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| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2022-2023** |
| *PCAL* | *English* |
| *English for Secondary Teaching (561)* |
| *Jeff Rice* |
| ***Is this an online program***? [ ]  Yes [x]  No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here [x]  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.*** |
| **SLO 1: Use one or more of the rhetorical appeals (logos, ethos, pathos) to successfully address a particular audience.**  |
| **Instrument 1** | Student writing samples from Rhetoric course (ENG 301) |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **SLO 2: Incorporate material from secondary sources to support an original analysis.**  |
| **Instrument 1** | Student writing samples from Capstone course (ENG 416)  |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **SLO 3: Correctly Document Secondary Sources.**  |
| **Instrument 1** | Student writing samples from Capstone course (ENG 416)  |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Assessment Cycle Plan:**  |
| We will assess these SLOs again in the 2023-24 assessment cycle.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Analyze argumentative and persuasive techniques in a variety of genres.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1**  | Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from ENG 301: Argument and Analysis, a required rhetoric course for all EST majors. This learning outcome falls under the department’s larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to successfully analyze argumentative techniques, and each rhetoric 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) Demonstrates skillful use of appropriate rhetorical strategies to support the audience, purpose, and use 3 (middle score) Demonstrates an attempt to use appropriate rhetorical strategies, but does not consistently incorporate them well enough to support the audience, purpose, and use1 (lowest score) Demonstrates an attempt to use rhetorical strategies, but does incorporate them to support audience, purpose, and useN/A Does not use rhetorical appeals to address a particular audience.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** | 67% received an average rating of 4 or higher, 0 received 3 or lower. |
| **Methods**  | A total of eleven (11) students from the Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 sections of ENG 301: Argument and Analysis 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 six 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 both sections. At least 33% of students in each of the courses were evaluated and included in the data. Scores were averaged across reviewers. |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results:** Though this criteria was not met for the EST students (we conducted the same assessment for both the English major and the EST major), it was very close to our goal and we feel that the department’s attention to teaching persuasive strategies and techniques over the past several years is showing as students move through the program. The sample size for EST students is small, and the success they have had on the PRAXIS exam encourages us to continue measuring this SLO in the 2023-24 cycle.**Conclusions**: We believe that this SLO’s low success rate can be attributed to sample size (11) and the course evaluated (ENG 301: Argument and Analysis). With such a small sample size, it is difficult to achieve a higher success rate, but as stated above, we believe that we are close to achieving our goal of 70%. It should also be noted that the course evaluated is a 300-level course that EST majors take early in their academic career, so the results will not be a strong as samples evaluated in 400-level courses, such as the Capstone course (ENG 416), they take later in their career. **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Analyzing argumentative and persuasive techniques in a variety of genres 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 at our yearly fall retreat, we will assess this SLO again in the 2023-24 assessment cycle. In addition, we will track PRAXIS scores from EST students and review elements of the exam that align with this learning outcome and other learning outcomes that will cycle in to our ASL. We have not included PRAXIS scores as a part of the ASL for EST previously, in part because we don’t want to rely on standardized tests, however we anecdotally have learned that we have an excellent pass rate (with high scores) among our EST cohort so it seems sensible to formalize the use of this data and add it to what we learn from the writing pieces we’ll continue to evaluate. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Program 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 the Capstone Course (ENG 416) required of all EST majors. 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% of student artifacts rated at 4 or higher, none at 3 or lower. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 83% of student artifacts were rated at 4 or higher, 0 received 3 or lower. |
| **Methods**  | All four (4) EST students in the Fall 2022 ENG 416 Capstone Course submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. All four (4) student artifacts were made anonymous and evaluated independently by six faculty members using the rubric guidelines above. Scores were averaged across reviewers. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: We are pleased with the result, especially given the increased rate of success compared to the 2021-22 cycle (50% vs. 83%). That said, such a small sample size (4) may have inflated the success rate. **Conclusions**: While the sample size is small, we believe that part of this SLO’s success can be attributed a renewed effort in implementing this SLO into the ENG 416 Capstone course. Students receive dedicated instruction on this SLO and how to better implement it into their writing. Of note here is how the writing assessed requires students to use a secondary text in their discussions of educational trends and subsequent classroom applications. We believe that this shows a strong reinforcement and mastery of the skills associated with this SLO.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: This will be assessed in the 2023-24 assessment cycle. In addition, we will track PRAXIS scores from EST students and review elements of the exam that align with this learning outcome and other learning outcomes that will cycle in to our ASL. We have not included PRAXIS scores as a part of the ASL for EST previously, in part because we don’t want to rely on standardized tests, however we anecdotally have learned that we have an excellent pass rate (with high scores) among our EST cohort so it seems sensible to formalize the use of this data and add it to what we learn from the writing pieces we’ll continue to evaluate. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Correctly Document Secondary Sources** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from the Capstone Course (ENG 416) required of all EST majors. 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 citationsA 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** | 75% of student artifacts were rated at 4 or higher, one received 3 or lower. |
| **Methods**  | All four (4) EST students in the Fall 2022 ENG 416 Capstone Course submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. All four (4) student artifacts were made anonymous and evaluated independently by six faculty members using the rubric guidelines above. Scores were averaged across reviewers. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: We are pleased with the success rate, especially given the increased rate of success compared to the 2021-22 cycle (50% vs. 75%). That said, we were disappointed to see one artifact (25%) receive a score of 3 or lower, though again tempered by the small sample size and the success of these same students on the PRAXIS exam.**Conclusions**: While the sample size is small, we believe that part of this SLO’s success can be attributed a renewed effort in implementing this SLO into the ENG 416 Capstone course and paring it with SLO 2. Students receive dedicated instruction on this SLO and how to better implement it into their writing. Of note here is how the writing assessed requires students to use a secondary text in their discussions of educational trends and subsequent classroom applications. We believe that this shows a strong reinforcement and mastery of the skills associated with this SLO, despite approximately 25% of the student artifacts scoring a 3 or lower.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: This will be assessed in the 2023-24 assessment cycle. In addition, we will track PRAXIS scores from EST students and review elements of the exam that align with this learning outcome and other learning outcomes that will cycle in to our ASL. We have not included PRAXIS scores as a part of the ASL for EST previously, in part because we don’t want to rely on standardized tests, however we anecdotally have learned that we have an excellent pass rate (with high scores) among our EST cohort so it seems sensible to formalize the use of this data and add it to what we learn from the writing pieces we’ll continue to evaluate. |

**\*\*\* 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 |
| Linguistics | ENG 104: Intro to Linguistics | I |  |  | R |  |  |  |
| Grammar | ENG 204: English Language | M, A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing (1) | ENG 203: Intro to Creative WritingENG 212: Intro to Digital Texts & MediaENG 303 Intermediate Fiction WritingENG 305: Intermediate Poetry WritingENG 311: Creative Nonfiction WritingENG 329: Topics in Creative WritingENG 358: Drama WritingENG 401: Advanced CompositionENG 402: Editing & PublishingENG 415: Writing and Technology |  |  | R | R |  |  |  |
| Rhetoric  | ENG 301: Argument and Analysis | R |  | M | R |  | R |  |
| American Lit | ENG 391: Survey of American Literature I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing Pedagogy | ENG 410: Comp. Theory & Practice | 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 |
| Literature Pedagogy | ENG 476: Crit. Approaches to Literature in Secondary Curriculum |  | R |  | R | R | R | R |
| Capstone  | ENG 416: Literature/EST Capstone |  | A | A | M, A | M, A | M, A | M, A |