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

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	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?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	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.*
1.Rhetorical Stance (role, audience, and purpose) 2.Writing Ability (expression of ideas in prose) 3. Organization (logical arrangement from paragraph to paper/project) 4. Disciplinary Understanding (awareness of literature and language) 5. Synthesis of Ideas (use of multiple sources and perspectives) 6. Documentation (use of citation of others' work) 7. Technical Skills (grammar, usage, and mechanics)	1 and 2. We use the final paper in English 484 (Interrelationships of Literature). English 484 is the "capstone" course for English majors; consequently, we expect to see evidence that all of the principles listed in Column 1a are in use. [English 484 is not only our capstone, but it is also an approved UDIE course for Foundational Studies. We, therefore, base our review on only English majors—excluding UDIE students.)	The seven principles noted in Column 1a provide a full range of assessment—from global to particular. We expect majors to incorporate this full range to thinking and writing skills; however, we're also realistic and know that few students will excel in all assessment categories. Nonetheless, we assume that our majors in good standing will, on average, "meet expectations" across categories, and we hope that most students will "exceed expectations" in some (if not most) categories.	I have attached the Fall 2018 summary of class results. *Stance:* 75% "Exceeds"; 25% "Meets" *Writing:* 66.6% "Exceeds"; 33.3% "Meets" *Organization:* 83.3% "Exceeds"; 16.7% "Meets" *Disciplinary Understanding:* 66.6% "Exceeds"; 33.3% "Meets" *Synthesis:* 58.3% "Exceeds"; 41.7% "Meets" *Documentation:* 58.3% "Exceeds"; 33.3% "Meets"; 8.3% "Does Not Meet" *Technical:* 50% "Exceeds"; 41.7% "Meets"; 8.3% "Does Not Meet"	As we would expect, English majors are generally effective communicators in writing. They have, generally, a good sense of stance (1); they write effectively (2); they organize well (3); they understand their discipline (4); they deal with ideas successfully (5); and they know how to document work from other sources. However, they continue to struggle with some technical elements of writing (7)—although they skills are still strong by most standards

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

Table 1: Cohort Group

2016	2017	2018	2019
58	59	69	52

Table 2: Year-to-Year Retention

2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
28.13%	50%	47.06%	53.33%	41.18%

Table 3. Five-Year Graduation Rate

2010	2011	2012	2013	2014

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

- **Regularized Instruction in Early Courses in the Major.** We have begun to restrict who teaches entry-level courses (English 108, English 230, English 240, and English 250). We decided that these "gateway" courses should have a more consistent "vision"; consequently, these courses rotate among a smaller group of faculty, who work together closely to ensure that there is more consistency in methodology than existed in the past (when the goals were consistent but the methodology varied more).

- **Landini Series (see below).** These sessions were well attended and generated a great deal of enthusiasm among our students.

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

- **A Proposal to Create Concentrations in the Major**. The Undergraduate Committee presented to the Department a proposal to create two concentrations in the English major: one in literature and one in creative writing. The proposal passed at the last Department meeting. By providing students with the opportunity to focus their studies, we hope that this curricular change will build our program and attract additional students (this dual-focus option will make us, we believe, more competitive with other institutions). Our opportunity/challenge will be to usher

this program through the curricular-review process (via Curriculog) and then create the scheduling and course revisions that will facilitate the change.

- **Landini Series (see below)**. We want to expand this series even more. Additional topics to consider are interviews, graduate program review, upgrading/expanding technical skills (Photoshop, PageMaker, web design programs), and others.

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 <u>not</u> expected that every course in your curriculum correspond to a career readiness competency.

- **English 308 (Practical Criticism)** is the upper-division writing course for English majors. The course fulfills the Foundational Studies junior-level composition requirement and, therefore, must meet FS goals. However, we have found time in English 308 (as well as *all* junior composition courses) to present a specific unit on professional writing. The unit requires that students create a cover letter, résumé, and course list.

- **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 discoveries are fairly specific: English majors manage content well and the structural and idea-oriented features of writing; they also need more focused instruction on the technical elements of writing (they still perform better than most student writers, but our standards for them are higher, as might be expected). Our rethinking of the "gateway" courses—with shared strategies—will allow us, we believe, to address these issues in a targeted, more strategic way.

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

   I believe the plans are covered above. However, our new chair of the Assessment Committee (Brian Stone, who is an officer of the University's Assessment Council) will help to guide us toward a more strategic approach to assessment.

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

   We will review the assessments of English 240 and English 250 to see whether our patterns of review have provided helpful data; if the process seems positive and productive, then we will refine it; if the results are only marginally useful, then we'll try, try again.

4) **how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

Results will be shared with teachers of key courses—for example, the teachers of the "gateway" courses described above. 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.

Undergraduate Assessment: Final Projects in English 484 (Fall 2018 Class)
Brendan Corcoran

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Rhetorical Stance (role, audience, and purpose)	9	3	
Writing Ability (expression of ideas in prose)	8	4	
Organization (logical arrangement: from paragraph to paper/project)	10	2	
Disciplinary Understanding (awareness of literature and language)	8	4	
Synthesis of Ideas (use of multiple sources and perspectives)	7	5	
Documentation (use and citation of others' work)	7	4	1
Technical Skills (grammar, usage, and mechanics)	6	5	1

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: B.A. English	Overall Rating: Developing (1.88/3.00)
Strengths	**Recommendations**
- Courses where assessments of learning outcomes will take place and specific assignments used for assessment are described. - Good note that only English majors are included in the data. - Expectations for student performance are generally described, and actual performance is clearly described by attainment level. - Good information about changes that have been/will be made as a result of findings, specifically in targeting improvement to student understanding and application of technical elements of writing. - 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.	- Learning Outcomes are written more as content area checklists, so some of them aren't measureable as written (e.g., Rhetorical Stance (role, audience, and purpose). - Information about how performance was evaluated (e.g., rubric, checklist, etc.) would give better context for the scores reported.

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

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