Degree Program Name: English Teaching   Contact Name and E-mail: Robert Perrin (Robert.perrin@indstate.edu)

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s)s did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Organization (logical arrangement from paragraph to paper/project)	Final project for English 486: English Teaching (our "capstone" course) is a three-week, integrated unit plan for teaching.	The organization of a three-week unit plan is different from the organization of a paper (and in many ways more complicated), but it follows the same principles. Therefore we expect them to succeed, with 60–70 percent in the "exceeding expectations" category; further, fewer than 10 percent should be in the "does not meet expectations" category.	The results in this category were good: 14 students (of 18) were rated "exceeds expectations"; the remaining 4 were rated "meets expectations." The 77.7% in "exceeds" meets our expectations. (This is an improvement over last year's result of 65%.)	The data were collected by Chris Drew, the faculty member who regularly teaches the course (one section each year). The data were then analyzed by Robert Perrin, Chairperson. We share these results at Department meetings (at the beginning of the subsequent semester: fall data shared in the spring; spring data shared in the fall).
2. Disciplinary Understanding (awareness of literature and language)	Final project for English 486: English Teaching (our "capstone" course).	As models of an instructional design that integrates all of the language arts, the unit plan is challenging. Nonetheless, we expect students to succeed, with 50 percent in the "exceeding expectations" category; further, fewer than 10 percent should be in the "does not meet expectations"	The results in this category were acceptable: 11 students (of 18) were rated "exceeds expectations"; 6 were rated "meets expectations"; 1 rated "does not meet expectations." The 61.1% in "exceeds" meets our expectations. (This is an improvement over last year's result of 50%.)	The data were collected by Chris Drew and analyzed by Robert Perrin. We share these results at Department meetings.

		category.		
613. Synthesis of Ideas (use of multiple sources and perspectives)	Final project for English 486: English Teaching (our "capstone" course).	Based on multiple sources and in including student work in all of the language arts, the unit plan requires skilled synthesis. We expect students to succeed, with 70 percent or higher in the "exceeding expectations" category; further, fewer than 10 percent should be in the "does not meet expectations" category.	The results in this category were very good: 15 students (of 18) were rated "exceeds expectations"; 3 were rated "meets expectations." The 83.3% in "exceeds" is pleasing. (This is an improvement over last year's result of 50%.)	The data were collected by Chris Drew and analyzed by Robert Perrin. We share these results at Department meetings.

* See https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf.

If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.

Notes
  a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
  b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
  c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark."
  d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., "85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
  e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two
In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

Assessment in English has always been a tricky business because we've resisted the urge to use "quantifiable measures" to judge something that's more amorphous: the ability to read, interpret, analyze, and communicate in writing (primarily) and speaking (secondarily).

As our means to assess the work of our English Teaching majors, we identified the final project in the capstone course: English 486 (English Teaching). Our specific assessment has involved evaluating the students' work based on seven primary traits (rhetorical stance, writing ability, organization, disciplinary understanding, synthesis of ideas, documentation, and technical skills). Although all seven criteria are assessed each year, we concentrate on several each year in order to focus our efforts.

1. *DISCOVERIES.* Although we have continual discussions about the quality of our students as they progress through our program—often observing that *this group* seems stronger than *that group*, our assessments show us that by the time they reach the end of our program, students are fairly uniformly prepared. We've also discovered that our assessments aren't consistently helpful because non-majors can take English 486 as an Upper-Division Integrative Elective; we believe that these students are (at least potentially) skewing our results (see #2 below for future plans).

   We've also discovered the comprehensive assessments that we have done for selected Foundational Studies courses—English 101/English 105 (2012–2013), English 239 (2014–2015), and English 305 (2015–2016) have no bearing on our "assessment load," even though this kind of assessment is crucial to the University (and even our majors, since they must meet these FS requirements).

2. *CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS.* We need to do several things differently: (a) we need to identify some "assessment points" earlier in the program than English 486, which will require some discussion among the members of the Department; and (b) we need to create a pattern for "blind review" for English 486 that will, nonetheless, allow us to sift out the results that relate to our majors only.

   We also need to stop doing assessments of non-major courses since it multiplies our "assessment load" and is acknowledged only minimally.

3. *ASSESSMENT PLAN FOR NEXT YEAR.* We need to rethink our assessment goals to focus on only our majors. That rethinking will need to occur in the early fall so that we can concentrate our efforts internally; further, we'll need to reconstitute our assessment group to reflect this shift in focus. The new group will need to (a) identify major courses for which earlier assessments can be meaningful, (b) devise and administer the assessments, and (c) evaluate the data. Additionally, we'll need to develop a strategy to separate the majors from the non-majors in the English 486 assessment.

Degree Program: BA in English Teaching   Date: 8.23.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☒ No outcomes were identified. ☐ No Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes were identified. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				☒ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☐ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. ☒ Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☒ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that

			demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do. ☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☒ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Results are provided. ☒ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. 2 ☒ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☒ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust

	(planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. ☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	the results of assessment. ☒ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☐ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☒ **Level 1 - Developing**	☐ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement
Please submit next year's report as a Word document so that I easily can append the scoring rubric and my comments to it. Better yet, combine the two programs into a single report, since most of Part Two is applicable to both.

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   It occurs to me now that the "outcomes" identified in the Student Learning Summary Report are the primary traits your rubric is organized around. In any case, these are not program outcomes, and they do not match those in the Outcomes Library or the Curriculum Map (which is incomplete). Please revise these documents.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   The program uses the final project—which is briefly explained--to measure students' attainment of the outcomes. Expectations are set appropriately high for teaching candidates.

3. **Results**
   Students met expectations for all three outcomes. In addition to the numerical results you list in Part One, please use Part Two to discuss what you learned about students' knowledge and skills, based on the categories you use to assess them (rhetorical stance, writing ability, etc. Shouldn't one of these be specific to teaching?). Having detailed results should help you develop specific plans for improvement and pinpoint earlier courses where some additional emphasis on X is needed. Since licensure is required for practice in this field, please identify your most recent exam results and note how they compare to the state average.

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   Because the data for this assessment cycle came from a single course, one individual was responsible for collecting them and a second for analyzing and sharing the results (which will occur this fall). Part Two notes that students generally are well prepared, and it identifies the same areas for potential improvement that the "regular" English report did, all of them related to the assessment plan itself. In next year's report, please include additional details about your measures, discoveries, and plans for improvement.

   Thanks!