However, alumni surveys do point to an area for discussion. On the 2016 supplemental survey, 67% of our alums claim they would have liked more support in “Application of Writing Skills in a Real-World Environment”; On the 2015 supplemental survey, 50% of respondents claim they would have liked more support in this area. While we are producing strong writers who feel confident in their writing abilities, they may be struggling to make the connection between their academic writing and its application in a professional setting.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

We feel that this course, and our program in general, is largely successful regarding this outcome. Instructors in EN 301 have worked hard to engage students in a reflective awareness of their own writing abilities and to help them address their weaknesses. Based on the success of this outcome in this year’s assessment, as well as a general sense among faculty, students, alumni, and prospective employers that our program produces strong, reflective writers, we plan to continue our current instructional methods in EN 301 and our focus on writing throughout the program.

In an effort to address alumni concerns about connecting their academic writing to a career situation, we plan to put together a list of “transferrable skills” directly correlating our learning outcomes with language students can use to discuss their aptitudes in a job interview or on a resume. Such language will also hopefully help students see the broad applicability of their academic writing skills in professional settings. Other efforts, like bringing successful alums back for English Night to discuss their career experiences, is also a strategy that can help address the divide students perceive between academic and career writing.

Learning Outcome 7: Students will deliver oral presentations that are focused, well-organized, effective, and establish a connection with the audience.

Assessment Activity

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>9 presentations in EN 290 rated by multiple 3 faculty with a shared rubric (See appendix H)</p>	<p>A rating of "meets criteria" (2.5 or above) on the relevant section of the Outcomes Assessment Criteria form. The outcome is divided into 4 subtopics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation identifies clear purpose/objectives. • Content is well organized and effectively presented. • Speaker demonstrates a clear understanding of the subject. • Speaker is poised, articulate, and audible, and establishes a connection with the audience 	<p>EN 290 is a course required of all majors in the literature and writing tracks and is also taken by most students in the media and performance studies track. It is also required of all English minors. The course is normally taught by tenure-track faculty. Three tenure-track professors attended in-class final presentations and rated 9 presentations. Raters were provided with standardized rating sheets that they submitted at the end of the session. Results were later entered into an online survey created by Institutional Effectiveness.</p>	<p>1. Multiple raters assessed final class presentations in EN 290, with a minimum of three raters per presentation. Raters used the same assessment rubric for all presentations to ensure uniform criteria. 2. This outcome rated 3.48 out of a possible 5, indicating that overall the sample met the Outcomes Assessment Criteria. Additionally, only one of the 9 presentations fell below our goal of 2.5 on this outcome, and it fell into the 1.5-2.5 category. None scored in the highest category, 4.5-5 on our 5-point scale, but since this is a 200-level course populated primarily by sophomores and juniors, we do not expect to see fluency. More than half (55.6%), however, did fall into the second highest 3.5-4.4 section. Overall this marked an increase in the 3.02 mean achieved the last time this outcome was measured (2013-2014). The higher scores possibly indicate increased attention to oral presentations across the curriculum in all of our courses, from freshman composition through senior seminar.</p>
<p>Indirect Measures: Confidence in presentation skills as shown on alumni and graduating student surveys (See Appendices C, D, E and F); Internship evaluations (See Appendix G); job placement of graduating students; student conference presentations</p>	<p>Above 50% satisfaction rate in related areas on alumni and graduating student surveys; Ratings of "good" or "excellent" on the presentation skills criteria from student internship evaluations</p>	<p>Alumni and graduating student surveys coordinated by PIE; Internship evaluations administered by Career Services</p>	<p>Students and supervisors alike feel positively about our students' preparation in terms of oral presentation skills. 10 of 12 internship supervisors rate students' oral communication skills as good or excellent. Most graduating seniors evaluate their preparation to "Deliver a coherent oral presentation" as good or excellent (87.5% on the 2015-16 survey and 80% on the 2016-17 survey).</p> <p>75% of alumni on the 2015 survey and 85.7% in 2016 said their education prepared them to "Deliver a coherent presentation." Additionally, alumni rate their major course of study highly in terms of how well it prepared them to "Deliver and effective oral presentation" (4.33 out of 5 on the 2016 survey and 4.0 out of 5 on the 2015 survey).</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.
			Amanda Bourne presented her research at a variety of venues, including the International Annual Virginia Woolf Conference at Leeds Trinity University.

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

This outcome rated 3.48 out of a possible 5, indicating that overall the sample met the Outcomes Assessment Criteria. Additionally, only one of the 9 presentations fell below our goal of 2.5 on this outcome, and it fell into the 1.5-2.5 category. These results indicate that students deliver competent oral presentations. The majority of alumni and graduating seniors also feel confident in oral presentation skills, and potential employers rate our students’ oral communication skills highly. On the 2016-17 survey, one student directly cites her “speaking skills” as one of the strongest aspects of her MU education.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

Overall our program produces graduates with strong oral communication skills who are able to deliver successful oral presentations. The rise in scores this assessment cycle to 3.48, up from the 3.02 mean achieved the last time this outcome was measured (2013-2014), indicates an increased attention to oral presentations across the curriculum in all of our courses, from freshman composition through senior seminar. We will continue to include oral presentations throughout the program at all levels of instruction.

We did have one student present her research at several venues, including an international academic conference. Overall, however, while our graduate students continued to excel in terms of conference presentations, we had fewer undergraduate students present during this assessment period. We believe this is due at least in part to the decreased visibility of funding for undergraduate research.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Overall, program performance is strong in this outcome. However, as a department, we will discuss specific strategies for supporting more students in presenting their work outside of the classroom in university, local, regional, and even national conferences. The major problem we see is related to funding. While many of our students are interested, they don’t always have the ability to travel to conferences due to financial constraints. We plan to make more students aware of the funds available for undergraduate research travel, and we also want to seek funding to take a group of students (through a single project or panel) to the Virginia Humanities Conference or similar regional conference. We also plan to encourage more students to present at the Student Research Conference on campus, which does not require any expense on students’ part, and we will provide direct outreach through professors and advisors in terms of submitting student work to appropriate conferences.



Curriculum Map

These will be sent for review and feedback to the Liberal Arts Core Committee.

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM MAP

Degree Program: English (B.A.)

Year: 2016-17

Program Outcomes:

Program Outcome	Critical Thinking	Inquiry	Information Literacy	Written Communication
1. Students will respond to a literary text in a way that reflects an awareness of aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach.	X	X		
2. Students will write coherent, well-organized essays that establish a clear focus, provide appropriate evidence, and are grammatically correct.	X			X
3. Students will conduct appropriate research and synthesize their own original ideas with those advanced by literary critics and other scholars. (Inquiry Outcome)		X	X	
4. Students will demonstrate a thoughtful understanding of their own writing process	X	X		X
5. Students will analyze literary works - in all genres - with respect to structure, style, and theme	X			
6. Students will demonstrate information and technological literacy in research and competence in MLA documentation.			X	
7. Students will deliver oral presentations that are focused, well-organized, effective, and establish a connection with the audience.	X			

Curriculum Map:

For each course, indicate which competencies are included using the following key. Please refer to the director of assessment in Planning and Institutional Effectiveness if you need more detailed explanation of the four core competencies.

Level of instruction: I – Introduced, R-reinforced and opportunity to practice, M-mastery at the senior or exit level

Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-other (explain briefly)

Required Course	Critical Thinking		Inquiry		Information Literacy		Written Communication	
	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess
EN 200 Elements of Literary Study	I	P, E, O	I	P, E, O	I	P, O	I	P, E
EN 201 or 202	I	P, E, O	I	P, E, O	I	P, O	I	P, E
EN 203 or 204	I	P, E, O	I	P, E, O	I	P, O	I	P, E
EN 290	R	P, E, O	R	P, E, O	R	P, O	R	P, E
EN 301 or 308	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P
EN 424 Senior Seminar	M	P, E, O	M	P, E, O	M	P, O	M	P, E
EN 490 Major Authors	M	P, E	M	P, E, O	M	P	M	P, E
EN 400 Internship	M	I	--	--	--	--	M	I