

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: Linguistics and TESL M.A.

Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Brian José = brian.jose@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

<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. CGPS outcome #3: <i>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</i></p> <p>This CGPS outcome aligns most closely with program outcome #4. (See part 1a, column e =>.)</p>	<p>(1.1) Students complete online research ethics training through the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) program, administered locally through ISU's Office of Sponsored Programs.</p> <p>(1.2) We typically require CITI certification in our research methods course (LLL 607), but some students obtain it in other courses (e.g., if they need certification for another course prior to taking LLL 607)</p>	<p>CITI program requirements are that a minimum 70% score is needed to pass the online test and become certified to conduct research with human subjects. As certification is an essential and indispensable pre-requisite to being able to apply for approval from ISU's IRB to conduct research with human subjects, we expect that <u>all</u> of our students will satisfy that requirement.</p>	<p>Of the 10 students enrolled in our MA program in 2018-2019, all 10 of them (100%) successfully completed the CITI training course and were certified to confront many of the ethical challenges that come with conducting research with human subjects. Their scores for the online training course ranged from 71% to 100%, with both mean and median scores of 91% and a std dev of 8.6%.</p>	<p>In response to feedback from last year's SOAS report, we identify the programmatic outcome that (most closely) aligns with this CGPS learning goal: Demonstrates ability to use appropriate resources ... in order to successfully complete course work requirements and produce significant research projects and/or thesis (program outcome #4).</p>
<p>as above</p> <p>continued</p>	<p>(2.1) Students were asked to identify one reason why "It is important to obtain IRB approval for research involving human subjects"</p> <p>(2.2) The question was included as part of our written "content" comprehensive M.A. exam in the spring (2019) semester.</p>	<p>Like CITI, we require students to earn a minimum score of 70% to pass our comprehensive exam. We expect that all of them will eventually pass. (They have up to 3 attempts.) Because of CITI training results, we expect all students should be able to answer this question, in particular, satisfactorily.</p>	<p>Responses were assigned one of three scores by the graduate faculty: 0 (no credit), 0.5 (partial credit), 1 (full credit). Five of five candidates opted to answer this question: four responses earned full credit and one earned partial credit (average score = 0.9).</p>	<p>as above</p> <p>continued</p>

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.

- 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):

- Cohort Sizes
- Year-to-Year Retention
- 5-Year Graduation Rate

1). cohort sizes

		start F15	start F16	start F17	start F18	start F19
number of majors		24	16	12	13	11
	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20
new students	15	9	5	6	5	not avail
admit-to-enroll %			43%	67%	55%	54%
degrees awarded	31	13	12	13	5	

2). year-to-year retention

Fall 2018 graduate retention rate = 75%
 Lang, Lit, Linguist - TESL/TEFL (1277) = 33%
 TESL and Linguistics (1268) = 100%

3). 5-year graduation rate

N.A. - graduation rates do not seem to be available in Blue Reports for graduate programs
 N.A. - our MA in TESL and Linguistics (1268) is a 2-year program (unless part-time); students either complete it or they don't

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

In 2018-2019, we took the following steps to support graduate student success. It remains to be seen whether or not they will be effective.

- We substantially revised our culminating experience, taking effect with the 2018-2019 incoming class. Rather than being rigidly confined to a 3-part comprehensive exam, students will select a career-appropriate option (according to, e.g., whether they plan to

seek employment as a language teacher or pursue an advanced graduate degree), with explicit guidelines being provided for each option.

- We created version 1.0 of our LLL graduate student handbook, which includes information on the new format of the culminating experience as well as other valuable and/or useful information about our program.

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

It's time for us to think seriously about revising and updating our program outcomes. While these are still relevant to our degree program, they reflect a historical period when we were able to offer (more) graduate courses in Spanish as well as in linguistics. (We do still offer occasional graduate courses in Spanish; in fall 2018, for example, two of our students took Span 595, a Spanish dialectology course.) As such, our program outcomes could ---should--- be more squarely oriented towards our current emphases and course offerings in TESL and linguistics.

Recruitment: we need more students in our program. The small cohorts are negatively affecting our course offerings (among other things), which is limiting our students' opportunities. For example, there are courses that we've had to scale back from offering every year to offering only every other year. If/When a student can't or won't take such a course the one time that it's offered during their time with us, then they simply miss out (whereas, in the past, they'd typically have had a 2nd opportunity to take the course).

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities

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>

The implementation of Career Readiness Competencies was always intended, as far as we know, to be an undergraduate initiative. Career readiness curriculum mapping was not carried out for the graduate program in LLL. However, we try to engage seriously with graduate-student career readiness, for example by encouraging them to go to conferences (see last year's assessment report) and/or taking them to conferences with us; by offering professionalization workshops; by offering professional internships; by involving them in our research projects; etc.

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**

1. Our assessment activities have allowed us to document something that we've long believed: that our MA students are capable of meeting standards not only of our program but of the discipline more generally. This speaks to their career readiness (e.g., they have a widely-accepted certification that they can itemize on their CVs) and, ultimately, to their prospects for success after leaving ISU. It stands to reason that if they are capable of satisfying industry standards in addition to MA program requirements, then there should be little question about their capacity to satisfy either employer requirements or the demands of an advanced graduate degree.
2. We will be able to put this industry training and certification to work in identifying at-risk students. If a student does not complete CITI training and obtain certification to conduct human-subjects research when this is asked of them, then we can be reasonably suspicious either that they are not serious about pursuing a graduate degree or that they might not have the wherewithal to complete a graduate degree. This, then will allow us an opportunity for early intervention. For those students who can and do meet the certification requirements, this instills confidence in their ability to complete and submit IRB applications for human subjects approval, which will be a pre-requisite to success in some cases. If they can manage CITI training, we can have a certain amount of faith in their ability to manage an IRB application.
3. In the previous assessment cycle, we assessed CGPS outcome #2; now, here, CGPS outcome #3. Our plan was to proceed to the next CGPS outcome (#4) this year, 2019-2020. **However**, nobody (including us) wants us to assess only CGPS outcomes, to the exclusion of our departmental outcomes. First, though, our departmental outcomes need to be updated. See part 1b, above. Therefore, that is where we intend to focus our assessment for 2019-2020: on revising and updating our programmatic outcomes.
4. All departmental assessment results are posted in Blackboard where LLL faculty can access them at will. The results will also be discussed at a meeting of the department's graduate committee and, presumably, at a meeting of the entire LLL dept.

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.

Dear Brian,

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: M.A. Linguistics & TESL	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcome is clear, specific, and measureable, and it is clearly aligned to the related GSLO.• Clear information is provided about the courses, assignments, and sampling method used for assessment.• Great use of the comprehensive exam question to uncover students' understanding and/or personal perspectives on the importance of IRB approval. This really links to the disposition expected of graduate students. Great use of measurement only of this section of the exam in reporting findings.• Again, great, collaborative approach among LLL faculty to determine how to address challenges and proceed with changes, such as those planned for the learning outcomes.• Clear information provided about how findings are shared and how faculty are involved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It definitely seems to be a good point in time to review and revise program learning outcomes, and you are definitely right that they should be the focus of your annual assessment rather than the Graduate Student Learning Outcomes from CGPS (though it's always helpful to note which GSLOs align with your outcomes). Let's talk more if you plan to not assess AY 19-20 learning outcomes while revising outcomes.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, 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, measurable, 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>Performance Goals & Measures</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 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>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 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>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>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<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>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<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>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</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>
Overall Rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped