AY 21-22 STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT & SUCCESS REPORT — OPTION A: TABLE FORMAT

Academic Program:	MA TESL & Linguistics	**Date:**	November 10, 2022
Author(s):	Ann Rider and Melanie D'Amico		
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 ___ Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		X Yes ___ No ___ Hybrid	

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Benchmark for Proficiency**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark**	**Prior Results for Comparison** (if applicable)
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
Oral Discourse Strategies Uses proficient discourse strategies and comprehensible grammar and pronunciation.	LING 607	Research Presentation	rubric (attached)	professional conference presentation	Proficient	Developing/Proficient

Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in Blue Reports to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	Through instruction provided in both LING 602 and LING 607 and examples of typical professional presentations in Applied Linguistics, students clearly understand the expected structure of presentations as well as professional speaking styles. Students do very well with appropriate content, organization, documentation, and delivery.
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	While students meet expectations for Proficient, overall, they need to improve how they will handle question and feedback at the end of their presentation. It would also be good to encourage them to spend more presentation time speaking about their results and discussing how those results may be interpreted, especially as they relate to prior research in the field.

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*	In giving their own presentations, students demonstrate that they are able to meet expectations for Proficient in presenting with formal discourse that is appropriate for the anticipated audience. Additionally, students demonstrate good English grammar and pronunciation. This is encouraging as most students are at the end of their first year in the MA program and we would expect them to be able to deliver a good quality professional presentation at this point. Where students appear to be the weakest is in the area of questions/feedback from the audience, with a few students falling into the Developing category. It appears that more instruction and/or examples with how to deal with audience questions would be beneficial. Additionally, continuing to have students focus the majority of their presentation on their results and discussion is a key concern for us. In comparing the current cohort of students to previous cohorts, we see an improvement in presentation style and inclusion of components. It appears that the newer combination of LING 602, wherein this type of research communication is introduced, and LING 607, where students' research knowledge becomes practical has been a positive change for the program.
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	We will continue to discuss research communication and research presentations in both LING 602 and LING 607. We will also continue to encourage first year students to attend at least one professional presentation, hopefully at a conference.
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?	Next year we intend to evaluate students' writing abilities from the Critical Thinking: Writing outcome.
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	As writing assignments are part of several courses, faculty will be asked for comparable assignments that may be assessed with a common rubric. Results of the assessment will be shared during a regular meeting of the graduate faculty.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: MA TESL & Linguistics

Evaluation: Mature

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.		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.)	Additional points of assessment may be helpful in providing a more robust picture of mastery of this LO, but as this is a significant in-course assignment with a developed rubric for evaluation it is likely sufficient for the purposes of basic LO assessment.	Mature

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	The benchmark for proficiency wasn't described, though it can be interpreted by the results that students were proficient by the intended standard. The actual student data is not specific. It notes that performance was "proficient" overall, but there is no information on whether this was all students, a certain percentage of students, etc. Additionally, the discussion goes into thoughtful detail about areas of strength and weakness in the presentations, which suggests that the rubric that was used was analytical to break presentations into component displays of specific skills. Reporting data in this format will provide a clearer, more descriptive record for faculty looking at this data over time and tracking areas for growth and improvement.	Developing
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.		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		Mature

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