

Degree Program Name: English—Liberal Arts

Contact Name and E-mail: Robert Perrin (Robert.perrin@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.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <u>Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</u> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) 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 expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1. Writing Ability (expression of ideas in prose)</p>	<p>Final project for English 484: Interrelations of Literature (our "capstone" course).</p>	<p>Students in our major have generally strong writing skills, so we expect them to succeed; however, a large number of non-majors also take this class. Our goal, therefore, is 60–70 percent in the "exceeds expectations" and "meets expectations" categories; further, fewer than 20 percent should be in the "does not meet expectations" category.</p>	<p>The results in this category are inconclusive because we haven't effectively separated majors from non-majors: 28 students (of 37) were rated "exceeds expectations" or "meets expectations." The 73.6% in "exceeds" or "meets" meets our expectations. (This is a lower rating than last year's 80.9%.)</p>	<p>The data were collected by Brendan Corcoran, the faculty member who regularly teaches the course (usually one section each year—although sometimes two sections). The data were then analyzed by Robert Perrin, Chairperson.</p> <p>We share these results at Department meetings (at the beginning of the subsequent semester: fall data shared in the spring; spring data shared in the fall).</p>
<p>2. Organization (logical arrangement from paragraph to paper/project)</p>	<p>Final project for English 484: Interrelations of Literature (our "capstone" course).</p>	<p>Even given the complexity of the final project, we expect students to succeed, with 60 percent in the "exceeds expectations" and "meets expectations" categories; further, fewer than 20 percent should be in the "does not meet expectations"</p>	<p>The results in this category are acceptable, even though we haven't effectively separated majors from non-majors: 28 students (of 37) were rated "exceeds expectations" or "meets expectations." The 73.6% in "exceeds" or "meets" meets</p>	<p>The data were collected by Brendan Corcoran and analyzed by Robert Perrin.</p> <p>We share these results at Department meetings.</p>

		category.	our expectations. (This is a lower rating than last year's 80.9%.)	
3. Disciplinary Understanding (awareness of literature and language)	Final project for English 484: Interrelations of Literature (our "capstone" course).	Seen in a holistic way, the final project "tells the tale." We expect students to succeed, with 60 percent or higher in the "exceeds expectations" and "meets expectations" categories; further, fewer than 20 percent should be in the "does not meet expectations" category.	The results in this category are disappointing—even though we realize that some of the problems exist because we haven't effectively separated majors from non-majors: 25 students (of 37) were rated "exceeds expectations" and "meets expectations." The 67.5% in "exceeds" or "meets" meets our expectations, but not by much. (This is considerably lower rating than last year's 80.9%.)	The data were collected by Brendan Corcoran and analyzed by Robert Perrin. We share these results at Department meetings.

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

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 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).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

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 our assessments aren't consistently helpful because non-majors can take English 484 as an Upper-Division Integrative Elective; we believe that these students are (at least potentially) skewing our results (see #2 below for future plans).

We've also discovered 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 need to do several things differently: (a) we need to identify some "assessment points" earlier in the program than English 484, which will require some discussion among the members of the Department; and (b) we need to create a pattern for "blind review" for English 484 that will, nonetheless, allow us to sift out the results that relate to our majors only.

We also need to stop doing assessments of non-major courses since it multiplies our "assessment load" and is acknowledged only minimally.

3. **ASSESSMENT PLAN FOR NEXT YEAR.** We need to rethink our assessment goals to focus on only our majors. That rethinking will need to occur in the early fall so that we can concentrate our efforts internally; further, we'll need to reconstitute our assessment group to reflect this shift in focus. The new group will need to (a) identify major courses for which earlier assessments can be meaningful, (b) devise and administer the assessments, and (c) evaluate the data. Additionally, we'll need to develop a strategy to separate the majors from the non-majors in the English 484 assessment.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BA in English Date: 8.19.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that

				<p>demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
3. Results	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. 2</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust</p>

	<p>(planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>the results of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.</p>	<p>activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

Please submit next year's report as a Word document so that I can append the scoring rubric and my comments to it.

1. Learning Outcomes

The "outcomes" identified in the Student Learning Summary Report (writing ability, organization, disciplinary understanding) are important categories of learning, but they are not program outcomes. Nor do they match the items labeled "outcomes" in the Outcomes Library or the Curriculum Map. Please revise these documents.

2. Measures & Performance Goals

The program uses the final project to measure students' attainment of the outcomes. What does this project entail? At least 60% of students are expected to meet or exceed expectations (and fewer than 20% are expected to NOT meet them). Even though there are non-majors in the course, is the 60% threshold high enough--particularly given the actual results and the fact that this is a capstone course? Once you can separate majors and non-majors, I assume you will raise the bar at least for the former?

3. Results

Students appear to have met expectations for all three outcomes (though the discussion in 1.d. is a bit confusing). In addition to the numerical results you list in Part One, please use Part Two to discuss what you learned about students' knowledge and skills, based on the categories you use to assess them (rhetorical stance, writing ability, etc.). Those detailed results should help you pinpoint earlier courses where some additional emphasis on X is needed.

4. Engagement & Improvement

Because the data for this assessment cycle came from a single course, one individual was responsible for collecting them and a second for analyzing and sharing the results (which will occur this fall). Part Two notes that students generally are well prepared, and it identifies several areas for improvement related to the assessment plan itself: Separating results for majors and non-majors; creating additional assessment points; and focusing assessment to reduce the workload (or more likely, redirect it). I am sympathetic to the fact that the department bears responsibility for assessing both the major and general education, and I appreciate your work. You may have heard that Foundational Studies has created a schedule for assessing key outcomes (writing, oral communication, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning) over a repeating, four-year cycle. I hope this will reduce your workload as well.

I look forward to hearing more about the specifics of what your students know and can do well (and less well) and what your plans are to help them continue to improve.