

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19 Consult with your college dean’s office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

Unit/Program Name: Department of English—MA Program
Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Robert Perrin (robert.perrin@indstate.edu)

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year’s report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</p>
<p>1. Students understand the basic tools of researching, writing, and subject matter for professionals in Literature and Writing.</p>	<p>English 600 introduces students to research and writing methods expected of work in the profession. English 635 prepares students to understand and incorporate specific, literary theories used in both professional reading and writing. Further, as an extension of work begun in English 685A, GTAs are exposed to and expected to incorporate pedagogy and practice in the field of teaching composition.</p>	<p>Performance evaluations are tied specifically to grades in the classes and reflect mastery of specific goals. Attention to systematic development of complex researched arguments, nuanced and balanced evaluations of others’ work, and technical editing. 80% are expected to maintain a 3.0 GPA or higher.</p>	<p>Varied from very good mastery to adequate: 8/12 displayed very good results in mastery of these skills; 1/12 showed adequate results; 1/12 showed poor results.</p>	<p>Both of our underperforming graduate students came to us in good standing from well-regarded schools, so we were surprised by their poor performances. We are doing in-house “interim grades” for graduate students, in hopes of staging “interventions.”</p>
<p>2. Students participate in diverse and complex communities and professional environments; student teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning and must reflect on their methods and learn from experience.</p>	<p>Students are encouraged to interact with guest speakers (Schick, Bash, and Dreiser lecturers), present their own research as part of the department’s Landini Series, and attend professional conferences. English 685A students (and second-year GTAs) meet in class, with the Director of</p>	<p>In English 600, students are informed about appropriate professional behaviors and encouraged to interact with scholars and teacher of all levels to learn about the field and its variety of contexts. They are measures by the class participation portion of their grade. Outside of the classroom,</p>	<p>Varied from very good mastery to adequate. The results were in keeping with our expectations</p>	<p>Participation in our lecture series and departmental activities have been strong, so we haven’t changed those. This past year, we hired a new, tenure-track Director of Writing Programs who will be able to devote himself to monitoring GTAs’</p>

	Writing Programs and the Department Chair, and in peer groups related to teaching.	they are expected to exhibit respectful attention to the presentation and analysis information and are advised independently. In English 685A, student are graded through various assignments on their professional development and comporment, as well as through classroom observations.		experiences in the classroom.
3. Recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline	Rigorous training in defining plagiarism and proper citation in all professional work. Mentoring of GTAs, advising for all students.	Adherence to professional modes of behavior and conduct. The measures for each case are provided within the context of their coursework and through graded and verbal feedback from their advisors and the Department Chair.	Very good. Their grades, their observation feedback, and their student evaluations (as instructor of record on their teaching assignments) are proof of their growing professional competency.	We are increasing the number of their teaching observations, as well as hosting panels as part of our Landini speaker series to address some of these concerns from varied perspectives.
4. Master the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.	In all graduate courses, students read widely, discuss concepts, and complete papers and projects. All graduate students must complete a culminating experience: paper, creative project, or thesis.	A grade of an A for successfully executing the requirements of the assignment	Varied from very good mastery to poor: 9 displayed very good results in mastery of these skills; 2/13 showed adequate results; 2/13 showed poor results.	We have added a new written-exam option for our culminating experiences so that we provide graduate students with varied approaches to fulfill their final program requirement. (The two low-performing students—mentioned above—performed poorly across multiple areas and have been dismissed.)
5. Master the skill (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.	Extensive researched and argued analytical papers, teaching experience, library and rare book room training (esp. in English 600), culminating papers/project/thesis/exam.	A grade of an A for successfully executing the requirements of the assignment	Varied from very good mastery to poor: 9 displayed very good results in mastery of these skills; 2/13 showed adequate results; 2/13 showed poor results.	As part of the Landini series, we as hosting panel discussions of professional matters: CV preparation, letters of application, interview strategies, writing

				conference proposals, and others.
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.*

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

[Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities](#)

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you):

- 1) Cohort Sizes
- 2) Year-to-Year Retention
- 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate

I don’t understand how 1, 2, and 3 apply, but here are a few details:

- Our program is very small—under twenty.
- We have seven assistantships.
- Not all of our students pursue a degree full time (some teach high school, work regular jobs, or have other obligations).

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

We have tried very hard to create opportunities to help graduate students “professionalize.”

- **The Landini Series** (see below) provided the most notable opportunity—with sessions on very practical matters. We offered a special session on writing a conference proposal just for graduate students; it seems to have worked because several second-year graduate students will be going to a national composition conference.
- **English 600 (Research Methods)** now includes faculty discussions of their research work. Each week, a different faculty member talks to the class about his or her research (how to get started, what the obstacles are, special work patterns, publishing options, conferences . . . anything, really), and then students ask questions. These discussions have been very illuminating for students.
- **Exam Option.** We haven’t had an MA Exam option in decades (most English programs haven’t). Yet we thought that such an option would provide a different route toward completion for students who did not plan to pursue the PhD, so we resurrected and redesigned it.
- **TA Responsibilities.** This year we instituted a new plan (based on an old plan). Once the Writing Center rightfully reestablished its connection with the Department of English, we rethought our TA assignments: TAs now teach one class (English 101 or English 105), tutor six hours in the Writing Center, and attend a two-hour, weekly workshop on teaching/tutoring/materials development.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

- **TA Responsibilities (see above).** This is our first year in this plan, so there have been many small of glitches; however, they've been outweighed by positive experiences. This is clearly "a work in progress," and we need to smooth out the processes, further define roles and responsibilities—in other words, keep trying to make this a better experience for the TAs.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)

Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. The template was sent to you with this form via email. It is not expected that every course in your curriculum correspond to a career readiness competency.

- **The Landini Series** (a departmental lecture/presentation/workshop series) provided an opportunity for us to host sessions of professional activities. We had a faculty panel on selecting, applying to, and surviving graduate school; we had a panel on securing letters of recommendation (Whom to ask? What to provide potential recommenders? When to ask? How to secure a balanced set of references?); we had a workshop on preparing personal statements; we had a graduate student (mostly teaching assistants) panel to talk to undergraduate students about the transition into specialized studies and teaching.

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- 1) **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness** (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)

Our review of results have been inconclusive. The courses in which some students have the most challenges (for example, English 600, the research methods class) are also the ones in which some students make the most strides. We've tried to correlate the results with students' GPAs (do students with the minimum—3.00—have more trouble than those with higher GPAs—3.91?) and have established no clear connection that would help us target students for additional help. We've tried exploring whether success is predicated on program (comparing students from our own undergraduate program with students from other programs) and have established no clear connection.

That leaves us to look at goals/objectives/outcomes in a straightforward way and simply try to identify areas for improvement that we believe will benefit all students, those who thrive and those who struggle.

- 2) **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**

See 2.1 above.

- 3) **what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**

I would like for us to survey previous graduate students who are currently in PhD programs or who are teaching as adjuncts so see what recommendations they would make for improving our program (curricular, professional). We have a strong sense (letters, e-mails, other

contacts) of students succeeding in their subsequent PhD studies and teaching, but I'd like for us to secure more specific responses. Even when students are succeeding, there are surely elements of our program that can be improved.

4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders

Results will be shared with the Graduate Committee and teachers of key courses. Further, at regularly scheduled Department meetings, we will share information and results with all faculty members.

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific—assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.

Dear Rob,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: M.A. English	Overall Rating: Developing (1.88/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable.• Courses where assessments of learning outcomes will take place are somewhat described. In some courses, specific assignments used for assessment are described.• In some cases, actual student performance is clearly described.• Good information about changes that have been/will be made as a result of findings. To the note that "results have been inconclusive" – I think that becoming more specific on the assignments selected for assessment, ensuring those assignments directly align to the learning outcomes to be assessed, setting clear expectations, and using a strong evaluative tool, such as a rubric, will provide you will better data upon which to understand student learning. Let me know how I can be of service.• Good suggestion to add an alumni survey as a method of indirect assessment to help provide more context for your results.• Good information is provided about how faculty are involved in and informed of the assessment practice/process and how information will be shared with stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Note which Graduate Student Learning Outcomes align to the outcomes listed.• Overall course grades are rarely applicable for learning outcome assessment since they are usually a reflection of a composite score of performance on multiple outcomes. Unless an entire course and all its assignments are definitively linked to one learning outcome, this should be changed to use student performance on specific assignments in these courses that directly align to the learning outcome in question.• Expectations for student performance are overly broad in most cases. Being more specific will help you define whether students are meeting expectations. It seems like a rubric may be used based on the terminology used to describe student performance, but I can't tell from the description.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. (specific assignments)</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome. (some)</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. (course grades)</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accretor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped