|  |
| --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2021-2022** |
| *PCAL* | *English* |
| *English (662)*  |
| *Ted Hovet* |

***Is this an online program***? [ ]  Yes [ ] X No

|  |
| --- |
| ***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 (NOTE: This does NOT require students to use secondary sources. Primary source only – e.g. close reading of a poem - is fine). This is one facet of Learning Outcome 2 -**  **Analyze, interpret, and critically discuss a diverse variety of texts.** |
| **Instrument 1** | Student writing samples from Capstone courses (ENG 413, 414, 416)  |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **X****[ ]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2: Incorporate material from secondary sources to support an original analysis.  This is a facet of Student Learning Outcome 7 - Conduct academic research and document it appropriately.** |
| **Instrument 1** | Student writing samples from Capstone courses (ENG 413, 414, 416)  |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **X****[ ]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3: Correctly Document Secondary Sources. This is a facet of Student Learning Outcome 7 - Conduct academic research and document it appropriately.** |
| **Instrument 1** | Student writing samples from Capstone courses (ENG 413, 414, 416)  |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **X****[ ]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)**  |
| We consider SLO #1 to be successfully achieved, and will move forward with a different SLO. SLO #2 will likely be revised. SLO #3 will be replaced. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | **Use textual evidence to build an interpretation (NOTE: This does NOT require students to use secondary sources. Primary source only – e.g. close reading of a poem - is fine)**. **This is one facet of Learning Outcome 2 -**  **Analyze, interpret, and critically discuss a diverse variety of texts.** |
| **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% of student artifacts rated at 4 or higher, none at 3 or lower.  | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 88% received an average rating of 4 or higher, 0 received 3 or lower.  |
| **Methods**  | 43 students across the three capstone courses (approx. 25% of total number of English majors) 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) were 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.** | **X****[ ]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| We were very pleased at the significant improvement in this learning outcome from 2020-21. While we understand that success in one sample year does not meant that this learning outcome does not merit continued attention, we feel that the department’s attention to close reading over the past several years is showing as students move through the program. -Fall 2022: Collect samples of student artifacts that were especially successful in this learning outcome. These artifacts will be saved as models for faculty and, potentially, students. -AY 2022-23: The department will revisit the 2017 core student learning outcomes to determine the place of close reading within the department’s curriculum (see Follow-Up below)-AY 2022-23: Determine a Student Learning Outcome from the existing or revised list of Student Learning Outcomes for the major to replace this SLO.  |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| August 2022: English faculty will discuss at our pre-fall semester retreat the qualities of successful student artifacts for this SLO and where best to archive them for use in faculty development and in teaching. Fall 2022 (with additional follow-up as needed): Revisit the 2017 Core Student Learning Outcomes for all English majors. These are now five years old, and we will address the continued relevance of these specific SLOs and the potential for updating and revising them. 2022-23 Assessment Cycle: Replace this SLO with one from the existing or revised list of Student Learning Outcomes |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| Using textual evidence to build an interpretation is central to the mission of the English department and will remain in some form in any core list of SLOs. Following our discussion and potential revision of the core SLOs, we will insert this back into our assessment cycle no later than 2025-26.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | **Incorporate material from secondary sources to support an original analysis. This is a facet of Student Learning Outcome 7 - Conduct academic research and document it appropriately.** |
| **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.  |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 70% of student artifacts rated at 4 or higher, none at 3 or lower. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 70% of student artifacts were rated at 4 or higher. Two (12%) were rated three or lower.  |
| **Methods**  | 43 students across the three capstone courses (approx. 25% of total number of English majors) 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) were 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, 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.) |
| This was again a strong improvement from when we measured the same SLO in 2020-21. Though we achieved the upper end of our target we still have some student artifacts that show significant problems in demonstrating this SLO. We will assess this again in the 2022-23 cycle, though it is possible the wording of the SLO may change following the potential revisions to the core English department SLOs. -Fall 2022: Collect samples of student artifacts that were especially successful and those that failed in this learning outcome. These artifacts will be saved as models for faculty and, potentially, students. -AY 2022-23: The department will revisit the 2017 core student learning outcomes to determine the place of this SLO within the department’s curriculum (see Follow-Up below)-AY 2022-23: Assess this SLO again. |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| August 2022: English faculty will discuss at our pre-fall semester retreat the qualities of successful and unsuccessful student artifacts for this SLO and where best to archive them for use in faculty development and in teaching. Fall 2022 (with additional follow-up as needed): Revisit the 2017 Core Student Learning Outcomes for all English majors. These are now five years old, and we will address the continued relevance of these specific SLOs and the potential for updating and revising them. 2022-23 Assessment Cycle: Assess this SLO again, with possible adjustment to the language of the SLO following our revision of the core English SLOs.  |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| This will be assessed in the 2022-23 assessment cycle.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | **Correctly Document Secondary Sources. This is a facet of Student Learning Outcome 7 - Conduct academic research and document it appropriately.** |
| **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): Internal and External Citations are correct throughout. 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 citations |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 70% of student artifacts rated at 4 or higher, none at 3 or lower. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 76% of student artifacts scored 4 or higher, none scored 3 or lower. |
| **Methods**  | 43 students across the three capstone courses (approx. 25% of total number of English majors) 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) were 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, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **X****[ ]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| This SLO has been met, and was also felt by several faculty to be too “mechanical” to demonstrate more complex skills in using sources within a piece of writing. For that reason we are going to take it out of our assessment cycle and replace it with something that better fits those larger goals. -Fall 2022: Report to faculty as fall retreat that this SLO has been met and will cycle off our future ASL plans. -AY 2022-23: The department will revisit the 2017 core student learning outcomes to determine the best way to demonstrate that students successfully make use of properly documented secondary sources (see Follow-Up below).-AY 2022-23: Determine a Student Learning Outcome from the existing or revised list of Student Learning Outcomes for the major to replace this SLO. |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| August 2022: English faculty will discuss at our pre-fall semester retreat the qualities of successful and unsuccessful student documentation of secondary sources and where best to archive them for use in faculty development and in teaching. Fall 2022 (with additional follow-up as needed): Revisit the 2017 Core Student Learning Outcomes for all English majors. These are now five years old, and we will address the continued relevance of these specific SLOs and the potential for updating and revising them. 2022-23 Assessment Cycle: Determine a Student Learning Outcome from the existing or revised list of Student Learning Outcomes for the major to replace this SLO. |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| This SLO will be removed from future ASL cycles and replaced by something more appropriate (see Follow-Up above).  |

**\*\*\* Please include Curriculum Map (below/next page) as part of this document**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Requirement** | **Course Number and Title** | **LO1:** **Understand explicitly the development and use of spoken and written language** | **LO2:** **Analyze, interpret, and critically discuss a diverse variety of texts** | **LO3:** **Analyze argumentative and persuasive techniques in a variety of genres** | **LO4:** **Compose successfully in multiple genres, media, and formats** | **LO5:** **Demonstrate a strong understanding of the history and development of literature in English in a global context** | **LO6:** **Analyze a diverse variety of texts through multiple theories and histories** | **LO7:** **Conduct academic research and document it appropriately** |
| Intro to Major | ENG 299: Introduction to English Studies |  | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Grammar | ENG 204: English Language | I, M, A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing (1) | ENG 203: Intro to Creative WritingENG 306: Business WritingENG 307: Technical WritingENG 401: Advanced CompositionENG 410: Comp. Theory & Practice |  |  | R | R |  |  |  |
| Rhetoric (1) | ENG 212: Intro to Digital Texts & MediaENG 201: Argument and AnalysisENG 412 Theories of Rhetoric and Persuasion | R |  | M | R |  | R |  |
| British & American Surveys (2) | ENG 381: Survey of British Literature IENG 382: Survey of British Literature IIENG 391: Survey of American Literature IENG 392: Survey of American Literature II |  | R |  | R | R | R | R |
| World Literature | ENG 385: Studies in World Literature |  | R |  | R | R | R | R |
| Upper-Level Literature Elective (1) | Select one 300- or 400- level literature elective from the departmental offerings |  | M |  | R |  | R | R |
| Capstone (1) | ENG 413: Creative Writing CapstoneENG 414: Professional Writing CapstoneENG 416: Literature/EST Capstone |  | A | A | M, A | M, A | M, A | M, A |