1. **Student learning goals:**

The department has identified five learning goals for all majors (a sixth goal applies only to students in the Secondary Education program).

**Goal #1.** Graduates from our program will read and be able to discuss major and exemplary literary works (which experts call “the canon”) that represent significant applications of literature in the English language. They should also understand the historical, psychological, cultural, and aesthetic background of the canon.

**Goal #2.** Graduates from our program will read and be able to discuss important works by writers who represent diversity, especially in British and American literature (women and writers of color, for example).

**Goal #3.** Graduates from our program will achieve and demonstrate a significant level of literacy, including interpreting and analyzing texts.

**Goal #4.** Graduates from our program will acquire sound written communication skills through the practice of writing and revising, and through studying texts. Those students who take the creative writing track will develop strong creative writing skills and be able to produce good prose and poetry, and those who minor in linguistics will show appropriate knowledge of language use, history, and grammatical analysis.

**Goal #5.** Graduates from our program will develop research skills so that they can retrieve, analyze, and present data from electronic databases, libraries, and other sources, including field work, and use information ethically.

**Goal #6.** Focuses on pedagogy and pertains only to students completing the Secondary Education Minor. While the additional Goal #6 is included on every Portfolio Assessment Sheet (which we refer to later), we score it only for students in the Secondary Education program.

Given the depth and subcomponents (outcomes) of the goals (above), the department has established a five-year rotation in order to review each goal thoroughly. For 2011, we
focused on Goal #2 and Goal #3. For the 2012 assessment report, we focused on Goal #4, which represents an understanding of language components of the program. For the 2013 assessment report, we focused on Goal #5, which represents the research and technology components of our program. This year, 2014, we have started the assessment process over and focused on Goal #1, which represents the knowledge of the canon. For next year, 2015, we will evaluate the effectiveness of Goal #6 (“Pedagogy”). We pushed this back a year because our Director of Secondary Education was on OCDA. Additionally, we will include our assessment procedures for secondary English Education minors on the assessed yearly goal(s).

2. Learning outcomes for these goals:

Goal #1: Knowledge of the Canon

The student will achieve

Outcome #1 Knowledge of literary periods and movements
Outcome #2 Knowledge of authors’ backgrounds
Outcome #3 Knowledge of developments in genres
Outcome #4 Awareness of exemplary works

Goal #2: Contextualizing Texts

The student will achieve

Outcome #1 Awareness of cultural diversity
Outcome #2 Awareness of historical developments
Outcome #3 Awareness of social milieu
Outcome #4 Awareness of aesthetic values

Goal #3: Interpreting Texts

The student will achieve

Outcome #1 An understanding of the range of critical approaches
Outcome #2 An ability to read texts for meaning
Outcome #3 Knowledge of terms and conventions
Outcome #4 An ability to construct a critical argument

Goal #4: Developing Communication Skills

The student will achieve
Outcome #1 An ability to use the formats for writing about literature
Outcome #2 An effective writing style
Outcome #3 An ability to observe correct conventions

Goal #5: Developing Research Skills and Using Digital Technologies

The student will be able

Outcome #1 To evaluate paper and digital sources and make appropriate distinctions between scholarly and popular sources
Outcome #2 To use effectively library resources and subscription databases
Outcome #3 To handle paper and digital sources properly and to follow the format and style conventions of the Modern Language Association
Outcome #4 To use research ethically and responsibly.

Goal #6: Pedagogy

The student will achieve

Outcome #1 An ability to design appropriate lesson plans
Outcome #2 An ability to implement a teaching performance
Outcome #3 An ability to develop a sequence of writing assignments
Outcome #4 An ability to present a critique of visual images

3. Courses and activities, where assessed:

Because our assessment instrument is a student portfolio, all upper-level English courses—both those that are required as a part of the 16-hour major program core and those that are upper-level English electives, of which a typical major must take 17 hours, require written assignments that address one or more of the program’s learning goals. As a result, a sample of writing assignments in upper-level English courses are subject to being scrutinized in ENGL 4199 (“Career Perspectives”) to determine if they fulfill the standards dictated by the program’s stated assessment goals and learning outcomes. Additionally, each student writes a self-assessment commentary and a substantial reflective commentary in ENGL 4199 (“Career Perspectives”) in which he or she addresses each of the goals and provides evidence in their commentaries (submitted as part of the portfolio) of meeting each goal. Evidence of meeting each goal includes providing relevant quotations from papers submitted, which suggest students are engaged in post-reflection analysis, have an understanding of and have met the stated goal.
4. Methods used:

The department’s major assessment tool has been the portfolio that students assemble while taking the one-credit capstone course ENGL 4199 (“Career Perspectives”), which is offered once a semester during the regular academic year and has been a required course for declared majors since 1999.

We adopted this course because we needed to communicate more effectively with students about progress assessment, and we were interested in developing evidence for a sound assessment system for our English Majors and English Secondary Education and Creative Writing Minors. Our assessment cycle thus relies on long-established procedure in both self and external evaluation. Assessments of particular goals are performed each year, and our assessment goals, methods, and procedures are then reviewed yearly in keeping with institutional guidelines and requirements. Our primary stakeholders are, of course, our students. Because assessment has taken deep root in our programs and because of our awareness of the critical place that clear course objectives have in relation to student writing assignments, faculty have developed assignments in accordance with our stipulated goals. To remind students of the portfolio requirement, the English faculty includes a written notice on syllabi as well as reminding them orally.

The student portfolios are put together during ENGL 4199, after detailed guidelines have been distributed and after the class has discussed how the portfolios should reflect students’ content knowledge of literature and language, critical thinking ability, and research skills. Preparation of the portfolio not only provides the students with a final product but a sense of closure and accomplishment as they approach graduation.

During the Career Perspectives course, students (Step 1) prepare a representative portfolio of papers; (Step 2) complete brief self-assessment forms about what they have learned and what suggestions they have for program improvements; and (Step 3), prepare a detailed written commentary in which they are asked to provide concrete evidence from their papers submitted for their English courses at UALR, those that they have met the criteria for each area.

Step 1, preparing a portfolio ensures that all upper-level English courses, both those that are required as a part of the sixteen-hour major program core and those that are upper-level ENGL electives, of which a typical major must take seventeen hours, require written assignments that address one or more of the program’s learning goals. As a result, written assignments in all upper-level English courses are subject to being rigorously reviewed in accordance with the standards dictated by the program’s assessment goals and learning objectives, since any such assignment may end up as an artifact in a student portfolio.

Step 2, completing self-assessment forms (Attachment #2) compels students to meta-assess, as it were, by reflecting on their experiences in the English Department
and their progress towards our stated goals. Learning objectives are detailed in the instructions provided to students as they begin preparing their portfolio. Specific questions on the self-assessment instrument ask students to measure their knowledge and understanding of key information and concepts (Section A). Other questions (Section B) ask students to discuss experiences with advising, describe interactions with faculty, and provide an overall assessment of the English Department and its programs. This process encourages graduating students to reflect on their course of study in English and allows them a formal feedback mechanism to suggest improvements in the major, as well as providing opportunities to discuss their thoughts and feelings about their course of study and the English Department.

**Step 3, completing the reflective commentary** (Attachment #3) asks each student to write a substantial reflective commentary that addresses six key questions pertaining to the stated goals and that supplies ample and appropriate evidence from their portfolio papers. The commentary questions also provide opportunities for students to describe their knowledge of canonical works; to demonstrate their knowledge of cultural, historical, psychological, political or aesthetic backgrounds; to demonstrate their ability to organize, analyze, and interpret texts in a competently written form; to demonstrate their awareness of various critical approaches to literature or language study; to show their understanding of cultural diversity; to demonstrate their ability to use library resources for literature research, and, if applicable, to demonstrate their creative writing skills, their understanding of visual literacy and content-pedagogy, and their understanding of linguistics or history of English. Students have the entire term to prepare this commentary and submit it with their final portfolios. Specifically, they are presented with the guidelines to help them determine how well a particular portfolio fulfills the stated outcomes for each goal.

Each semester, the instructor of ENGL 4199 collects and assesses the portfolios, self-assessment instruments, and reflective commentaries, along with the other requirements of the course (which include writing a resume, providing a table of contents, and composing a brief description of each paper submitted). The instructor then provides a grade for each student in Career Perspectives.

Since 1999, Assessment Committee members have been elected on one-and two-year staggered terms. The fact that, at any one point, four members of the department and the English Department Chair are serving on the Assessment Committee and that a number of faculty members, including the Chair, have taught English 4199 (as an overload) reflects our commitment to assessment. The Department relies on the substantial amount of literature citing the portfolio method as particularly appropriate and valid for assessing English programs.
Portfolios are assessed by members of the Assessment Committee, who score each portfolio on specified yearly goals on a three-point Likert-type scale, according to the following criteria: “Not available” (evidence not available), “does not meet expectations” (1), “meets expectations” (2), “exceeds expectations” (3) (see Attachment #4).

This year, the four members of the Assessment Committee divided the Career Perspectives’ portfolios according to the spring and fall 2014 terms. Two Assessment Committee members scored the spring portfolios and two Assessment Committee members scored the fall portfolios on each of the outcomes in relation to Goal #1 (“Knowledge of the Canon”) using a Likert-type scale and according to criteria on a standardized worksheet (Attachment #5). Thus, for each outcome, two assessors entered a numerical rating independently and then met to discuss their ratings and come to consensus—a process designed to ensure rater reliability. Individual outcome scores were tabulated for a mean score, and a mean for each outcome and each goal was tabulated per term and overall. Major scoring disparities, if present, were settled during a follow-up meeting with the Chair of the English Department, also a member on the Assessment Committee.

Additionally, the Secondary Education certification program in English Language Arts itself requires elaborate assessment criteria and an instrument to assess programmatic effectiveness. Students who minor in Secondary English Education upload six key elements in Chalk and Wire, the College of Education’s assessment database, for assessment. (The content-based portfolio assessed here represents only one key assessment—key assessment #2—of the six assessed key elements uploaded on Chalk and Wire.) Indeed, assessment issues for Secondary English Education have become a regular item on the agenda for department meetings and English department faculty are mindful of correlating learning objectives with student outcomes in their courses.

5. What are the assessment findings? How did you analyze them?

Overall in 2014, 39 students completed portfolios in ENGL 4199 (“Career Perspectives”), the capstone course for the English Department and the basis for this Assessment Report. As previously mentioned, students use several guideline instruments to prepare portfolios: “Guidelines for Preparing the Portfolio” (Attachment #1) informs students about the papers to include; the “Self-Assessment Form” (Attachment #2) identifies the courses in which students developed their skills within the curriculum, and has a number of other questions, including those on student advising; “Commentary Guidelines” (Attachment #3), require students to write substantive commentaries, using evidence from papers in their portfolios to suggest they understand fully each of the departmental goals. Another instrument, the “UALR Department of English Assessment Checklist” (Attachment #4), allows students and the instructor of record to review the portfolios. The “English Department Assessment Score Sheet” (Attachment #5) enables members of the Assessment Committee to rate each portfolio.
In the spring of 2014, student portfolios were assessed by four total raters, including the Chair of the English Department, using the “English Department Assessment Score Sheet.” Each set of scorers came together and determined the mean for each student for each sub-component and then the overall mean for each outcome. Results were tabulated per semester and overall.

The numerical results for the learning outcomes for Goal #1 (“Knowledge of the Canon”) are summarized below:

The student will achieve

**Outcome #1** Knowledge of literary periods and movements
**Outcome #2** Knowledge of authors’ backgrounds
**Outcome #3** Knowledge of developments in genres
**Outcome #4** Awareness of exemplary works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On outcome #1, overall, 3 students scored between 1.0-1.9; 15 students scored between 2.0-2.9; and 20 students scored 3.0.

On outcome #2, overall, 3 students scored between 1.0-1.9; 23 students scored between 2.0-2.9; and 12 students scored 3.0.
● On outcome #3, overall, 3 students scored between 1.0-1.9; 21 students scored between 2.0-2.9; and 14 students scored 3.0.
● On outcome #4, overall, 6 students scored between 1.0-1.9; 15 students scored between 2.0-2.9; and 18 students scored 3.0.
● The average score for this goal was 2.34 in the spring term and 2.28 in the fall.
● The overall mean score for this goal was 2.32, which suggests our students are meeting or somewhat exceeding our expectations.

In 2014, the Assessment Committee again received money from the university to administer an on-line survey (using Survey Monkey) for our alumni about the quality of the English Department’s various programs. Questions focused on current job status, educational goals, and satisfaction with the English program and its minor programs. Results are summarized below.

Out of 25 total respondents,

- Thirteen (13) graduated with an English B.A.
- Six (6) graduated with an English-Secondary Education B.A.
- Six (6) graduated with an English-Creative Writing Emphasis B.A.

Our majors reported being employed in areas for which an English degree is either essential or highly useful:

- Eight (8) reported working in secondary or elementary school teaching
- Four (4) reported working in other or for-profit business
- Two (2) reported working part-time in four-year college teaching
- One (1) reported working part-time in community college teaching
- One (1) reported working in college administration
- One (1) reported working in financial, accounting, real estate, or insurance services
- One (1) reported working in freelance or self-employed
- One (1) reported working in other or non-profit business

The survey also revealed that many of our majors have gone on to pursue advanced degrees; of the 7 total respondents,

- Four (4) are pursuing a graduate degree in another field
- One (1) is pursuing a graduate degree in education
- One (1) is pursuing MFA in Creative Writing
- One (1) is pursuing a graduate degree in law

Our survey included open-ended questions designed to measure the English program’s effectiveness and value. The first question asked, “What skills or types of knowledge that you learned in the English Department have proved most useful?” Respondents
indicated that the Department effectively teaches students several valuable skills. A sampling of these comments follows:

➢ “The ability not only to close read, but to analyze complex text has been one of the most useful skills taught by the English department.”

➢ “Reading for symbolism has been incredibly useful. I have helped a few high school students write papers on very symbolic works. And of course the Grammatical Analysis course I took has helped me edit those students’ papers.”

➢ “Learning how to problem solve and ask the right questions. Thought organization. Approach to critical reading. My epiphany of Moral Evolution thanks to Blake, Donne, and Dr. Paul Yoder. The belief and confidence in myself thanks to Dr. Ramsey.”

➢ “To effectively communicate with associates. Also familiar with grants and how to write them.”

➢ “Critical thinking and writing. I also liked that most classes required me to complete a presentation. Many job interviews now require candidates to present, so English faculty should continue to emphasize presentation skills in their classes.”

➢ “Classroom management. Lesson planning.”

➢ “Research, analyzing, effective writing, grammar.”

➢ “Reading. Analysis. Writing.”

➢ “Editing and research.”

Our survey also solicited suggestions from respondents, asking, “How could the student experience in the English Department at UALR have been improved?” Comments included:

➢ “In 2012, there was a shift in the English Department which encouraged professors and staff to teach courses they enjoyed, were heavily knowledgeable on, and could help students to truly understand. Please continue this trend. One improvement that I hope will be considered in the future is offering courses that are taught by both the English AND Rhetoric/Writing Department. Both students and professors could greatly benefit a "hybrid" of sorts.”

➢ “I would have liked to take more classes that would have prepared me for certain jobs. I was a fundraiser for a small non-profit in 2009 and I had to
teach myself certain writing techniques to get the donors attention. More work force preparation perhaps.”

➢ “More class offerings. Some classes were just not available at the right time and non-traditional students cannot work those in.”

➢ “More emphasis on how to make an English degree marketable after college. This was covered briefly in the Senior Seminar, but teachers could talk about marketability in other classes, too. English is NOT a "useless" degree by any means. Students should be able to articulate thoughtfully their reasons for pursuing an English degree. In turn, this will help students market themselves after college and become more competitive for jobs.”

Overall, respondents rated their experience with the English Department very highly.

In response to the question, “How effective was the teaching within the English Department at UALR?”

➢ Twelve (12) selected the response “Extremely effective”
➢ Six (6) selected the response “Very effective”
➢ Seven (7) left no response

In comparison, students were much less satisfied with their education outside the English Department at UALR. In response to the question, “How effective was the teaching outside the English Department at UALR”

➢ One (1) selected the response “Extremely Effective”
➢ Six (6) selected the response “Very Effective”
➢ Seven (7) selected the response “Moderately Effective”
➢ One (1) selected the response “Slightly Effective”
➢ Three (3) selected the response “Not at All Effective”
➢ Seven (7) left no response

In response to the question, “Overall, were you satisfied with your experience in the English Department at UALR, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with it, or dissatisfied with it?”

➢ Fifteen (15) selected the response, “Extremely satisfied”
➢ Three (3) selected the response, “Moderately satisfied”
➢ Seven (7) left no response

Overall, 84% of the respondents indicated that they were “extremely satisfied” with their experience in the English Department at UALR. The remaining respondents said that they were “moderately satisfied.”
Below please find bar graphs indicating results on our Alumni Survey (2014).

How effective was the teaching within the English Department at UALR?

How effective was the teaching outside the English Major at UALR?
Employer Satisfaction Survey

In 2014, the Assessment Committee received money from the university to administer an on-line survey (using Survey Monkey) of employers in the Little Rock metropolitan area about the quality of the English Department’s various programs. Unfortunately, the responses were few, mainly because our majors inevitably have a wide variety of jobs and work for a wide variety of employers.

Our survey included open-ended questions designed to measure the English program’s effectiveness and value, asking, “What are the strengths, if any, of your current or past employees who were English majors at UALR?” A sampling of these comments follows:

- “The students that we have hired have exhibited many of the qualities above and have moved comfortably into the teacher role at our school.”
- “Very creative, technically advanced, personable, knowledgeable in the content area.”

Our survey also solicited suggestions from respondents, asking, “What are the weaknesses, if any, of your current or past employees who were English majors at UALR?” One respondent answered:

- “Differentiation instruction-must meet the needs of all students. Not all students can be proficient or advanced. Need skills in working with the basic and below basic students and how to meet their needs.”
Our survey also asked, “When filling a teaching position in your school, what other skills are important?” One respondent answered:

- “It has been a great opportunity to have students in our school. The opportunity to work with prospective teacher candidates can be more significant than teaching experience in hiring. We have particularly had a very positive experience with the program that Dr. Minnick has brought to our school. Very much appreciate the interaction that his program provides.”

Below please find a bar graph indicating results on our Employer Survey (2014).
6. Conclusions drawn, decisions made, and stakeholders involved:

**Learning Outcomes**

The vast majority of our majors are either meeting or exceeding the learning outcomes for Goal #1.

**Conclusions from the Alumni Survey**

The alumni survey indicates that the overwhelming majority of English alumni are extremely satisfied with their experience in the English Department. Overall, 84% of the respondents indicated that they were “extremely satisfied” with their experience in the English Department at UALR. The remaining respondents said that they were “moderately satisfied.”

**Conclusions from Employer Satisfaction Survey**

The sample size was not large enough to draw meaningful conclusions. The English Department Assessment Committee will try to figure ways to increase the number of respondents for next year’s report.

We have omitted additional assessment for our B.A. in English, Secondary Education Track, (Plan #14 A) because our Director of English Secondary Education is on OCDA. This will be included in next year’s report.

**Final Recommendations**

The committee recommends a change in wording to one of our student assessment forms, as follows:

Original:

5. Provide examples from at least two different courses in the English Department to show that you can use source material accurately and responsibly. The papers should, when appropriate, follow the standard MLA format and should rely on scholarly sources.

Revision:

5. Provide examples from at least two different courses in the English Department to show that you can use source material accurately and responsibly. The examples should demonstrate your ability to follow standard MLA format and to rely on scholarly sources. Include at least one example of in-text citation and one example of Works Cited (copy and paste only relevant portions of your papers).
ATTACHMENT #1

UALR English Department Assessment
Guidelines for Preparing the Portfolio

For your portfolio, you will be pulling together materials from your course of study in English.

You are not being graded for this exercise. Your record will reflect only the fact that you submitted a complete portfolio. The purpose of the portfolio is to illustrate for an audience outside UALR how well the English major is doing its job. The program is what is being graded.

If you are in the William G. Cooper, Jr., Honors Program in English, we encourage you to include your Honors project as one of your papers.

FOR ENGLISH MAJORS

- At least one paper from a class in English Literature
- At least one paper from a class in American Literature
- Two research papers of at least 10 pages, with documentation
- Two reading or position papers of 2-6 pages
- Two papers of your choice

FOR ENGLISH MAJORS WITH AN EMPHASIS IN CREATIVE WRITING

Section One

- One paper from a class in English Literature
- One paper from a class in American Literature
- One research paper
- One position or reading paper

Section Two (choose one of the following options)

- Two short stories or chapters of a book
- 5-10 poems
- One short story or chapter and 3-5 poems

FOR ENGLISH SECONDARY EDUCATION MAJORS

Section One

- One paper from a class in English Literature
• One paper from a class in American Literature
• One research paper

Section Two

• A sequence of three writing assignments and appropriate rubrics designed for students and requisite commentary providing a rationale for writing assignments
• At least two (preferably more) Chalk and Wire papers prepared for two English Department courses, specifically related to content-level pedagogy
ATTACHMENT #2

UALR Department of English
Self-Assessment Form

Section A (Specific Courses):

Please answer the following questions in assessing your development within the discipline. Please refer to specific courses and/or professors. Please mention specific topics or areas of study, and/or specific activities such as term paper or research project assignments.

1. Give examples from two different courses that led to knowledge of major movements, periods, and authors in British, American, and other literatures.

2. Give an example from a course that led to a general knowledge of the grammatical structure of English and/or the historical development of the language.

3. Give examples from two different courses that led to a working knowledge of literary terms, the major reference tools, and literary criticism and scholarship.

4. Give examples from two different courses that led to your ability to think, discuss, and write critically about literature.

5. Provide examples from at least two different courses in the English Department to show that you can use source material accurately and responsibly. The papers should, when appropriate, follow the standard MLA format and should rely on scholarly sources.

6. Give examples from two different courses that led to a broadening or change in your intellectual interests.

7. Provide examples from two different courses, not including ENGL 4202/RHET 4202, that led to your ability to apply pedagogical concepts to literature, writing, linguistics and/or film (for English-Secondary Education majors only)

Section B (General Comments):

1. Comment on the advising you received from administration, staff, and faculty.

2. Comment on the encouragement you received from teachers and administrators.

3. What is your overall assessment of the effectiveness and usefulness of the education and training you received as an UALR English major?
4. If you have participated in any aspect of the William G. Cooper, Jr, Honors Program in English (e.g. taking a Cooper seminar, working on a Cooper project), please comment on your experiences.

5. What would you change to make the experience of a UALR English major better?

6. Please comment on your experiences as an English Education minor both in the English Department and the College of Education. Describe your overall assessment of the effectiveness of the program and suggest changes you think necessary (for English-Secondary Education majors only).
It is essential that in examining your work for the English major, you become reflective by providing evidence through commentary with respect to the papers you submit for your portfolio. In order to provide this essential evidence, please write a detailed commentary in which you address the following:

1. Which papers demonstrate your knowledge of the canon and its historical continuity? Cite particular portions of your selected paper(s), making sure to provide appropriate support and explanation. Please describe the reasons for the selection of your papers in this category.

2. Which papers demonstrate an evidenced understanding of cultural, historical, psychological, political or aesthetic background and knowledge of literature? Cite particular portions of your selected paper(s), making sure to provide appropriate support and explanation. Please describe the reasons for the selection of your papers in this category.

3. Which papers demonstrate an evidenced ability to organize, analyze, and interpret texts in a competent written form? Cite particular portions of your selected paper(s), making sure to provide appropriate support and evidence. Please describe the reasons for the selection of papers in this category.

4. Which papers provide an awareness of the various critical approaches to literature or language study. Cite particular sections from your papers as support and evidence, indicating ways of working with, interpreting, and analyzing texts using specific critical lenses to do so. Please describe the reasons for the selections of papers in this category.

5. Which papers show a distinct awareness and understanding of cultural diversity from authors in texts (for example, evidence of exposure to African American Literature, Native American Literature, Chicano/a Literature)? Cite particular examples from your papers that provide support and evidence indicating exposure and understanding particular to working with multi-cultural texts. Please describe how your work with multi-cultural forms of literature has contributed to your appreciation, knowledge, and understanding.

6. Which papers demonstrate your ability to use library resources for literature research? Use the research and bibliography portions of these papers to show your knowledge of library resources (both digital and paper), of MLA form, and to demonstrate your ethical, accurate, and responsible use of source material.
7. Creative writing skills (if applicable):

8. Pedagogy (if applicable): Which papers demonstrate an understanding of visual literacy and content-pedagogy? Please cite particular portions of selected papers and align the work on those papers to discrete NCTE Standards (for English-Secondary Education majors only).

9. Understanding of linguistics or history of English (if applicable):
## UALR Department of English
### Assessment Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Semester:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Goal #1: Knowledge of the Canon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #1</th>
<th>Knowledge of literary periods and movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #2</td>
<td>Knowledge of authors’ backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #3</td>
<td>Knowledge of development of genres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #4</td>
<td>Awareness of exemplary works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal #2: Contextualizing Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #1</th>
<th>Awareness of cultural diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #2</td>
<td>Awareness of historical developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #3</td>
<td>Awareness of social milieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #4</td>
<td>Awareness of aesthetic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal #3: Interpreting Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #1</th>
<th>An understanding of the range of critical approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #2</td>
<td>An ability to read texts for meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #3</td>
<td>Knowledge of terms and conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #4</td>
<td>An ability to construct a critical argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal #4: Developing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Communications Skills</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #1</td>
<td>An ability to use the formats for writing about literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #2</td>
<td>Development of an effective writing style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #3</td>
<td>An ability to observe correct conventions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goal #5: Developing Digital Skills and Using Research Technology</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #1</td>
<td>To evaluate paper and digital sources and make appropriate distinctions between scholarly and popular sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #2</td>
<td>To use effectively library resources and subscription databases</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #3</td>
<td>To handle paper and digital sources properly and to follow the format and style conventions of the Modern Language Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #4</td>
<td>To use research ethically and responsibly</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goal #6: Pedagogy (ELA Candidates only)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #1</td>
<td>An ability to design appropriate lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #2</td>
<td>An ability to implement a teaching performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #3</td>
<td>An ability to develop a sequence of writing assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #4</td>
<td>An ability to present a critique of visual images</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1 - does not meet expectations; 2 - meets expectations; 3 - exceeds expectations

**Portfolio Average**

23
The numerical results for the learning outcomes for Goal #1 ("Knowledge of the Canon") are summarized below:

**Outcome #1** Knowledge of literary periods and movements

**Outcome #2** Knowledge of authors’ backgrounds

**Outcome #3** Knowledge of developments in genres

**Outcome #4** Awareness of exemplary works

**Total Score**

The rating options are as follows: “Not available” (evidence not available), “does not meet expectations” (1), “meets expectations” (2), “exceeds expectations” (3).