

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20

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: English Teaching

Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Robert Perrin (robert.perrin@indstate.edu)

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

<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. Writing ability (expression of ideas)</p>	<p>In English 486, our capstone course for English Teaching majors, we assessed the final project.</p>	<p>We expect students—by the time they take this course—to be able to articulate their classroom plans.</p>	<p>Most students proved themselves able to articulate their goals for lessons, describe their activities, and develop clearly sequenced assignments and activities.</p>	<p>We are adding more directed writing activities in an earlier classes (English 307, Writing for Teachers) that address specific strategies, approaches, and techniques for achieving these ends.</p>
<p>2. Organization (logical arrangement of ideas and activities)</p>	<p>In English 486, our capstone course for English Teaching majors, we assessed the final project.</p>	<p>We expect our students to sequence a series of lessons (within a teaching unit) to move students through experiences in a way that will enhance their learning.</p>	<p>Students succeeded generally. Unit plans followed a clear sequence at the macro level. At the micro level, however, some students were less successful—not always understanding how basic skill developed in one activity must precede work on more complicated tasks, assignments, and projects.</p>	<p>We will give more attention to progressive complexity in activities for students—using hierarchies like Bloom's taxonomy to highlight that simple tasks require lower-level skills, while complex tasks require the blending of higher-order skills.</p>
<p>3. Documentation (particularly citation)</p>	<p>In English 486, our capstone course for English Teaching majors, we assessed the final project.</p>	<p>We expect students to acknowledge their use of resources, materials, and ideas, gathered through research, to support their instructional plans.</p>	<p>Students are exceedingly careful about identifying their sources: databases, interviews, articles, websites, and so on. However, many do not provide full and accurate citations—critical to their</p>	<p>We are adding more focused instruction in the first composition class for English majors (English 108, Literary Analysis) that address this important technical feature of writing in subsequent English</p>

			own work (and as a model for their prospective students). Some also rely on dated documentary guidelines.	literature classes, especially considering the changes in MLA documentary style.
--	--	--	---	--

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

- Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- 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.
- 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.)
- 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). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

Cohort Sizes

			Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019
Year 1	Fall	Enrolled at Census	24	17	30	17	24	28	25	31	26
Year 1	Fall	Cohort Graduates									
Year 1	Fall	Cohort Retention %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Year 1	Fall	Cohort Graduation %									
Year 1	Spring	Enrolled at Census	23	14	23	16	16	23	19	26	24
Year 1	Spring	Cohort Graduates									
Year 1	Spring	Cohort Retention %	95.83%	82.35%	76.67%	94.12%	66.67%	82.14%	76.00%	83.87%	92.31%
Year 1	Spring	Cohort Graduation %									
Year 2	Fall	Enrolled at Census	18	10	19	15	14	19	17	25	21
Year 2	Fall	Cohort Graduates									
Year 2	Fall	Cohort Retention %	75.00%	58.82%	63.33%	88.24%	58.33%	67.86%	68.00%	80.65%	80.77%
Year 2	Fall	Cohort Graduation %									
Year 2	Spring	Enrolled at Census	16	11	19	14	13	17	15	24	
Year 2	Spring	Cohort Graduates									
Year 2	Spring	Cohort Retention %	66.67%	64.71%	63.33%	82.35%	54.17%	60.71%	60.00%	77.42%	

			Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019
Year 2	Spring	Cohort Graduation %									
Year 3	Fall	Enrolled at Census	14	9	17	13	11	16	15	22	
Year 3	Fall	Cohort Graduates									
Year 3	Fall	Cohort Retention %	58.33%	52.94%	56.67%	76.47%	45.83%	57.14%	60.00%	70.97%	
Year 4	Fall	Enrolled at Census	13	9	16	8	9	15	14		
Year 4	Fall	Cohort Graduates			1			1			
Year 4	Fall	Cohort Retention %	54.17%	52.94%	53.33%	47.06%	37.50%	53.57%	56.00%		
Year 4	Fall	Cohort Graduation %			3.33%			3.57%			
Year 4	Spring	Enrolled at Census	12	7	15	7	9	12			
Year 4	Spring	Cohort Graduates	1	2	2	2	1	3			
Year 4	Spring	Cohort Retention %	50.00%	41.18%	50.00%	41.18%	37.50%	42.86%			
Year 4	Spring	Cohort Graduation %	4.17%	11.76%	6.67%	11.76%	4.17%	10.71%			
Year 5	Fall	Enrolled at Census	9	1	6	3	2	2			
Year 5	Fall	Cohort Graduates	5	7	11	6	9	13			
Year 5	Fall	Cohort Retention %	37.50%	5.88%	20.00%	17.65%	8.33%	7.14%			
Year 5	Fall	Cohort Graduation %	20.83%	41.18%	36.67%	35.29%	37.50%	46.43%			
Year 5	Spring	Enrolled at Census	5		3	2	2				
Year 5	Spring	Cohort Graduates	8	8	12	7	9				
Year 5	Spring	Cohort Retention %	20.83%		10.00%	11.76%	8.33%				
Year 5	Spring	Cohort Graduation %	33.33%	47.06%	40.00%	41.18%	37.50%				
Year 6	Fall	Enrolled at Census	1		0						
Year 6	Fall	Cohort Graduates	12	8	16						
Year 6	Fall	Cohort Retention %	4.17%		0.00%						
Year 6	Fall	Cohort Graduation %	50.00%	47.06%	53.33%						
Year 6	Spring	Enrolled at Census	1	0	0						
Year 6	Spring	Cohort Graduates	12	8	16						
Year 6	Spring	Cohort Retention %	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%						
Year 6	Spring	Cohort Graduation %	50.00%	47.06%	53.33%						
Year 7	Fall	Enrolled at Census	1	0	0						
Year 7	Fall	Cohort Graduates	13	8	16						
Year 7	Fall	Cohort Retention %	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%						
Year 7	Fall	Cohort Graduation %	54.17%	47.06%	53.33%						

			Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019
Year 7	Spring	Enrolled at Census	1								
Year 7	Spring	Cohort Graduates	13	8	16						
Year 7	Spring	Cohort Retention %	4.17%								
Year 7	Spring	Cohort Graduation %	54.17%	47.06%	53.33%						
Year 8	Fall	Enrolled at Census	1								
Year 8	Fall	Cohort Graduates	13	8	16						
Year 8	Fall	Cohort Retention %	4.17%								
Year 8	Fall	Cohort Graduation %	54.17%	47.06%	53.33%						
Year 8	Spring	Enrolled at Census	1								
Year 8	Spring	Cohort Graduates	13	8							
Year 8	Spring	Cohort Retention %	4.17%								
Year 8	Spring	Cohort Graduation %	54.17%	47.06%							
Year 9	Fall	Enrolled at Census	1								
Year 9	Fall	Cohort Graduates	13	8							
Year 9	Fall	Cohort Retention %	4.17%								
Year 9	Fall	Cohort Graduation %	54.17%	47.06%							
Year 9	Spring	Enrolled at Census									
Year 9	Spring	Cohort Graduates	14								
Year 9	Spring	Cohort Retention %									
Year 9	Spring	Cohort Graduation %	58.33%								

Year-to-Year Retention

	2013	2013	2014	2014	2015	2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018	2019	2019
English	30	63.33%	17	88.24%	24	58.33%	28	67.86%	25	68.00%	31	80.65%	26	80.77%
English (1021)	13	76.92%	4	100.00%	10	50.00%	9	55.56%	10	80.00%	14	85.71%	6	100.00%
English Teaching (1022)	17	52.94%	13	84.62%	14	64.29%	19	73.68%	15	60.00%	17	76.47%	20	75.00%

One-Year Retention Rates

	2013	2013	2014	2014	2015	2015	2016	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018	2019	2019
English	30	63.33%	17	88.24%	24	58.33%	28	67.86%	25	68.00%	31	80.65%	26	80.77%
English (1021)	13	76.92%	4	100.00%	10	50.00%	9	55.56%	10	80.00%	14	85.71%	6	100.00%
English Teaching (1022)	17	52.94%	13	84.62%	14	64.29%	19	73.68%	15	60.00%	17	76.47%	20	75.00%

5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)

	Fall 2009	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2014
	Cohort Total	Cohort Graduation %										
English	34	35.29%	32	28.13%	24	50.00%	17	47.06%	30	53.33%	17	41.18%
English (1021)	13	46.15%	14	21.43%	15	53.33%	7	57.14%	13	53.85%	4	50.00%
English Teaching (1022)	21	28.57%	18	33.33%	9	44.44%	10	40.00%	17	52.94%	13	38.46%

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

Chris Drew, who teaches the English Teaching Methods class, has been especially focused on providing enhanced learning experiences for our teaching majors. He's welcomed young secondary teachers to his class to share their of-the-moment experiences. He's introduced long-time secondary teachers to share their sense of how the field has transformed. He has created opportunities for students to create professional portfolios during their student teaching semesters (connected with the English 402, a 1-hour course linked to student teaching). These very specific, course-specific opportunities help to make our English Teaching majors more able to succeed in their chosen profession.

Further, we have continued a variety of focused panels and workshops that emphasized professional (career) development. Topics included résumé/CV writing, personal/professional statements, applications to graduate schools, and so on. Of course, the ones for late spring were cancelled. However, with more technical proficiency (based on experience for faculty and students), we have begun this programs via Zoom.

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

It's hard to say. The Department has managed reasonably well in the current COVID-19-dominated world, but there's a lot going on this fall. I'm retiring at the end of the semester, so we're in the middle of the process for selecting an Interim Chairperson. For that reason, I have avoided trying to launch some initiatives that someone else will have to usher through. Further, the Department is also in the middle of a Self-Study Review; external reviewers currently have our documents, and late October and early November will be devoted to related Zoom meetings.

There are, of course, opportunities for improvement, but, in the short term, we have to complete our Self-Study, learn from it, ensure a smooth transition to a new Chairperson, and wrestle with the complications created by COVID-19.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs

If you submitted a report last year, you only need to resubmit if there are changes to your current career readiness competencies map.

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>

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?)**
- 2) findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
- 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
- 4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

Assessment in English has always been a tricky business because we've resisted the urge to use "quantifiable measures" to judge something that's more amorphous: the ability to read, interpret, analyze, and communicate in writing (primarily) and speaking (secondarily).

As our means to assess the work of our English Liberal Arts majors, we identified the final project in the capstone course: English 484 (Interrelations of Literature). Our specific assessment has involved evaluating the students' work based on seven primary traits (rhetorical stance, writing ability, organization, disciplinary understanding, synthesis of ideas, documentation, and technical skills). Although all seven criteria are assessed each year, we concentrate on several each year in order to focus our efforts.

-
1. **DISCOVERIES.** Although we have continual discussions about the quality of our students as they progress through our program—often observing that *this group* seems stronger than *that group*, our assessments show us that by the time they reach the end of our program, students are fairly uniformly prepared.

We've also discovered that the comprehensive assessments that we have done for selected Foundational Studies courses—English 101/English 105 (2012–2013), English 239 (2014–2015), and English 305 (2015–2016) have no bearing on our "assessment load," even though this kind of assessment is crucial to the University (and even our majors, since they must meet these FS requirements).

2. **CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS.** We have done several things differently: (a) we have begun the process of selecting an “early” paper or project to use as a “baseline” for our later, summative assessment of the final paper in English 484), and (b) we now assess *only* English Liberal Arts majors in English 484.

Having reviewed the papers from multiple 200-level courses, we are now ready to have the focused discussions that will allow us to select the course/project that will best serve our needs (beginning with fall 2017).

We have decided that we will not engage in comprehensive assessments of additional courses because such work has multiplied our “assessment load” and has been acknowledged only minimally.

3. **ASSESSMENT PLAN FOR NEXT YEAR.** We will review the strategies discussed in Part 1a, Column E: a review of the added elements in English 108, English 230, and English 308.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 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 practice and use 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: B.S. English Teaching	Overall Rating: Undeveloped (0.75/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description of course and measure used for assessment. The measure is a culminating project, providing summative evidence of student achievement. • Expectations are described in narrative detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes, as displayed in the report, are not outcomes. Include full outcome statements in the report. If these are the full statements, these should be revised to include a verb that signifies the level of mastery students should attain in the program and in what context. Let me know if resources are needed – I'm happy to help. Specific learning outcomes will help ensure all faculty in the program have a shared sense of intended student outcomes as well as teach to and evaluate performance relative to the outcomes. Specific outcomes are more measureable, giving you more accurate data on student learning achievement upon which to base curricular, pedagogical, or general program decisions. • Consider being even more specific about expectations for student achievement. If you are using rubrics, checklists, or other evaluative tools to rate student performance, note this. Rubrics are very helpful for measures that might include multiple performances, such as a lesson plan. The rubric could contain multiple dimensions (ex: activity planning, pedagogical approach, assessment plan, etc.) that could be evaluated separately to allow faculty to pinpoint areas of strength and weakness. This also allows you to provide your actual data in a format more suited to interpretation and use. The narrative reflection given in the report is useful, but it doesn't give insight into magnitude of achievement gaps or range of achievement, and it also may be hard for faculty who didn't author the report to interpret the findings.

- It is noted that the plan to improve student learning includes focus on skill development in earlier courses. Consider adding assessment from these courses to your assessment plan to provide formative data on whether these changes are having the intended effect, rather than waiting to rely solely on the summative measure of the final project to tell you this. By then it's too late to change anything for those graduating students. It's noted in Part 2 that you already do some form of this, though no data was provided nor reflections on the progress made. It is noted that the extra work this creates was "acknowledged only minimally," but I'm unsure what that means. Assessment practices should be helpful for faculty to inform what they know about student learning and how that shapes how and what they teach.
- Assessment in English doesn't have to be "tricky business," as noted in the report, and quantifiable measures aren't simply composite scores and statistics. Brian Stone is doing some great work using rubrics in Composition that provides faculty with meaningful, rich information on student progress that can be used to inform students about their learning and areas for improvement as well. There are many more examples of how assessment can enrich learning and teaching in English by providing feedback loops to students and faculty. I'm happy to share resources or talk more on this.
- Be sure to provide information on how assessment findings are shared among faculty and how faculty participate in assessment, including discussion and decisions of how to use assessment findings to shape teaching, curriculum, assessment, etc.

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No (program) learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<p>Analysis & Results</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided</p>
<p>Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided.</p>
<p>Overall Rating</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Mature</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developing</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped</p>

Please see reviewer notes for more details.