Assessment of English Program
Indiana University-Purdue University Columbus

2013-2014 Program Year
Submitted June 2014
Submitted by: Katherine V. Wills, Ph.D., English Program Director

Reviewed by:
George Towers, Ph.D., Liberal Arts Division Head and
English Program Assessment Committee

Introduction to the First IUPUC English Program Review

The IUPUC English Program was approved in October 2013 for the granting of local English Bachelor (BA) degrees, as well as minors in creative writing and literature. This is the first program review and assessment report on student learning.

In order to provide a framework, we have modeled our first program review and assessment report on the IUPUI School of Liberal Arts models (SLA Report). We provide a framework to assess programmatic and student learning. These models are similar to those from the Planning for Learning and Assessment table that has been approved by IUPUI's Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC). *In order to assist the report reviewer, this year's report*

contains background information about the development of this first year assessment program thus, it may be less concise than in future years. It is our intention to continue to consult the philosophy, procedures, and curriculum of the IUPUI English program towards the goals of clarity and coherence. We use the same course numbers, course numbers and descriptions, and almost all of the same degree requirements, even though IUPUC English has fewer concentrations, faculty, and resources.

Defining IUPUC English Program Assessment in its First Year

Program Assessment

The English BA meets and will continue to meet the requirements of Indiana University, which is accredited by the Indiana Commission of Higher Education (ICHE). The curriculum follows the guidelines suggested by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and Writing Program Administrators organization (WPA). Assessment will closely track the program's learning outcomes. Key opportunities for demonstration of student learning and technical proficiency will occur in coursework, senior capstone, internships, practica, research projects, creative projects, service learning, academic travel, civic engagement, and other learning activities.

Since 2010, IUPUC, including the English Program, has initiated a process of identifying student learning outcomes and linking them to specific components on the campus program outcomes and Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULS) in 2010 on a five-year staged rotation (see Appendix A). The IUPUC English Program will continue to incorporate the assessment of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as they pertain to student coursework. Faculty will evaluate student products in individual English courses. With the assistance of the IUPUC Office of Institutional Research (OIR), we have selected and created campus–wide digital tools to measure these SLOs and collect data (Stages 3 and 4). Upon receiving feedback from the survey, we already made some initial curricular adjustments. As we proceed through Stages 4 and 5, we will use the additional data collected as a guide to further possible curricular changes.

Five-Stage Assessment for IUPUC English Program Assessment

Stage 1	Identify the program's student learning outcomes (SLOs)
Stage 2	Link these SLOs to specific components in the program's curriculum
Stage 3	Identify or create methods to measure these SLOs
Stage 4	Collect data to determine if the SLOs are being accomplished successfully
Stage 5	Use the data collected in Stage 4 to make curricular changes and
Stage 6	Repeat Stage 4 to determine if the curricular changes were effective.

The goals of the program as stated in the 2013 IUPUC English Program Proposal to prepare students are as follows:

1. Communicate effectively in written and oral venues, adapting to varied audiences;
2. Read and understand a wide variety of literature and apply those ideas to our contemporary world;
3. Analyze a wide range of texts using current criticism styles: digital, literary, others;
4. Gain a background in the study of the arts, humanities, and sciences;
5. Appreciate diverse cultures and perspectives;
6. Demonstrate creativity in critical thinking and written work.

Listed below are the learning outcomes that students completing this program are expected to master and how the outcomes relate to the program goals:

1. Define, compare, and contrast theoretical critical approaches to varied texts (*e.g*.,) literary, multi-modal, rhetorical, workplace)-(Program Goal 3);
2. Demonstrate and analyze critical thinking in a variety of texts. (Program Goals 3, 6);
3. Investigate, synthesize, and integrate primary and secondary research with appropriate documentation styles. (Program Goals 1, 3, 4, 6);;
4. Select and effectively apply appropriate genres for specific purposes. (Program Goals 1, 3, 4);
5. Read and interpret a wide variety of literature about our contemporary world and historical contexts. (Program Goals 2, 3, 4);
6. Read, analyze, synthesize, and (self) evaluate language and texts critically and creatively (e.g. literature, professional, multi-modal). (Program Goals 2, 3, 4);
7. Describe the interdisciplinary context (ways of knowing) of English as a field of study and its connection to other disciplines. (Program Goals 1, 2);
8. Define basic concepts and terms within English specializations (e.g. creative writing, digital literacy, film, literature, linguistics, rhetoric, writing and literacy). (Program Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 6);
9. Discuss diverse cultures and perspectives through reading and writing (Program Goals 1, 5); and
10. Make data-informed decisions with respect to aesthetics, ethics, diverse perspectives, and civility. (Program Goals 2, 3 5, 6).
    (See IUPUC SLO and PUL alignment. SLO/PUL Table)

The English Director will supervise the assessment and adjustment process and will oversee the program assessment with advisory input from a committee of English faculty. The program assessment report will be submitted when due each year. The program will be reviewed annually as part of the IUPUC campus strategic plan, which is hosted in the IUPUC WEAVE Data Management System and *Chalk and Wire*, a management tool for curriculum, assessment, data gathering, analysis, and reporting. The management database provides a sustainable assessment and accreditation system that facilitates continuous improvement. A full program review will be conducted every five years to determine how well the program is meeting programmatic goals (due in 2018).

Continuous Advising

Students will be assigned a liberal arts advisor who will guide student them through the IUPUC English BA program. Students can expect to meet with their advisors twice a year and have access to the advisors in the summer. The advisors will maintain an advising file for each major. A financial analysis of the program will be conducted annually with the Division Head. Unless otherwise noted, results will be available to English faculty, the Office of Institutional Research, and the Vice Chancellor's and Dean's Office.

Student Tracking

We will begin to document English graduates as they move into professional life through the administration of an *English Graduate Exit Survey* in the form of an exit interview and/or survey. Questions for the survey will be designed to evaluate outcomes of student learning and to identify modifications in program resources. Along with the results of *English Graduate Exit Survey*, information regarding graduate/professional school admissions statistics, other professional achievements will be recorded by the English Program Director and reported in the annual program report to assess the employability and satisfaction of graduates as well as their preparedness for graduate and professional school. This is an indirect measure.

An *Alumni Survey* will be conducted every three years after the first graduation year to track student employment (due in 2017). Data will be recorded by the English Program Director and reported in the annual program report. The *English Graduate Exit Survey*, the *Alumni Survey*, the English Department annual assessment report, and other ongoing assessment reports will be shared with the IUPUC Office of Institutional Research. Surveys will be stored with the graduating student's records and will be used to evaluate long-term student satisfaction with courses and other program elements.

General Education Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs, direct and indirect) Data

In terms of student learning, the preliminary results trend along IUPUI and national findings. Areas that need improvement are synthesis of ideas, resources and rhetorical conventions. The results are encouraging in that we have no anomalous trending in the SLOs. Another positive fact was the fact that we were already collecting data before we were approved as a program ICHE. Faculty reported results in SLOs and PULs. The IUPUC Division of Liberal Arts hired a professional advisor, so the advising load is now becoming centralized and standardized.

Key Findings about Student Learning Outcomes (11/12/13).
Upon review of the SLO 1 Written Communication response Summary (2012-2013), the reviewers (Dibble and Wills) were able to identify ways to improve teaching and learning. The changes suggested below are based on an *n* of 262. Most students self-reported their

areas of study as the following: Business-18%; UCOL-17%; Nursing-16%; Science-10%; Mechanical Engineering 8%; Education-4%; and Other 18%.

1. The SLO data showed that students could use the most improvement in the area of (1.3) S*ynthesizes diverse sources and viewpoints*. The average scores across most sections were Proficient or 3.2-3.7. This was the area that needed the most improvement.

2. Second, students could use the improvement in the area of (1.2) *Uses appropriate rhetorical conventions*.   The average scores across most sections were Proficient or 3.2-3.7. After S*ynthesizes diverse sources and viewpoints*, this was the second are that needed improvement.

Actions Taken: Changes to course content, assignments, assessments, teaching methods, delivery format.

Based on the results stated above, there are some changes or interventions with the course curriculum that should be considered for multiple sections of ENG W131.

At the spring 2013 meeting with W131 teaching faculty, Dr. Terry Dibble discussed the effectiveness and feasibility of the rubric. All the W131 instructors, who met with Dibble in F12, reported that the rubric was clear and usable.

Dr. Dibble and the faculty then examined and discussed the data. A major concern arose because the scores on the 'Synthesis' category were only marginally lower than those in other categories. Our own experience with upper-level writing courses, in agreement with the IUPUI Writing Program self-assessment, indicates that students who have passed IUPUC W131 often have difficulties with 'synthesis' tasks in subsequent researched writing courses. Thus, we felt that our 'synthesis' scores, only marginally lower than scores in other categories, may not have accurately represented student performance.

Accordingly we proposed action on two fronts. First, future assessment tools should include both the Final Portfolios and Draft Packet versions of Synthesis Essay. Final Portfolios may, but are not required to include Synthesis essays. Second, all W131 sections should be required to include a Synthesis essay or a Summary / Response essay among the four major writing assignments. At present almost all sections do so, but this requirement will assure both that Synthesis is taught and that it be assessed in depth.

These changes may have the seemingly paradoxical effect of lowering some SLO scores. But our goal is to discover ways to improve learning, not, except incidentally, ways to raise scores.

1. The actions to be taken to improve (1.3) S*ynthesizes diverse sources and viewpoints* are as follows:

Faculty Intervention-- Wills and Dibble were to communicate with W131 faculty in fall 2013 and spring 2014 about the SLO results. We will request that W131 teachers incorporate additional exercises that focus on synthesizing sources.

2. The actions to be taken to improve (1.2) *Uses appropriate rhetorical conventions* are as follows*:*

   Faculty Intervention—Drs. Wills and Dibble were to communicate with W131 faculty in fall 2013 and spring 2014 about the SLO results requesting that W131 teachers incorporate additional exercises that focus on MLA format and other citation styles. Course evaluations of part-time faculty will be reviewed by the English Program Director, with a view to gathering suggestions for improvement in program delivery and implementation of SLOs and PULs. Future adjustments may include the creation of a common technology literacy module for all sections of W131.

3. Looking forward, Wills will begin discussions with Division Head Towers, strategic planners, and English faculty to consider a common syllabus for W131.

4. Looking to the future, Dr. Wills will begin discussions with Division Head Dr. Towers, strategic planners, and English faculty to consider a common syllabus for W131.

Changes Recommended for SLO: Feedback to General Education Board

The SLO was well-written and provided a sound basis for a common rubric. No changes are needed at this time in the SLO or rubric.

Changes Recommended for SLO Common Rubric: Feedback to General Education Board

The SLO was well-written and provided a sound basis for a common rubric. No changes are needed at this time in the SLO or rubric.

Assessment Plan and Timeline: Identify goals identified in 1-4 and continue on timeline for two subsequent assessment cycles. Indicate courses to be assessed with rationale.

Selected sections of W131 will be assessed for improvement in the areas 1.3 and 1.2 after intervention in spring of years 4 and 5.

General Education Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs indirect) Data

Faculty Ratings of School of Columbus Student Performance on PULs with Moderate Emphasis (100 Level & Lower)

PUL – Major Emphasis	Mean [2]	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
1A. Written, Oral, & Visual Communication Skills	478 2.90	72 15.1	68 14.2	173 36.2	165 34.5	478 100.0
1B. Quantitative Skills	119 2.92	22 18.5	17 14.3	29 24.4	51 42.9	119 100.0
1C. Information Resource Skills	17 3.53	0 0.0	2 11.8	4 23.5	11 64.7	17 100.0
2. Critical Thinking	921 2.66	218 23.7	165 17.9	248 26.9	290 31.5	921 100.0
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	90 2.59	21 23.3	20 22.2	24 26.7	25 27.8	90 100.0
4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness	18 2.72	3 16.7	2 11.1	10 55.6	3 16.7	18 100.0
5. Understanding Society and Culture	13 3.08	1 7.7	3 23.1	3 23.1	6 46.2	13 100.0
6. Values and Ethics	9 3.33	1 11.1	1 11.1	1 11.1	6 66.7	9 100.0
Total [1]	1,665 2.76	338 20.3	278 16.7	492 29.5	557 33.5	1,665 100.0

[1] Combined number of student ratings in all 100-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Fall 2012. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 100 level course.

[2] Scale: 1 = "Not Effective", 2 = "Somewhat Effective", 3 = "Effective", 4 = "Very Effective"

Ongoing Improvement Summary
- o continue in staged program assessment as noted above
- o intervene as needed with full-and part-time faculty to improve SLOs
- o create English graduate and alumni survey
- o create exit survey for students who leave the English program before graduating (*e.g.,* financial assistance, large campus experience, family support)
- o assess syllabi assessment in fall 2014 that references course objectives, SLOs, PULs
- o hire FTE in creative and professional writing
- o apply for PRAC grant to develop the English program assessment

Appendix A

IUPUC's Five Year Assessment Plan

- **Year 1 (2010-2011)**
  - Develop measures for SLOs for introductory, core courses, learning community, and certificate programs
  - Collect and analyze data
  - Identify curriculum changes
  - Develop a timeline for changes
  - Identify student needs
  - Identify faculty needs
- **Year 2 (2011-2012)**
  - Develop measures for SLOs related to elective courses, certificate programs, support services(advising, mentoring, tutoring, Research facilities), faculty needs and student needs
  - Collect and analyze data
  - Identify curriculum and support services changes
  - Develop timeline for changes
- **Year 3 (2012-2013)**
  - Evaluate curriculum and support services changes
  - Evaluate student and program changes
  - Adjust and make additional changes as needed
- **Year 4 (2013=2014)**
  - Begin cycle with re-evaluating SLOs, measures, and assessment processes
  - Reassess courses, research, capstone, learning community, student needs, and faculty needs
  - Collect and interpret data
  - Identify changes and begin implementation
- **Year 5 (2015-2016)**
  - Reassess elective courses, support services, faculty needs, and student needs
  - Interpret data
  - Identify and begin changes.