|  |
| --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2020-2021** |
| *PCAL* | *English* |
| *English Major (662)* |
| *Ted Hovet* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.*** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1:** Use textual evidence to build an interpretation  |
| **Instrument 1** | Student Portfolios – Capstone courses |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **X****[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2:** Incorporate material from secondary sources to support an original analysis |
| **Instrument 1** | Student Portfolios – Capstone courses |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[ ]  Met** | **X****[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3:**  Correctly document secondary sources |
| **Instrument 1** | Student Portfolios – Capstone courses |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[ ]  Met** | **X****[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)**  |
| As we did not meet the goals set for these learning outcomes, we will assess them again in the 2021-22 ASL cycle. The actions we had planned to take to address these three SLOs in AY 2020-21 were superseded by the necessary attention to remote learning and to DEI – two pedagogical issues that responded to the immediate needs of students and that we thoroughly explored in our departmental meetings and our monthly pedagogy chats in 2020-21. While we will be no means let up on our attention to these two matters, we now feel that time and attention can be brought back to these SLOs – all of which are a part of the larger program goals for EST and for English. Detailed actions and timelines are in report below for each SLO. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Use textual evidence to build an interpretation  |
| **Measurement Instrument 1**  | Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from all three English Capstone Courses (ENG 416, literature; ENG 414, professional writing, and ENG 413, creative writing.) This learning outcome falls under the department’s larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to successfully incorporate evidence into their writing, and each capstone course assigned student writing that addressed this goal.  |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The language in this rubric is freely adapted from the [AAC&U Value Rubrics](https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics) provided for us by the WKU ASL Office. Instead of creating prose for each possible nuance on a 5-point scale we have created a high, middle, and low end target. RUBRIC5 (highest score) Evidence is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation to develop a comprehensive analysis. 3 (middle score) Evidence is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis. 1 (lowest score) Evidence is taken from source(s) without any interpretation. N/A = No information is taken from source(s)A score of 4 or higher is deemed to be successful. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 70% 4.0 or higher, none at 2.0 or lower. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 42% of students achieved a 4.0 or higher; none received a 2.0 or lower. |
| **Methods**  | 43 students across the three capstone courses (approx. 25% of total number of English majors, all of whom are seniors) submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. A representative number of artifacts from each class (selected at random by assigning each student a code number, then using a random number generator) was made anonymous and evaluated independently by three faculty members using the rubric guidelines above. To assure that the same criteria were being applied across the major, each reviewer was given samples from all three concentrations (Creative Writing, Professional Writing, Literature). At least 33% of students in each of the capstones (Lit, CW, PW) were evaluated and included in the data. |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **X****[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| The results for this SLO were disappointing, but we are pleased the rubric was able to give us guidance for where the student writing was coming up short of our expectations. 25% of students scored between 3.5 and 3.99, which indicates that while we fell well short of our goals improvement is within reach. **ACTIONS**: (NOTE – These actions are nearly identical to the actions we had planned for 2020-21. However, the attention to student learning throughout AY 2020-21 in departmental meetings and workshops was shifted to best practices in remote learning and in pedagogy that attends to our goals for DEI within the department.)-The program assessment committee will identify samples of student writing that achieved the outcome and samples that did not achieve it to share with faculty and further discuss our expectations for this SLO (ASL workshops within our pre-semester retreat, Fall 2021)-Faculty will be encouraged to incorporate more direct instruction on this SLO in classes for English majors (AY 2021-22)-The English department will assess this same learning outcome this year in hopes of identifying improvement. (2021-22 assessment cycle) |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| August 2021: Faculty will discuss at our pre-fall semester retreat classes in addition to Capstones that may provide opportunity to further develop this SLO as an overall goal for the major and will gather additional student artifacts to assess. Fall 2021: Faculty will use artifacts from 2019-2021 (we now have two full cycles of artifacts to use since we evaluated the same one in 201-20) to identify the most successful examples of this SLO and to identify common problems2021-22 Assessment Cycle: Reassess this SLO |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| This SLO will be assessed in the 2020-21 Cycle.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Incorporate material from secondary sources to support an original analysis |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from all three English Capstone Courses (ENG 416, literature; ENG 414, professional writing, and ENG 413, creative writing.) This learning outcome falls under the department’s larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to successfully incorporate evidence into their writing, and each capstone course assigned student writing that addressed this goal.  |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The language in this rubric is freely adapted from the [AAC&U Value Rubrics](https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics) provided for us by the WKU ASL Office. Instead of creating prose for each possible nuance on a 5-point scale we have created a high, middle, and low end target.5 (highest score) Demonstrates skillful use of high quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas in support of an original analysis. 3 (middle score) Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources, but did not consistently incorporate them well to support an original analysis. 1 (lowest score) Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing, but did not incorporate them to support original analysis. N/A Does not attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing. A score of 4 or higher is deemed to be successful. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 70% 4.0 or higher, none at 2.0 or lower | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 33% of students scored 4.0 or higher, 0 scored 2.0 or lower. |
| **Methods**  | 43 students across the three capstone courses (approx. 25% of total number of English majors, all of whom are seniors) submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. Each sample was made anonymous and evaluated independently by three faculty members using the rubric guidelines above. To assure that the same criteria were being applied across the major, each reviewer was given samples from all three concentrations (Creative Writing, Professional Writing, Literature). |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[ ]  Met** | **X****[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| We are going to follow the same plan of action as for SLO #1, making sure to clarify that SLO#1 focuses on primary textual evidence while this one focuses on secondary sources. Once again a good percentage of students came reasonably close to our goal (25% scored between 3.5 and 3.99), suggesting that we need to address the SLO with care but without calling for a major overhaul of the program. **ACTIONS**: (NOTE – These actions are nearly identical to the actions we had planned for 2020-21. However, the attention to student learning throughout AY 2020-21 in departmental meetings and workshops was shifted to best practices in remote learning and in pedagogy that attends to our goals for DEI within the department.)-The program assessment committee will identify samples of student writing that achieved the outcome and samples that did not achieve it to share with faculty and further discuss our expectations for this SLO (Pre-Fall Semester Retreat 2021)-Faculty will be encouraged to incorporate more direct instruction on this SLO in classes for English majors (AY 2021-22)-The English department will assess this same learning outcome this year in hopes of identifying improvement. (2021-22 assessment cycle) |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| August 2021: Faculty will discuss at pre-fall semester retreat classes in addition to Capstones that may provide opportunity to further develop this SLO as an overall goal for the major and will gather additional student artifacts to assess. Fall 2021: Faculty will use artifacts from 2019-2021(we now have two full cycles of artifacts to use since we evaluated the same one in 201-20) to identify the most successful examples of this SLO and to identify common problems2021-22 Assessment Cycle: Reassess this SLO |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| This SLO will be assessed in the 2021-22 assessment cycle.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Correctly document secondary sources |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Direct Measure**: Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from all three English Capstone Courses (ENG 416, literature; ENG 414, professional writing, and ENG 413, creative writing.) This learning outcome falls under the department’s larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to successfully incorporate evidence into their writing, and each capstone course assigned student writing that addressed this goal. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | 5 (highest score): Internal and External Citations are correct throughout following the appropriate documentation style (e.g. MLA) for the assignment. 3 (middle score): Internal and/or External Citations are generally correct, but have a few major errors OR persistent small errors1 (lowest score): Internal and/or External Citations are attempted, but done incorrectly throughout.N/A: No citationsA score of 4 or higher is deemed to be successful. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 70% of students will score 4.0 or higher, none will score 2.0 or lower. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 50% scored 4.0 or higher, none scored 2.0 or lower. |
| **Methods**  | 43 students across the three capstone courses submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. Each sample was made anonymous and evaluated independently by three faculty members using the rubric guidelines above. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[ ]  Met** | **X****[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| We were disappointed to see this SLO decline from the 2019-20 assessment cycle, with 10% fewer students meeting our goal. There were also considerable differences (unlike the other two SLOs) in the scores given by faculty evaluators, suggesting that perhaps the faculty does now share wide agreement on what counts as “correct” documentation. ACTIONS: (NOTE – These actions are nearly identical to the actions we had planned for 2020-21. However, the attention to student learning throughout AY 2020-21 in departmental meetings and workshops was shifted to best practices in remote learning and in pedagogy that attends to our goals for DEI within the department.)-Share student artifacts with faculty as the pre-fall English department retreat to explore why students are failing to meet our expectations-Clarify as a faculty what counts as “correct documentation” within the major, using professional citation guides (MLA, APA, Chicago) as the standard for judgment-The English department will assess this same learning outcome this year in hopes of identifying improvement. (2021-22 assessment cycle |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| August 2021 – Discuss correct citation standards at pre-semester faculty retreat.Fall 2021 – Discuss as a faculty the frequency and role of assigning student writing that requires citation. Spring 2022 – Gather artifacts for the assessment cycle that require external citation.2021-22 Assessment cycle: Reassess this SLO.  |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| This SLO will be assessed in the 2020-21 cycle.  |