

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18**

*Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

**Unit/Program Name:** \_\_ LLL – TESL and Linguistics (MA) \_\_\_\_\_ **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** \_Brian José = brian.jose@indstate.edu \_\_\_\_\_

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

**Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year’s report?</b></p>
<p>1. CGPS outcome #2: Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p>	<p>(1) Activities assessed: Student conference attendance</p> <p>(2) In multiple courses: LLL 590, 607; Ling 613</p>	<p>Our goal is that every MA student in our program attend at least one conference during their two-year period of study. Reaching 75% attendance in any one year reflects healthy participation and the likelihood of attaining the 100% target ---or nearly so--- in year two for those students who were not able to do so in year one.</p>	<p>We had 12 graduate students enrolled in our MA program for at least part of the 2017-2018 academic year.</p> <p>9 of the 12 (75%) either <i>presented at</i> and/or <i>attended</i> one or more off-campus conference(s) in 2017-2018</p> <p>Table 1, below, summarizes the level of students’ activity at the conferences that they attended.</p>	<p>A second language research group was created to promote research and provide a setting to hear and practice talks.</p> <p>We are striving to develop more ongoing collaborative projects with students.</p> <p>We are looking for and exploring opportunities and sources of funding to support student and student-faculty research.</p>

		level of student activity	
		attend as presenter	attend without presenting
conference	Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association	✓	✓
	New Ways of Analyzing Variation	✓	
	Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages	✓	
	American Association for Applied Linguistics		✓
	Southeastern Conference on Linguistics	✓	

Table 1

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.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must 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 must 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.
- 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: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

1) We had 12 graduate students enrolled in our MA program for at least part of the 2017-2018 academic year.

7 of the 12 (58%) were enrolled full time for the full academic year.

3 of the 12 (25%) were enrolled only in the fall semester.

--1 of those 3 completed the program and graduated in December.

--1 of those 3 completed courses in December; only culminating experience in spring.

--1 of those 3 didn't return to the program after the fall semester.

1 of the 12 (08%) was enrolled only in the spring semester, and, by the end, less than full time.

1 of the 12 (08%) was enrolled (full time) for only part of the spring semester (withdrawal).

9 of the 12 (75%) either *presented at* and/or *attended* one or more off-campus conference(s) in 2017-2018.

7 students gave a presentation at one or more conference(s)      7/12 = 58%

Note: 3 of 7 students gave 2 presentations

10 students gave 6 conference presentations

2/6 presentations :      1 student sole author

2/6 presentations :      1 student co-author with 1 faculty member (same prof for both)

1/6 presentations :      2 student co-authors

1/6 presentations :      4 student co-authors

7 students attended (but didn't present at) one or more conference(s)      7/12 = 50%

Note: 4 students attended (but didn't present at) more than one conference

2 students submitted 2 unsuccessful conference abstracts with faculty member co-authors

Based on these results, we conclude that our students are becoming appropriately initiated into the professional culture of the discipline and that they are gaining valuable relevant experience outside of the classroom as both students and researchers. Student attendance at conferences, either as an attendee and/or a presenter, requires students to engage with their field of discipline in a professional setting. They meet fellow graduate students, faculty, and other professional representatives from the field. They also participate in academic conversations concerning current research, best practices, and the profession itself. While it is difficult to qualify the students' attendance, quantifying it is straightforward: the data on attendance and presentations is a strong indicator that this learning outcome is being met.

2) For 2018-2019, our plan is to assess CGPS outcome #3: *Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.*

3) Assessment information is (will be) shared with the members of the department at department meetings, where plans are announced, data is requested, and reports are provided. We have also recently started storing documents (reports, tools, etc) in a departmental *Blackboard* site where any member of the department can access and review them according to their needs.

## Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. Enhance cohesiveness and a sense of community among our graduate students.	<p>Reallocate unused office space within the department for a graduate student lounge for socialization, study groups, and other purposes as appropriate.</p> <p>Sterling, D'Amico, Rider</p>	<p>Faculty report observances of students using the space.</p> <p>Faculty perceive fewer reports of student anxiety and personality conflicts.</p>	<p>Physical space had to be allocated. Furnishings, etc had to be acquired. Many of our grad students already had semi-private office space and, so, some time was needed for them to appreciate the potential value of this shared space.</p>	Continuing (ongoing upkeep, maintenance, etc)
2. Increase success rates on students' first attempt to pass comprehensive examinations.	<p>Provide clear(er) information earlier about exam format.</p> <p>Suggest repeatedly that students start studying for the exam sooner than has been the tradition.</p> <p>Meet with students individually to address weaknesses, offer strategies, etc.</p> <p>Develop a new and expanded bank of test questions.</p> <p>Bakos, D'Amico, José, Sterling</p>	<p>The number of 2nd and/or 3rd attempts to pass the exam.: If fewer exam retakes, then progress.</p>	<p>Several students who were identified as struggling in their first semester were able to pass the comprehensive exam on their first attempt.</p>	Continuing
3. Increase student participation in (extra-curricular) research activity.	<p>Faculty actively promoted student attendance of AAAL</p>	<p>Faculty and students are already collaborating on conference presentations</p>	<p>Graduate students are (or were)...</p>	Continuing

	<p>conference in nearby Chicago. (Bakos, D'Amico, Sterling)</p> <p>Faculty work with students on conference presentations, publications (and etc). (Bakos, D'Amico, José, Sterling)</p> <p>Creation of Second Language Research Group (D'Amico, Sterling)</p> <p>Engage students in other diverse aspects of research (Bakos, D'Amico, José, Sterling)</p>	<p>(see Part 1B) and other forms of research.</p>	<p>employed to collect internet-based data for linguistic analysis</p> <p>employed to help turn a language collection into a speech corpus</p> <p>involved in the YNSL (Why No Second Language) research project</p> <p>working with a faculty member on <i>language autonomy</i> research</p> <p>working with a faculty member on an accented speech project</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

## Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?**

*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.*

Not without exception, but generally speaking, our MA students are persistent: 13/13 = 100% of the students in the program in 2016-2017 either graduated or returned in 2017-2018. (Two of them who returned took the fall semester off but then came back in the spring semester.) The following year, 9/12 = 75% of the students in the program in 2017-2018 either graduated or returned this year. (Two of the three who didn't return this year are the same two who took the fall 2017 semester off.)

Not without exception, but generally speaking, our MA students are also likely to complete the program. Of the 28 students who've gone through the program in the last 3 years (including those who started it 4 years ago), 21 of them (=75%) have successfully completed it. The other 7 (=25%) either chose to leave the program, were dismissed from it, or were unable to pass the comprehensive exams. The very small number of students who were unable to pass the exams were monitored and given multiple opportunities to attend meetings where they were provided with various strategies to prepare for the exam. The students who were unable to pass appeared to faculty to lack the dedication, commitment, or determination needed to succeed. Noticing that around one quarter of our students were not completing the program over the last several years, we took steps to try to remedy the situation.

One strategy that we implemented in order to increase retention and persistence was to create a collective space for students to use. We noticed that students who were not working as TAs and, therefore, who did not have offices showed less of a presence around the department and were less likely to work with other students or to take advantage of faculty office hours. This new collective space has been utilized by many of our graduate students. They organize projects, host study groups, and study individually there when their office mate is holding office hours to meet with undergraduates. Students have also used the space as a comfortable place to 'unplug' for a while. We often hear stories of students napping or watching movies. We believe that these sorts of breaks are good for the mental health of otherwise stressed students.

Another major change that we have made targets student performance. Faculty regularly discuss students' work in committee meetings in order to ascertain whether students are making satisfactory progress toward their degree. These informal progress reports help us to gauge students' strengths and weaknesses. They have also enabled us to initiate intervention measures with students who show signs that they are struggling. One example of this was a faculty member who worked with an international student identified as having weak writing skills. The student would write for 15 minutes while the faculty worked on other tasks, and then they would evaluate the writing together. That student, who struggled to write a single page in their first semester, only needed one attempt to pass the written comprehensive exam two years later. Open door policies encourage students to discuss other issues that can affect their academic performance, such as stress, homesickness (many of our MA students are international students), and others.

Finally, the department is working hard to help students achieve their career goals. In the previous several years we have made great strides towards promoting collaboration within the program. In particular, changes to departmental promotion and tenure guidelines now recognize the value of collaborative research, thereby permitting students to join faculty members' ongoing research projects. The newly-created second language research group (SLRG) promotes science and research in our department to help students better understand how to be an academic. We have held various workshops with students to discuss professional etiquette (e.g., at conferences), applying to PhD programs, and other topics. While we have done a respectable job promoting research and continued education, we haven't yet done as much on other career paths, including teaching.

Dear Brian,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are 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)

<b>Program: TESL &amp; Linguistics MA</b>	
<b>Assessment Practice Overall Rating:</b> Mature (2.56/3.00) <b>Student Success Practice Overall Rating:</b> Mature (2.00/3.00)	
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Good alignment using a CGPS outcome for assessment.</li><li>• Good information on how many students participated and at what level of engagement (attendance v. presentation).</li><li>• Clear discussion of findings, suggestions for supporting continued student success, and information about sharing.</li><li>• Good note of the ongoing assessment that will be done in the next cycle.</li><li>• <b>Student success goals hang together nicely – enhance community, improve success rate on comprehensives, encourage student participation in faculty research. The focus on student-faculty research is a unique goal compared across programs, so one to highlight.</b></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Are there articulated learning outcomes for your program that are separate from but related to the CGPS outcomes? If so, list those along with the corresponding CGPS outcome to show specificity to your program and alignment to CGPS.</li><li>• You may consider creating targets that indicate the engagement and meaningfulness of contributions students are making in these professional environments to better capture achievement of the learning outcome beyond attendance. You do that a bit in your reporting with the notation of attending and/or presenting, so I think you've got a good start for this. This will help you set target expectations for the quality of your students' engagement and create evaluative tools, like a checklist or rubric, that will indicate the deeper level of engagement I believe the outcome is written toward. Even including ways you prepare students for these environments or debrief with them after to understand their gains would help sharpen the information you receive about their learning.</li></ul>

Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below.

Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

**Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Rubric**

**Unit/Program: TESL & Linguistics MA**

**Office of Assessment & Accreditation, Indiana State University**

**Evaluation Date: Fall 2018**

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, 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, measureable, 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><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></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</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</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>



	<p>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>student learning, including at least one direct measure.</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>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	
<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<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 accreditor 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>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<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>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>

	A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>