## Assurance of Student Learning Report
## 2022-2023

| PCAL | English |
|---|---|

*Creative Writing, Master of Fine Arts, 0478*

*David Bell, MFA director; Trini Stickle, program assessor*

***Is this an online program***? ☐ Yes ☒ No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here ☐ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle**)

---

*Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages. Add more Outcomes as needed.*

**Program Student Learning** Outcome 6: Demonstrate understanding of professional and pedagogical practices and opportunities within and related to the field of creative writing.

| **Instrument 1** | Direct: Exit papers for ENG 515, the Internship course. This course is a second-year degree requirement. |
|---|---|
| **Instrument 2** | NA |
| **Instrument 3** | NA |

Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.

Overall, the students in this second-year course were assessed as having a developing understanding of professional practices, pedagogical application, and knowledge of opportunities within and related to the field of creative writing. The assessment scores show an overall positive movement toward sufficient understanding. On a six-point scale in which 4 indicates a display of professional knowledge, these six, 3rd semester students (of the 6-semester program) had an aggregate score of 2.65. Considering this course occurs at the mid-point in the MFA program, the score of 2.65 is an acceptable baseline at this juncture. Our plan, then, is to reassess using 3rd year artifacts to see if the program is ensuring professional understanding in these areas.

Assessment was calculated based on the demonstration of three skills listed within SLO6—professional practices, pedagogical application, and knowledge of other opportunities for creative writers.

The six students were evaluated by all seven MFA faculty members and the program coordinator: 8 raters.
The complete assessment scale is as follows:
NA—Skill not applicable to project; 0—Skill is applicable but not demonstrated; 1—novice; 2—developing; 3—sufficient; 4—professional

SLO 6 is comprised of three subskills.
Our assessment survey provides a nuanced view of each subskill, and the results show promising development for our second-year students.
Subskill 1) Upon completing their professional internship, on displays of professional practices, the aggregate score for six students was 2.22.
Subskill 2) On displays of professional opportunities, the aggregate score for the six students was 2.81, the highest overall score.
Subskill 3) Our second-year students have a healthy knowledge of pedagogical opportunities; the aggregate score for the six students was 2.69.

Subskill 1 proved to be the lowest score of this assessment, which is unsurprising considering the course's placement in the six-semester program. We may opt to expand our coverage on professional practices earlier in the program to ensure they gain the most out of the internship; alternatively, the 3rd year artifact may prove that subskill 1 along with subskill 2 and 3 achieved during the three subsequent semesters post the

☐ **met**  ☒ **Not Met**

ENG 515 Internship course.

**Program Student Learning Outcome 2:** [Add the Program Student Learning Outcome from CourseLeaf here]

| Instrument 1 | |
|---|---|
| Instrument 2 | |
| Instrument 3 | |

| Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2. | ☐ Met | ☐ Not Met |
|---|---|---|

**Program Student Learning Outcome 3:** [Add the Program Student Learning Outcome from CourseLeaf here]

| Instrument 1 | |
|---|---|
| Instrument 2 | |
| Instrument 3 | |

| Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3. | ☐ Met | ☐ Not Met |
|---|---|---|

**Assessment Cycle Plan:**

For AY2223, we assessed one SLO, *SLO 6 Students will demonstrate understanding of professional and pedagogical practices and opportunities within and related to the field of creative writing*. The above SLO is different from what is presently the official SLO in CourseLeaf; however, the changes from the previous SLOs are visible in CouseLeaf, but those changes have not yet been accepted. The Assessment Cycle Plan below has the new SLOs listed for our schedule of assessment. We expect the changes will accepted and processed through the requisite channels early FA23.

We have created a five-year assessment plan to ensure all SLOs are assessed for a baseline score using a variety of program artifacts; thus, we hope to identify any deficits or insufficiencies. We will then use each year's data to instantiate changes to the curricula or in delivery of instruction to address such issues. Within the five-year assessment plan, we will reassess each SLO to measure the effects of our improvement measures.

Below is our five-year assessment plan:

**MFA Assessment AY2223—YR 1**
**Course: 515 Internship—final paper (n=6)**
**Baseline score for SLO 6**

| SLO 6 | Students will demonstrate understanding of professional and pedagogical practices and opportunities within and related to the field of creative writing. ¶ | Summative and formative assessment by instructor of record in internship course and in thesis defense. Evaluated by entire Creative Writing faculty on a rotating basis as the focal point of annual ASL reports under the direction of the MFA program coordinator. |
|---|---|---|

**MFA Assessment AY2324—YR 2**

**SLO 4 will be examined using papers written in literature courses by MFAs (n = 8-10) Baseline score for SLO 4**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SLO 4 | Students will demonstrate the ability to write a comprehensive analysis of a literary work.¶ ¤ | Summative and formative assessment by instructor of record in creative writing and literature classes and in thesis defense. Evaluated by entire Creative Writing faculty on a rotating basis as the focal point of annual ASL reports under the direction of the MFA program coordinator.¤ |

**MFA Assessment AY2425—YR 3**

**SLO 1 and SLO 2: One product from each MFA student from across the AY2324 501 workshops and the theses of graduating MFAs (n = 15)**

**Baseline score for SLO 1 and 2**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SLO 1 | Students will generate complex, original subject material of literary quality and value.¶ ¤ | Summative and formative assessment by instructor of record in creative writing classes and thesis defense. Evaluated by entire Creative Writing faculty on a rotating basis as the focal point of annual ASL reports under the direction of the MFA program coordinator.¤ |
| SLO 2 | Students will successfully apply relevant craft techniques to their own original writing.¶ ¤ | Summative and formative assessment by instructor of record in creative writing classes and thesis defense. Evaluated by entire Creative Writing faculty on a rotating basis as the focal point of annual ASL reports under the direction of the MFA program coordinator.¤ |

**Course: 515 Internship—final paper (n=5)**

**Recheck SLO 6 to ensure deficits met or approaching goals; add in a second measure for third-year students to see level of achievement. This could be the final reflection essay to their theses or their CVs.**

**MFA Assessment AY2526—YR 4\**

**ENG 512 Reading as a Writer (n = 8-10) Baseline check for SLO 3 and 5**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SLO 3 | Students will demonstrate the ability to critically evaluate literary works in progress, both in the student's own work-in-progress and in that of their peers.¶ ¤ | Summative and formative assessment by instructor of record in creative writing classes. Evaluated by entire Creative Writing faculty on a rotating basis as the focal point of annual ASL reports under the direction of the MFA program coordinator.¤ |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SLO 5 | Students will clearly articulate their own writerly aesthetic. | Summative and formative assessment by instructor of record in creative writing classes. Evaluated by entire Creative Writing faculty on a rotating basis as the focal point of annual ASL reports under the direction of the MFA program coordinator. |

**MFA Assessment AY2627—YR 5**

**Recheck SLO 1 and SLO 2 to ensure deficits met or approach goals: One product from each MFA student from across the AY2324 501 workshops and the theses of graduating MFAs (n = 15)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SLO 1 | Students will generate complex, original subject material of literary quality and value. | Summative and formative assessment by instructor of record in creative writing classes and thesis defense. Evaluated by entire Creative Writing faculty on a rotating basis as the focal point of annual ASL reports under the direction of the MFA program coordinator. |
| SLO 2 | Students will successfully apply relevant craft techniques to their own original writing. | Summative and formative assessment by instructor of record in creative writing classes and thesis defense. Evaluated by entire Creative Writing faculty on a rotating basis as the focal point of annual ASL reports under the direction of the MFA program coordinator. |

**Recheck SLOs 3 and 5 to ensure deficits met/approaching goals, ENG 512 Reading as a Writer (n = 8- 10)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SLO·3 | Students·will·demonstrate·the·ability·to·critically·evaluate·literary·works·in·progress,·both·in·the·student's·own·work-in-progress·and·in·that·of·their·peers.¶ | Summative·and·formative·assessment·by·instructor·of·record·in·creative·writing·classes.·Evaluated·by·entire·Creative·Writing·faculty·on·a·rotating·basis·as·the·focal·point·of·annual·ASL·reports·under·the·direction·of·the·MFA·program·coordinator. |
| SLO·5 | Students·will·clearly·articulate·their·own·writerly·aesthetic.·¶ | Summative·and·formative·assessment·by·instructor·of·record·in·creative·writing·classes.·Evaluated·by·entire·Creative·Writing·faculty·on·a·rotating·basis·as·the·focal·point·of·annual·ASL·reports·under·the·direction·of·the·MFA·program·coordinator. |

**Any additional SLO that has not yielded sufficient results may be subject to recheck in year 5.**

**End of five-year plan. This may involve additional artifacts.**

**Data will be used for MFA program assessment occurring in year 5; data will be used to set the next five-year sequence.**

| | Program Student Learning Outcome 1 | |
|---|---|---|
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | SLO 6: Students will demonstrate understanding of professional and pedagogical practices and opportunities within and related to the field of creative writing. | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have <u>at least one direct measure of student learning</u>. Indirect measures are not required.**<br>The artifact selected to measure SLO 6 is particularly aligned as the paper from the final ENG 515 paper is a summary and reflection of the 120-hour internship required within a professional setting for all MFA second year students. The experience and paper are designed to expose the MFA students to a variety of professional avenues for which their skills may be applied. The inquiry and selection process along with designing and executing the internship are meant to expand their professional skills. Upon completing the internship, as they reflect on their experiences, students should be able to discuss the pedagogical value of their particular internship, the educational value of skills they acquired, or ways that their classes could help prepare future MFA students for the internship.<br><br>**<u>Please attach any/all rubrics used.</u>**<br>Here is <u>the link</u> to the rubric designed through Qualtrics that was used to assess the artifacts. Below is an image of the assessment rubric:<br><br>MFA Student A | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | For any given year, there are 15-18 MFA students. Each year 4-6 graduate with the MFA. The redesign of the MFA program from a two-year to a three-year commitment speaks directly to the criteria for success: Our students are preparing themselves and we are helping prepare them for a future of professional opportunities. At this first evaluation of SLO 6, using ENG 515 in semester 3, we expect 80% of the students will achieve high developing to sufficient level knowledge of professional and pedagogical practices and opportunities, i.e., a 2.7+ to 3.0 on the survey scale. | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | As we expand our measure of SLO 6, we expect that by our second measure, in the 3rd year, 80% of our students demonstrate sufficient to professional understanding of professional practices—publications, conference attendance, teaching of courses, and other career experiences—reflected in their final thesis reflection piece and evidenced on their vitas. Thus, we expect the range of scores to be a score of 3+ to 4.0. | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | For any given year, our MFA incoming student cohort should be a minimum of 5. We expect 80% will demonstrate a high developing (2.7+) to sufficient (3.0) understanding of professional and pedagogical practices and opportunities by the end of semester 3 and a professional understanding by the time they graduate. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | In this measure, 0 of the 6 MFA students scored an overall rating of 3, but all had an overall score of 2+, moving toward our expectation. Two students met the 2.7+ overall score. Scores ranged from 2.33 to 2.91, with the median score at 2.43. |
| **Methods** | Because the MFA admits 5 MFA students per year with the occasional part-time MFA student, we opted to evaluate 100% of the second-year class or n=6, all of whom took the ENG 515 internship during their 3rd semester of 6. The anonymized final papers from the ENG 515 internship class were evaluated using the rubric above independently by the seven MFA faculty and the program coordinator. Each subskill received a rating and an overall score—the combined rating for each subskill--was averaged for each paper/student. | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | Do you have other measures of assessment for SLO 1? If so, please add those here along with all the information below. If not, you may delete this section and move on to **"… whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1."** | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |
| **Methods** | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | Do you have other measures of assessment for SLO 1? If so, please add those here along with all the information below. If not, you may delete this section and move on to **"… whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1."** | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |
| **Methods** | | | |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | ☐ **Met** | ☐ **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn't, and plan going forward)** | | | |

<u>Results</u>: We note that additional guidance is required for our MFA students to better design and synthesizing the internship experience to achieve a sufficient to professional understanding of practices, opportunities, and pedagogical applications within the field of creative writing. Additionally, students need better guidance in what types of observations should be included in the final exit paper that reflect this growth within their specific genres.

<u>Conclusions</u>: We strongly believe that the internship (ENG 515) has professional and pedagogical value. All students displayed a developing understanding of professional practices and, as their actual varied internships attest, they have a strong awareness of professional opportunities open to members of the creative writing community. One area to further develop is the second-year students' understanding of how better to make professional connections from this experience and/or how we can better assess their professional practices from this experience. Going forward, we hope to ensure that ENG 515 has clear guidance on the hours required for the internship, the supervisory role of internship mentors, and the requisite parts and goals of the exit paper, particularly with better measures of the how this experience yields increased professional practices, that is, how this experience translates into actual creative writing products and/or professional engagement.

**\*\*<u>IMPORTANT</u> - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: As noted earlier, we have instantiated a five-year recursive assessment plan. We are working to identify both strengths and weaknesses and for the latter, we will institute changes in the coursework and modality of instruction to ensure better outcomes. In AY2324, we plan to evaluate SLO 6 for the current second year cohort having put into place the added guidance and structures to the internship requirement. We will also reassess the development of SLO 6 skills by selecting an artifact for the 3$^{rd}$ year, graduating MFAs (the same 6 students) to see whether knowledge of professional practice, pedagogical connections, and opportunities are evident. Going forward, we will continue assessing both an artifact from ENG 515—second year—and an artifact from the 3$^{rd}$ year students.

| Program Student Learning Outcome 2 | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.** | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** |
| **Methods** | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** |
| **Methods** | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | | |

| Program Success Target for this Measurement | | Percent of Program Achieving Target | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Methods** | | | |

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

**Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn't, and plan going forward)**

Results: Are the results what was expected or not? Explain

Conclusions: What worked? What Didn't? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met. Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results**.

| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3** | |
|---|---|
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.** |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | |

| Program Success Target for this Measurement | | Percent of Program Achieving Target | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Methods** | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | | | |

| Program Success Target for this Measurement | | Percent of Program Achieving Target | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Methods** | | | |

| Measurement Instrument 3 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria for Student Success** | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |
| **Methods** | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | ☐ **Met** | ☐ **Not Met** |

| Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn't, and plan going forward) |
|---|
| Results: Are the results what was expected or not? Explain

Conclusions: What worked? What Didn't? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in "closing the loop."  For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met;  Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results**. |

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

# MFA Curricular Map

**CURRICULUM MAP Example**

| Program name: | MFA Creative Writing |
| Department: | English |
| College: | PCAL |
| Contact person: | Trini Stickle |
| Email: | trini.stickle@wku.edu |

**KEY:**
I = Introduced
R = Reinforced/Developed
M = Mastered
A = Assessed

| Course Subject/Core Course | Number | Course Title | LO1: Students will generate complex, original subject material of literary quality and value. | LO2: Students will successfully apply relevant craft techniques to their own original writing. | LO3: Students will demonstrate the ability to critically evaluate literary works in | LO4: Students will demonstrate the ability to write a comprehensive analysis | LO5 Students will clearly articulate their own writerly aesthetic. | LO6 Students will demonstrate understanding of professional and |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ENG | 507 | Introduction to Creative Writing | I | I | | | | I/A |
| ENG | 510 | Graduate Rhetoric and Writing | | | | I/R/A | | |
| ENG | 512 | Reading as a Writer | | | R/A | R/A | | |
| ENG | 515 | Internship | | | | | | I/A |
| ENG | 501 | Writing Workshop(s), repeatable | R/M/A | R/M/A | | R/M/A | I/R/M/A | I/R/M/A |
| ENG | 400G*/500 | One literature course | | | R/M/A | R/M/A | | |
| ENG | 599 | Thesis | M/A | M/A | M/A | M/A | M/A | M/A |