AY 21-22 STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT & SUCCESS REPORT
OPTION B: NARRATIVE FORMAT

Academic Program:	English Liberal Arts BA English Teaching BA	Date:	
Author(s):	James Greene (Assessment committee chair) James Wurtz (Department chair)		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.		___ Learning Outcomes ___ Curriculum Map _X__ Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		___ Yes _X__ No __ Hybrid	

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year
Our current Learning Outcomes on file are a version of the following rubric. In Fall 2021, the department Assessment committee revised the rubric that is on file to the example seen below:

	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Does not meet
Argumentation				
Organization				
Disciplinary Understanding				
Synthesis of ideas				
Documentation				
Technical/mechanical skills				

Table 1: Department of English Assessment Rubric

In Fall 2022, the department voted to restructure the English major and the English Teaching major by reducing the required credits from forty-eight to thirty-nine. As part of that curricular revision, we have designed new learning outcomes for the two majors. We will send these outcomes to the Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator once the revised majors have been approved through the university curriculum review process.

Courses Where Learning Took Place
We (the Assessment committee of the English Department) collected final assignments from three classes. One of these courses was a lower-division class that typically enrolls first-year students (ENG 230: Literary Analysis). We set this course in comparison with assignments from two upper-division courses: ENG 436: Topics in World Literature and ENG 460: Shakespeare.

We collected twelve artifacts from the upper-division courses, and eleven artifacts from the lower-division course (though the course enrolled more students, only eleven submitted the final project).

Assignments Used
All three classes culminated in an argumentative essay. These essays asked students to present original interpretations that also engaged with at least one secondary source.

Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders?
As Assessment committee chair, I assigned each of the four faculty members participating in the evaluation into pairs. Each pair was given a set of papers, which they assessed using the rubric. I asked faculty members to discuss their individual evaluations of each paper, and come to a consensus score in each category of the rubric. I then collected these scores across the two classes we chose to evaluate.

The faculty members completing this assessment were not the instructors of record for either of the sample classes we used, so they were reading these papers without any context beyond the assignment description.

Student Performance
The following tables contain the combined scores in each category for the two courses we used in the assessment. The number in each box of the table indicates the numbers of students marked at that level on the rubric.

ENG 230	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Does not meet
Argumentation	4	1	5	1
Organization	5	3	2	1
Disciplinary Understanding	4	4	0	3
Synthesis of ideas	4	1	5	1
Documentation	4	3	1	3
Technical/mechanical skills	4	2	3	1

Table 2: Data from ENG 230: Literary Analysis

ENG 436 & ENG 460	Exceeds	Meets	Developing	Does not meet
Argumentation	4	5	3	0
Organization	5	5	2	0
Disciplinary Understanding	7	5	0	0
Synthesis of ideas	4	5	3	0
Documentation	5	4	3	0
Technical/mechanical skills	6	4	2	0

Table 3: Data from ENG 436: Topics in World Literature and ENG 460: Shakespeare

Comparison to any Prior Data
In our assessment for the previous academic year, we also compared a section of ENG 230 with two sections of upper-division courses within our major. We reported strengths in Disciplinary Understanding and Technical/Mechanical Skills across all three courses in that report, with clear signs of improvement as students progressed through the major. We also noted synthesis of ideas and documentation as areas for improvement.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings.
These findings reiterate the marked improvement we saw last year in all categories as students progress through the major. Given our data from AY 21, it's reassuring to see a strong number of upper-division students continuing to exceed expectations in Disciplinary Understanding.

The continued weakness we see in Synthesis of Ideas raises the question of assignment design across different courses in our evaluation. Faculty do not have the same expectations for assignments, and we might be seeing a contrast in what students are being asked to do more than a contrast in student learning. That observation speaks to our need as a department to develop a new curriculum map that explicitly establishes which courses and artifacts will best demonstrate student learning in a particular outcome.

Additionally, the fact that only four students exceeded expectations in the Argumentation category in upper-division courses suggests a need to emphasize the writing process in all courses. Developing a complex interpretive claim presents one of the most difficult challenges in English classes, even as it represents the foundation of our disciplinary approach. We need to be sure that we give students ample instruction on writing as a process of discovery, where they are encouraged to develop an argument through multiple drafts.

We will discuss these numbers with the department faculty during the Spring 2023 semester. Given the small sample size we used for this assessment, rather than arguing for changes based on this data, our discussion will likely focus on the need to develop a stronger curriculum map. We need to ensure that we gain multiple perspectives on student learning, and are not relying on brief snapshots.

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?
Assuming our proposed changes to the undergraduate major are approved in Spring 2023, we will implement revised learning outcomes for the 2023-2024 academic year. We will use our existing rubric for the last time in Fall 2023 to assess learning outcomes for the 2022-2023 academic year.

Student Success Activities
Cohort Size: In Fall 2021, the cohort of English (10) and English Teaching (12) majors was 22.

Year-to-Year Retention: For that freshman cohort, from Fall 2021 to Fall 2022 the retention rate was 63.64%. When broken down by major, we find that retention was higher for English Teaching majors (70%) than for English majors (58.33%). Looking back through the past four years, retention rates held steady from 2020 to 2021 at either 62.96% or 68.18%, depending on whether one looks at the initial department (i.e. they came in as an English or English Teaching major vs. changing to an English Teaching major before the end of their first year). In either case, retention hovered around the mid 60-percent mark for the two-year period covered by the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic.

However, looking at the two-year period prior to AY 2020-21, we see that year-to-year retention numbers were over 80% for either calculation of cohort (initial or latest major). When considering this steep drop-off in retention, it seems that pandemic conditions are unavoidable as at least a partial explanation. As with the University-wide drop in retention over this period, the Department of English drastically scaled back its activities and opportunities for students to interact both in and outside of the classroom. It is logical, then, that along with the various life pressures our students experienced during this difficult time, they also had fewer opportunities to identify with their program, to get to know their fellow majors, and to develop the sense of belonging that research identifies as a key component of retention.

While we cannot expect a full return to pre-2020 numbers and a pre-2020 college experience, this year's cohort at least has the opportunity to engage in a richer set of out-of-class activities, including face-to-face social events, creative readings, lecture series, and volunteer opportunities, that will hopefully reinforce the full return to in-person classes and assist them in identifying with their major, Department, and University.

5-Year Graduation Rate: For the most recent cohort (Fall 2016), the 5-year graduation rate was 53.57% (55.56 % for English and 52.63% for English Teaching). This is the highest graduation rate of the previous 5 years tracked (2011-2016), and is well ahead of ISU's 5-year graduation rate for that cohort, which appears to be 37%.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

The Department's academic advising structure ensures that all majors get individual attention with an informed and available advisor. We have also shifted how we offered our Creative Writing workshops, separating out the introductory workshop from the advanced workshops so as to better provide level-appropriate feedback.

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

As mentioned in last year's assessment report and above, we continue to work towards building a culture of assessment, and using the data from assessment to inform decision-making. Recruiting remains a priority, and partially to that end, we have passed curricular revisions, including a certificate and a concentration in Rhetoric and Professional Writing, that we believe will assist in attracting students to the study of English.

Continuous Quality Improvement

This information may be found on pages 3 & 4 of this report.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: BA English

Evaluation: Exemplary

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)		Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.	Excellent use of assessment sampling at entry and advanced points in the curriculum, as well as coordination of assignment development and evaluations strategies.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)		Exemplary

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described		Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.	Plans reference limitations of the data in informing any major changes, and suggest review of practices across the department and involving faculty in updating of curriculum maps to ensure consistency in understanding and LO development across the curriculum. Comparison to prior data reveals strategies that seems to be successful in supporting student learning achievement, as well areas that seem resistant.	Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	As noted, other points of assessment data may provide more useful reference for any areas that are targets for improvement over time.	Exemplary

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.