Assurance of Student Learning 2019-2020	
Potter College of Arts and Letters	English Department
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages 478	

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: Ability to articulate a logical and supported argument.			
Instrument 1	DIRECT: Analysis of practicum research paper		
Instrument 2			
Instrument 3			
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.		<mark>Met</mark>	Not Met
Student Learning Outcome 2: Ability to gather evidence to address an issue			
Instrument 1	DIRECT: Analysis of practicum research paper		
Instrument 2			
Instrument 3			
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.		<mark>Met</mark>	Not Met
Student Learning Outcome 3: Ability to synthesize and analyze assembled evidence			
Instrument 1	DIRECT: Analysis of practicum research paper		
Instrument 2			
Instrument 3			
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.		<mark>Met</mark>	Not Met
Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)			
Overall, we met or exceeded our three student learning objectives. All of the learning objectives address a TESOL minor's ability to understand and apply evidence to make an argument or solve a problem. This is a skill all professionals working with second language learners must have as language acquisition is a complex process that rarely manifests as a 'textbook' example. In general, we have instituted several curricular changes stemming from TESOL faculty assessment meetings to further develop articulation and critical thinking to move more students into the exceeds expectations category.			

Student Learning Outcome 1	
Student Learning Outcome	**Ability to articulate a logical and supported argument.**
Measurement Instrument 1	This assessment protocol requires students write, expand, and revise one paper in three classes (469, 470, 471). This allows them to see continuity in the program and combine the theoretical with the pedagogical. It also allows the faculty to develop students' research and writing skills over an extended period.
Criteria for Student Success	Average score of 2 or higher in all categories on the articulation rubric (3=exceeds expectations, 2=meets expectations, 1=below expectations). Rubric attached to this document.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	75% of students	Percent of Program Achieving Target	89% of students

Methods	Each TESOL faculty member independently scored the final revised research paper in ENG 471 using the articulation rubric. Nineteen undergraduate students were evaluated. Only two students received a rating of below expectations on the articulation rubric.

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

While we met our goal, our analysis of the articulation rubric showed that students scored between a 2.5 and a 2 in two areas: effective abstract and sufficient title. Based on these scores, we added an assignment to ENG 407. The critical analysis assignment requires students to write a 300-word summary of an article on L2 phonetic perception/acquisition and provide the APA reference. The instructor draws parallels between the critical analysis and the skills of writing an abstract.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

As indicated above, our students met the program success target. The program faculty will devote one meeting at the end of spring of 2020 to discuss the results of the next round of assessment to see growth in articulation.

Student Learning Outcome 2

Student Learning Outcome	Ability to gather evidence to address an issue		
Measurement Instrument 1	This assessment protocol requires students write, expand, and revise one paper in three classes (469, 470, 471). This allows them to see continuity in the program and combine the theoretical with the pedagogical. It also allows the faculty to develop students' research and writing skills over an extended period.		
Criteria for Student Success	Average score of 2 or higher in all categories on the evidence rubric (3=exceeds expectations, 2=meets expectations, 1=below expectations). Rubric attached to this document.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	75% of students	Percent of Program Achieving Target	100% of students
Methods	Each TESOL faculty member independently scored the final revised research paper in ENG 471 using the evidence rubric. Nineteen undergraduate students were evaluated. No student was rated below expectations on the evidence rubric.		

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	Met	Not Met

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

Our students successful identify peer-reviewed resource relevant to their research questions. Our decision to have students expand and revise a research paper in three courses has greatly improved their research skills, particularly when it comes to aligning research to a specific population of language learners. Our plan is to continue the current course of action.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

As indicated above, our students met the program success target. The program faculty will devote one meeting at the end of spring of 2020 to discuss the results of the next round of assessment to monitor for any changes in use of evidence.

Student Learning Outcome 3

Student Learning Outcome	Ability to synthesize and analyze assembled evidence		
Measurement Instrument 1	This assessment protocol requires students write, expand, and revise one paper in three classes (469, 470, 471). This allows them to see continuity in the program and combine the theoretical with the pedagogical. It also allows the faculty to develop students' research and writing skills over an extended period.		
Criteria for Student Success	Average score of 2 or higher in all categories on the critical thinking rubric (3=exceeds expectations, 2=meets expectations, 1=below expectations). Rubric attached to this document.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	75% of practicum students	Percent of Program Achieving Target	84% of students

Methods	Each TESOL faculty member independently scored practicum students' final revised research paper in 471 using the critical thinking rubric. In spring of 2019, 19 undergraduate students were evaluated. Only three students received scores in the below expectations range.

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	**Met**	**Not Met**

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

While we met our goal, our analysis of the critical thinking data showed that students could improve on their ability to apply evidence to pedagogical interventions.   Ten students scored in the exceeds expectations range for critical thinking. As a result, in 471, a more explicit focus was added to reflection assignments requiring students to draw upon concepts from 407 to develop pedagogical applications grounded in methodology.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

As indicated above, our students met the program success target. The program faculty will devote one meeting in the spring of 2020 to discuss the results of the next round of assessment to monitor for any changes in use of critical thinking.

Articulation: Ability to articulate a logical and supported argument.

(3) 90% of arguments are clearly worded.	(2) At least 70% of arguments are clearly worded.	(1) Less than 70% of arguments are clearly worded.	Score:
(3) 90% of arguments are supported by evidence.	(2) At least 70% of arguments are supported by evidence.	(1) Less than 70% of arguments are supported by evidence.	
(3) 90% of arguments are connected to each other (e.g., connection between affect and second language learning is apparent).	(2) At least 70% of arguments are connected to each other (e.g., connection between affect and second language learning is apparent).	(3) Less than 70% of arguments are connected to each other (e.g., connection between affect and second language learning is apparent).	
(2) Title suggests paper's arguments (e.g., "Dyslexia in English Language Learners and Implications for Second Language Learning").	(1) Title does not suggest paper's arguments (e.g., "Differentiated Instruction in ESL").	Score:	
(2) Abstract provides accurate roadmap of the arguments to be made.	(1) Abstract does not provide accurate roadmap of the arguments to be made.		
Comments (i.e., examples of arguments supported by evidence)	Total: _____/13		

Evidence: Ability to gather sound and relevant evidence to address an issue

(3) Evidence for *all* claims in the paper is from peer-reviewed publications (e.g., books and academic journals).	(2) Evidence for *most* claims in the paper (at least 80%) is from peer-reviewed publications (e.g., books and academic journals.).	(1) Less than 80% of the evidence is from peer-reviewed publications (e.g., books and academic journals).	Score:
(3) All evidence is directly related to population in question (e.g., techniques for teaching refugees survival English reflect studies with that population; approaches to teaching dyslexic ESL students are based on studies with these students).	(2) Most evidence (at least 80%) is directly related to population in question (e.g., techniques for teaching refugees survival English reflect studies with that population; approaches to teaching dyslexic ESL students are based on studies with these students).	(1) Less than 80% of the evidence is *not* directly related to population in question (e.g., techniques for teaching refugees survival English reflect studies with that population; approaches to teaching dyslexic ESL students are based on studies with these students).	
(3) All evidence for pedagogical interventions is built on theoretical and/or empirical base (e.g., techniques for teaching refugees survival English reflect studies of what works and what does not work; approaches to teaching dyslexic ESL students are based on studies of their effectiveness).	(2) Most evidence (at least 80%) for pedagogical interventions is built on theoretical and/or empirical base (e.g., techniques for teaching refugees survival English reflect studies of what works and what does not work; approaches to teaching dyslexic ESL students are based on studies of their effectiveness).	(1) Most evidence (less than 80%) for pedagogical interventions is built on theoretical and/or empirical base (e.g., techniques for teaching refugees survival English reflect studies of what works and what does not work; approaches to teaching dyslexic ESL students are based on studies of their effectiveness).	

Comments (i.e., examples of types of sources and their location in paper)	Total: _____/9

Critical Thinking: Ability to synthesize and analyze the assembled evidence

(3) 90% of evidence is coherently expressed (e.g., Findings of language immersion programs are largely summarized and paraphrased and rarely quoted; the evidence for the role of affect in second language learning is clear).	(2) At least 70% of evidence is coherently expressed (e.g., Findings of language immersion programs are largely summarized and paraphrased and rarely quoted; the evidence for the role of affect in second language learning is clear).	(1) Less than 70% of evidence is coherently expressed (e.g., Findings of language immersion programs are largely summarized and paraphrased and rarely quoted; the evidence for the role of affect in second language learning is clear).	Score:
(3) 90% of evidence is applied (e.g., pedagogical implications L2 accent issues are discussed) and/or criticized (e.g., empirical support for phonemic awareness exercises lacking).	(2) At least 70% of evidence is applied (e.g., pedagogical implications L2 accent issues are discussed) and/or criticized (e.g., empirical support for phonemic awareness exercises lacking).	(1) Less than 70% of evidence is applied (e.g., pedagogical implications L2 accent issues are discussed) and/or criticized (e.g., empirical support for phonemic awareness exercises lacking).	
Comments (i.e., examples synthesis and analysis and their location in paper)	Total: _____/6		