



Lander University: Unit/Program Review Report

UNIT/PROGRAM NAME	English
OFFICE OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY	English Department Curriculum and Assessment Committee (Lloyd Willis - Chair, Judy Bello, Lillian Crayton, Virginia Dumont-Poston)
ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR	Lloyd Willis
SUBMISSION DATE OF THIS REPORT	August 18, 2009

I. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL: Students will read works from the English literary tradition across cultures and periods.

Strategic Goal Supported	1. Learning						
Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome	Indicator/ Learning Outcome		AY 2004-05	AY 2005-06	AY 2006-07	AY 2007-08	AY 2008-09
	1.	Average Diagnostic Test Subscore	N/A	76.4	74.2	80.2	77.5
AND	2.	Average Writing Portfolio Subscore	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1
Summary of Data	3.	Average Exit Interview Performance Rating	3.0	3.5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment	Instrument		Frequency				
	1.	English Department Diagnostic Test (subscore beginning in AY 2008-09)	Administered yearly in ENGL-200 and ENGL-499				
	2.	Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill 1: Demonstrate an ability to analyze and interpret literature from a variety of periods and cultures.)	Submitted by graduating English majors in ENGL-499				

	3.	Exit Interview (This assessment instrument was discontinued after the 2006-2007 academic year. See "Review of Results and Actions Taken" section for a full explanation).	Administered to graduating English majors at the end of their final semesters through 2006	
Expected Outcome		Met (3)	Partially Met (2)	Not Met (1)
	1.	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 80.0%	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 70.0% and less than or equal to 79.9%	Average subscore is less than 70.0%
	2.	Average portfolio subscore is greater than or equal to 3.0	Average portfolio subscore is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive	Average portfolio subscore is less than 2.5
	3.	Average performance rating is 3.0 or higher	N/A	N/A
Review of Results and Actions Taken	1.	<p>Spring 2009: Because the English faculty has reported an aggregate score in the past and as of the most recent data collection cycle broke the Test down into subscores in order to more precisely measure the success of students, conclusions are difficult to draw and the results do not inform us well about student learning relative to this goal; therefore, the use of this instrument has been discontinued. The English Department will be using the Major Field Test (MFT) from the Educational Testing Service to assess this goal beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year through the use of the Literary Analysis (Skill Area 1) Subscore. Using the MFT will allow us to benchmark, at the end of academic year 2009-2010, our student's aggregate scores against normative data drawn from senior-level test takers at a large number of diverse institutions and then to set appropriate expected outcomes for our program effective for academic year 2010-2011.</p> <p>Spring 2008: This is the average score of senior English majors. Data from the 2006 Diagnostic Test for English Majors will serve as a baseline for longitudinal data that should allow for a thorough program evaluation by 2010.</p>		
	2.	<p>Spring 2009: Revised instructions to make sure students show their knowledge of literature from a variety of periods and cultures. Also revised the scoring rubric to reflect the new department goal. Together these changes should help us confirm that we have data to assess that students have read these works and are familiar with the literary tradition in English.</p> <p>Spring 2008: This is the average score for Spring 2008 portfolios. The English Department Curriculum Committee is currently considering revisions to the department curriculum that are designed to create a better sense of comprehensive literary history. In the 2007-2008 academic year, the English Department changed its program requirements to require English Majors to take ENGL-201, ENGL-202, ENGL-221 and ENGL-406. These course</p>		

		descriptions were also modified to ensure that the 200-level classes will be taught as survey courses. These new requirements will ensure that English majors have at least one survey class in British Literature, American Literature and World Literature as well as one course in Shakespeare.	
	3.	Spring 2006: As of this term, the English Department has discontinued the use of exit interviews as assessment tools because this assessment was a survey of student opinion that did not allow us to accurately measure student learning. During this exit interview, students responded to a questionnaire that asked them to rate the department's success on all four learning goals on a four-point scale.	
	Sum	Academic Year 2008-2009 has been a year of closely examining goals and measures - attempting to simplify/clarify the former and to define and align the latter. To that end, the English faculty has crafted a simplified and clarified goal as follows effective in the 2009-2010 academic year: "To demonstrate an ability to analyze and interpret literary works from a variety of periods and cultures." Since 2006, this department has worked to modify its program to make it more effective and to improve its assessment practices. This has been a major period of change involving an influx of new faculty members and a number of retirements. The most significant changes are the new requirements that English majors must take the 200-level classes (as explained above). This change was implemented to strengthen the core literary knowledge that our students attain, and we anticipate that these changes will result in significant improvements in student learning. During this period of change, the department has also made a number of major changes to its assessment plan. The department has abandoned its exit interview because it did not provide accurate data about student learning, it has revised its portfolio requirements to better align data derived from the portfolio with learning goals, and it has decided to replace the departmental diagnostic test with the MFT because the MFT will provide more accurate data and normative data. We recognize that these are serious, comprehensive changes to the department's curriculum and assessment program, but we are confident that the curriculum and assessment program are now seamless and effective.	
Outcomes		Indicator of Success Evaluation	Indicator of Success Score
	1.	Partially Met	2
	2.	Met	3
	3.	Not Evaluated	Not Scored
Additional		\$0.00	

Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results	Explanation
---	-------------

II. **UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL:** Students will demonstrate their ability to relate writers and their writing to cultural, social, economic, political, and scientific events.

Strategic Goal Supported	1. Learning						
Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome	Indicator/ Learning Outcome		AY 2004-05	AY 2005-06	AY 2006-07	AY 2007-08	AY 2008-09
AND	1.	Average Diagnostic Test Subscore	N/A	76.4	74.2	80.2	76.7
Summary of Data	2.	Average Writing Portfolio Subscore	3.3	2.9	3.1	2.9	3.1
AND	3.	Average Exit Interview Performance Rating	3.7	3.2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment	Instrument		Frequency				
AND	1.	English Department Diagnostic Test (subscores as of AY 2008-09)	Administered yearly in ENGL-200 and ENGL-499				
AND	2.	Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill 2: "Demonstrate an ability to understand literature in the context of history, politics, and culture.")	Submitted by graduating English majors in in ENGL-499				
AND	3.	Exit Interview (This assessment instrument was discontinued after the 2006-2007 academic year. See "Review of Results and Actions Taken" section for a full explanation).	Administered to graduating English majors at the end of their final semesters through 2006				
Expected Outcome	Met (3)		Partially Met (2)		Not Met (1)		

	1.	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 80.0%	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 70.0% and less than or equal to 79.9%	Average subscore is less than 70.0%
	2.	Average portfolio subscore is greater than or equal to 3.0	Average portfolio subscore is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive	Average portfolio subscore is less than 2.5
	3.	Average performance rating is 3.0 or higher	N/A	N/A
Review of Results and Actions Taken	1.	<p>Spring 2009: Because the English faculty has reported an aggregate score in the past and as of the most recent data collection cycle broke the Test down into subscores in order to more precisely measure the success of students, conclusions are difficult to draw and the results do not inform us well about student learning relative to this goal; therefore, the use of this instrument has been discontinued. The English Department will be using the Major Field Test (MFT) from the Educational Testing Service to assess this goal beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year through the use of the Literary History and Identification (Skill Area 2 and Skill Area 3) subscore as well as the Literary History (Indicator 6) and Identification (Indicator 7) Assessment Indicators. Using the MFT will allow us to benchmark, at the end of academic year 2009-2010, our student's aggregate scores against normative data drawn from senior-level test takers at a large number of diverse institutions and then to set appropriate expected outcomes for our program effective for academic year 2010-2011.</p> <p>Spring 2008: This is the average score of senior English majors. Data from the 2006 Diagnostic Test for English Majors will serve as a baseline for longitudinal data that should allow for a thorough program evaluation by 2010.</p>		
	2.	<p>Spring 2009: Students still cannot contextualize as well as we believe they should.</p> <p>Spring 2008: This is the average score for Spring 2008 portfolios. The English Department Curriculum Committee is currently considering revisions to the department curriculum that are designed to create a better sense of comprehensive literary history, and the Assessment Committee supports these revisions.</p>		
	3.	<p>Spring 2006: As of this term, the English Department has discontinued the use of exit interviews as assessment tools.</p> <p>During this exit interview, students responded to a questionnaire that asked them to rate the department's success on all four learning goals on a four-point scale.</p>		
	Sum	<p>The English faculty have redefined this goal as follows, effective academic year 2009-2010, to provide greater clarity and to make the goal more measurable: "To demonstrate an ability to understand literature in the context of history, politics, genre, and/or culture."</p>		
	Outcomes	Indicator of Success Evaluation		Indicator of Success Score

	1.	Partially Met	2
	2.	Met	3
	3.	Not Evaluated	Not Scored
Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results	\$0.00 Explanation		

III. **UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL:** Students will demonstrate the ability to apply a variety of critical methods to a wide range of genres, styles, and levels of discourse.

Strategic Goal Supported	1. Learning						
Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome	Indicator/ Learning Outcome		AY 2004-05	AY 2005-06	AY 2006-07	AY 2007-08	AY 2008-09
	1.	Average Diagnostic Test Subscore	N/A	76.4	74.2	80.2	82.9
	2.	Average Writing Portfolio Subscore	3.5	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.8
AND	3.	Average Exit Interview Performance Rating	3.9	3.8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summary of Data							
Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment	Instrument		Frequency				
	1.	English Department Diagnostic Test (subscores as of AY 2008-09)	Administered yearly in ENGL-200 and ENGL-499				
	2.	Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill 3: Demonstrate an awareness of critical theory.)	Submitted by graduating English majors in ENGL-499				
	3.	Exit Interview (This assessment instrument was discontinued after the 2006-2007 academic year. See "Review of	Administered to graduating English majors at the end of their final semesters through 2006				

		Results and Actions Taken" section for a full explanation).		
Expected Outcome		Met (3)	Partially Met (2)	Not Met (1)
	1.	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 80.0%	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 70.0% and less than or equal to 79.9%	Average subscore is less than 70.0%
	2.	Average portfolio subscore is greater than or equal to 3.0	Average portfolio subscore is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive	Average portfolio subscore is less than 2.5
	3.	Average performance rating is 3.0 or higher	N/A	N/A
Review of Results and Actions Taken	1.	Spring 2009: Because the English faculty has reported an aggregate score in the past and as of the most recent data collection cycle broke the Test down into subscores in order to more precisely measure the success of students, conclusions are difficult to draw and the results do not inform us well about student learning relative to this goal; therefore, the use of this instrument has been discontinued. The English Department will be using the Major Field Test (MFT) from the Educational Testing Service to assess this goal beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year through the use of the Literary Theory (Indicator 8) Assessment Indicator. Using the MFT will allow us to benchmark, at the end of academic year 2009-2010, our student's aggregate scores against normative data drawn from senior-level test takers at a large number of diverse institutions and then to set appropriate expected outcomes for our program effective for academic year 2010-2011.		
	2.	Spring 2008: This is the average score of senior English majors. Data from the 2006 Diagnostic Test for English Majors will serve as a baseline for longitudinal data that should allow for a thorough program evaluation by 2010. Spring 2009: Portfolio requirements were changed so students are required to submit a specific paper in which they must demonstrate awareness of critical theory. The Rubric was revised accordingly. Spring 2008: This is the average score for Spring 2008 portfolios.		
	3.	Spring 2006: As of this term, the English Department has discontinued the use of exit interviews as assessment tools. During this exit interview, students responded to a questionnaire that asked them to rate the department's success on all four learning goals on a four-point scale.		
	Sum	The English faculty discussed and approved a change to the goal because "critical theory" is a better reflection of what we feel our students need and because the language of the original goal was too vague. The new goal for 2009-2010 and forward is: "Students will demonstrate a familiarity with critical theory."		

Outcomes	Indicator of Success Evaluation		Indicator of Success Score	
	1.	Met	3	
	2.	Partially Met	2	
	3.	Not Evaluated	Not Scored	
Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results		\$0.00 Explanation		

IV. **UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL:** Students will write and speak fluently, correctly, and gracefully in a variety of situations, contexts, and forms and to use language with refinement to express meaning precisely

Strategic Goal Supported	1. Learning						
Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome	Indicator/ Learning Outcome		AY 2004-05	AY 2005-06	AY 2006-07	AY 2007-08	AY 2008-09
	1.	Average Diagnostic Test Subscore	N/A	76.4	74.2	80.2	84.2
	2.	Average Writing Portfolio Subscore	3.4	2.8	3.3	3.4	3.3
AND	3.	Average Exit Interview Performance Rating	3.2	3.5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summary of Data							
Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment	Instrument		Frequency				
	1.	English Department Diagnostic Test (subscore beginning AY 2008-09)	Administered yearly in ENGL 200 and ENGL 499				
	2.	Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill #4: "Demonstrate an ability to generate written texts that follow the grammatical conventions of written American English.")	Submitted by graduating English majors in ENGL-499				

	3.	Exit Interview (This assessment instrument was discontinued after the 2006-2007 academic year. See "Review of Results and Actions Taken" section for a full explanation).	Administered to graduating English majors at the end of their final semesters through 2006	
Expected Outcome		Met (3)	Partially Met (2)	Not Met (1)
	1.	Average score is greater than or equal to 80.0%	Average score is greater than or equal to 70.0% and less than or equal to 79.9%	Average score is less than 70.0%
	2.	Average portfolio score is greater than or equal to 3.0	Average portfolio score is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive	Average portfolio score is less than 2.5
	3.	Average performance rating is 3.0 or higher	N/A	N/A
Review of Results and Actions Taken	1.	Spring 2009: As of this year, the Test was broken down into subscores in order to more precisely measure the success of the students; however, the results do not inform us well about student learning relative to this goal; therefore, the use of this instrument has been discontinued. The English Department will be using the Major Field Test (MFT) from the Educational Testing Service to assess some of its goals beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year; however since the MFT does not provide Subscores or Assessment Indicators that we can use to measure this goal, the relevant questions from the English Department Diagnostic Test will be extracted and used in the local questions section of the MFT to derive meaningful scores/subscores for the assessment of this particular goal.		
		Spring 2008: This is the average score of senior English majors. Data from the 2006 Diagnostic Test for English Majors will serve as a baseline for longitudinal data that should allow for a thorough program evaluation by 2010.		
	2.	Spring 2009: These results appear to reaffirm the continuing efficacy of this evaluation of multiple forms of writing; however a closer examination of the results leads us to believe that they also do not inform us well about student learning relative to this goal. Spring 2008: This is the average score for Spring 2008 portfolios. The results reaffirmed the efficacy of this assessment method as a way to evaluate multiple forms of student writing. The results of these portfolios led to faculty teaching upper-level courses planning to post continual reminders about grammar and mechanics rules - handouts, items on Blackboard and/or require Writing Center attendance.		
	3.	Spring 2006: As of this term, the English Department has discontinued the use of exit interviews as assessment tools because the results do not inform us well about student learning relative to this goal.		

		During this exit interview, students responded to a questionnaire that asked them to rate the department's success on all four learning goals on a four-point scale.	
	Sum	Spring 2009: Given that our results are not as informative as we would like and the fact that fluency and grace are difficult to measure, the English Department has reformulated this goal as follows beginning in academic year 2009-2010: "To demonstrate an ability to generate written texts that reflect conventions of grammar and organization."	
Outcomes		Indicator of Success Evaluation	Indicator of Success Score
	1.	Met	3
	2.	Met	3
	3.	Not Evaluated	Not Scored
Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results	\$0.00 Explanation		

- V. **UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL:** Students will be able to use research to find information in a variety of formats and locations, integrate sources as support for original ideas, and document the researched information in Modern Language Association (MLA) style

Strategic Goal Supported	1. Learning						
Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome		Indicator/ Learning Outcome	AY 2004-05	AY 2005-06	AY 2006-07	AY 2007-08	AY 2008-09
	1.	Average Diagnostic Test Subscore	N/A	76.4	74.2	80.2	90.0
	2.	Average Writing Portfolio Subscore	3.6	3.6	2.8	2.6	2.8
AND Summary of Data	3.	Average Exit Interview Performance Rating	3.4	3.8	N/A	N/A	N/A

Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment	Instrument		Frequency	
	1.	English Department Diagnostic Test (subscores as of AY 2008-09)	Administered yearly in ENGL-200 and ENGL-499	
	2.	Writing Portfolio Rubric subscore (Skill 5: "Demonstrate an ability to generate written texts that follow the documentation conventions of the Modern Language Association)	Submitted by graduating English majors in ENGL-499	
	3.	Exit Interview (This assessment instrument was discontinued after the 2006-2007 academic year. See "Review of Results and Actions Taken" section for a full explanation).	Administered to graduating English majors at the end of their final semesters through 2006	
Expected Outcome	Met (3)		Partially Met (2)	Not Met (1)
	1.	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 80.0%	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 70.0% and less than or equal to 79.9%	Average subscore is less than 70.0%
	2.	Average portfolio subscore is greater than or equal to 3.0	Average portfolio subscore is between 2.5 and 2.9, inclusive	Average portfolio subscore is less than 2.5
	3.	Average performance rating is 3.0 or higher	N/A	N/A
Review of Results and Actions Taken	1.	Spring 2009: As of this year, the Test was broken down into subscores in order to more precisely measure the success of the students; however, the results do not inform us well about student learning relative to this goal; therefore, the use of this instrument has been discontinued. The English Department will be using the Major Field Test (MFT) from the Educational Testing Service to assess some of its goals beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year; however since the MFT does not provide Subscores or Assessment Indicators that we can use to measure this goal, the relevant questions from the English Department Diagnostic Test will be extracted and used in the local questions section of the MFT to derive meaningful scores/subscores for the assessment of this particular goal. Spring 2008: This is the average score of senior English majors. Data from the 2006 Diagnostic Test for English Majors will serve as a baseline for longitudinal data that should allow for a thorough program evaluation by 2010.		
	2.	Spring 2009: last three years of data suggest more worked needed in this area. In addition, students themselves report same thing verbally.		

		Spring 2008: This is the average score for Spring 2008 portfolios. The Assessment COmmittee recommends that research methods and MLA documentation guidelines receive greater emphasis in all English courses beyond ENGL-101. All English classes above the 101-level will be required to devote at least one class period to research and documentation issues beginning Fall 2008.	
	3.	Spring 2006: As of this term, the English Department has discontinued the use of exit interviews as assessment tools. During this exit interview, students responded to a questionnaire that asked them to rate the department's success on all four learning goals on a four-point scale.	
	Sum	New Goal: "To demonstrate an ability to use MLA documentation conventions." This goal has been revised because research skills are more appropriate as a general education goal and because our students have demonstrated and expressed verbally a specific weakness in their knowledge of MLA documentation conventions.	
Outcomes		Indicator of Success Evaluation	Indicator of Success Score
	1.	Met	3
	2.	Partially Met	2
	3.	Not Evaluated	Not Scored
Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results		\$0.00 Explanation	

VI. **UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL:** Students will understand how literature provides insights into the moral, psychological, ideological, political, and aesthetic choices faced by individual people.

Strategic Goal Supported	Choose One						
Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome		Indicator/ Learning Outcome	AY 2004-05	AY 2005-06	AY 2006-07	AY 2007-08	AY 2008-09
	1.	Average Diagnostic Test Subscore	N/A	76.4	74.2	80.2	81.4
	2.	Average Exit Interview Performance Rating	3.4	3.8	N/A	N/A	N/A

AND							
Summary of Data							
Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment	Instrument			Frequency			
	1.	English Department Diagnostic Test (subscores as of AY 2008-09)		Administered yearly in ENGL 200 and ENGL 499			
	2.	Exit Interview (This assessment instrument was discontinued after the 2006-2007 academic year. See "Review of Results and Actions Taken" section for a full explanation).		Administered to graduating English majors at the end of their final semesters through 2006			
Expected Outcome	Met (3)		Partially Met (2)		Not Met (1)		
	1.	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 80.0%	Average subscore is greater than or equal to 70.0% and less than or equal to 79.9%		Average subscore is less than 70.0%		
	2.	Average performance rating is 3.0 or higher	N/A		N/A		
Review of Results and Actions Taken	1.	Spring 2009: Because the English Department has reported an aggregated score in the past and is now reporting a subscore for this program goal, conclusions are difficult to draw. The current term of data will be used as a benchmark for future terms. Spring 2008: This is the average score of senior English majors. Data from the 2006 Diagnostic Test for English Majors will serve as a baseline for longitudinal data that should allow for a thorough program evaluation by 2010.					
	2.	Spring 2006: As of this term, the English Department has discontinued the use of exit interviews as assessment tools. During this exit interview, students responded to a questionnaire that asked them to rate the department's success on all four learning goals on a four-point scale.					
	Sum	2009: Given that the results are not as informative as we would like and the fact that this goal would require the measurement of perception rather than actual learning, the English faculty and elected to eliminate this program goal beginning in academic year 2009-2010.					

Outcomes	Indicator of Success Evaluation		Indicator of Success Score
	1.	Met	3
	2.	Not Evaluated	Not Scored
Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results	\$0.00 Explanation		

VII. UNIT/PROGRAM SUMMARY

Unit/Program Goal	Strategic Goal Supported	Unit/Program Goal Outcome		Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results
		Score	Evaluation Met: 3.00 – 2.01 Partially Met: 2.00 – 1.01 Not Met: 1.00 – 0.01 Not Evaluated: 0.00	
1. Students will read works from a variety of periods and cultures, including non-western as well as English, American (including non-majority), and European literature and to be familiar with the literary tradition in English	1. Learning	2.50	Met	\$0.00
2. Students will understand how cultural, social, economic, political, and scientific events and movements have affected writers and their writing	1. Learning	2.50	Met	\$0.00
3. Students will be able to apply a variety of critical methods to a wide range of genres, styles, and levels of discourse	1. Learning	2.50	Met	\$0.00
4. Students will write and speak fluently, correctly, and gracefully in a variety of situations, contexts, and forms and	1. Learning	3.00	Met	\$0.00

to use language with refinement to express meaning precisely				
5. Students will be able to use research to find information in a variety of formats and locations, integrate sources as support for original ideas, and document the researched information in Modern Language Association (MLA) style	1. Learning	2.50	Met	\$0.00
6. Students will understand how literature provides insights into the moral, psychological, ideological, political, and aesthetic choices faced by individual people.	1. Learning	3.00	Met	\$0.00
UNIT/PROGRAM TOTALS		2.60	Met	\$0.00

Unit/Program Summary: In the Fall 2006 semester, it became apparent to Lander University's English Department that its program was in need of revision. Its goals were not clear, its assessment instruments were not tightly aligned with its goals, and the assessment data that was being collected with the existing assessment instruments indicated that some program changes needed to be made. Between that Semester and the Fall 2009 semester, a number of significant changes have been made to strengthen the overall effectiveness of the department. The English Department has made a series of 200-level courses mandatory for all English majors because assessment data from 2006 and earlier indicated that students needed a stronger core knowledge base that those classes can provide. The English department has abandoned an exit interview that was being used in previous years because it was a survey of student opinions that did not accurately assess the department's goals, and the department has adopted a new set of goals that are easier to understand and assess along with a modified assessment plan that will effectively assess the department's success.

Beginning in the Fall 2009 semester, the English Department has replaced the seven former program goals with four new goals that it believes to be clearer and more measurable:

1. To demonstrate an ability to analyze and interpret literary works from a variety of periods and cultures.
2. To demonstrate an ability to understand literature in context of history, politics, genre, and/or culture.
3. To demonstrate familiarity with critical theory.
4. To demonstrate an ability to generate written texts that reflect conventions for grammar, organization, and documentation.

Beginning with this Fall 2009 semester, the department will assess these goals with a portfolio project that features new requirements that ensure each department goal will be measured, and with the ETS Major Field Test for English, which will feature a number of custom

questions generated by the department. The department will also identify specific subscores within the Major Field Test that are linked to each learning goal, thus giving us the most specific assessment of each goal possible.