

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
<i>PCAL</i>	<i>English</i>
<i>English for Secondary Teachers, Bachelor of Arts (561)</i>	
<i>Trini Stickle, Assistant Chair</i>	
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 Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Understand explicitly the development and use of spoken and written language.
Evaluation	Reflection Overview The ENG 561 program underwent its five-year assessment in AY25. This process highlighted the need for curricular revisions at all levels: course availability/selection, reassessment of requirements; SLOs, measurement instruments; SLO assessment schedule. Presently, 9 SLOs exist for the ENG 561, so in this process, we will initiate faculty discussion on distilling the 3 or 4 key learning outcomes a Secondary English teacher should achieve and how those skills are both transferable to professions and how we ensure our students can clearly articulate those skills to potential employers. Thus, we take this time to evaluate areas of needed improvement. From this review, we will bring the following recommendations to the faculty for consideration, vote, and, if accepted, revision. <u>Important- Overall Plans for Next Assessment Cycle based on this reflection:</u> Proposal for faculty discussion in AY26: Revision to the curriculum map; Reduction of the 9 SLOs to 4-5 drawn from the current 5 Subareas--Literature, Composition, Global/Cultural. Pedagogy, and General. This reduction will allow all SLOs to be evaluated and re-assessed, need be, within a 3- or 4-year assessment cycle, ensuring both faster comprehensive assessment and remediation. Each annual assessment period would cover either content SLOs or general SLOs. The proposed schedule could be: Year 1: General Year 2: Literature Year 3: Composition

Year 4: Global/Cultural Intelligence/Awareness

Year 5: Pedagogy

In such discussions, we will have content faculty (i.e., literature or composition) discuss reducing and/or rewording SLOs related to their areas, and all graduate faculty discuss the number and rewording of the general SLOs. By ASL AY26, we will begin the new assessment cycle by assessing the new or revised general SLOs.

Secondary, indirect measure of SLOs-- English Language Arts: Content Knowledge (5038) Praxis, for which students must pass to be granted licensure.

Detailed Breakdown of Skills Tested*

- **Reading:**
 - Understanding and analyzing various literary genres (fiction, drama, poetry) and informational texts (literary nonfiction, essays, biographies, speeches).
 - Identifying key literary elements and rhetorical devices.
 - Analyzing the central ideas and themes of texts.
 - Evaluating the author's purpose and effectiveness.
- **Language Use and Vocabulary:**
 - Understanding the conventions of standard English (grammar, punctuation, usage).
 - Developing vocabulary and understanding word meanings.
 - Analyzing how language choices impact meaning and tone.
- **Writing, Speaking, and Listening:**
 - Analyzing the structure and organization of different text types.
 - Understanding and applying rhetorical strategies in writing and speaking.
 - Evaluating the effectiveness of different communication methods.

Our last 3-year pass rate**

2022 n = 9 89% (n = 8) pass; 11% fail (n = 1)

2023 n = 5 100% pass

2024 n = 5 100% pass

*<https://praxis.ets.org/on/demandware.static/-/Library-Sites-ets-praxisLibrary/default/pdfs/5039.pdf>

**<https://drive.google.com/drive/search?q=praxis>

SLO 1

This SLO was not assessed in the last 3 assessment cycles.

Half of this SLO is no longer relevant. Considering that we no longer teach the History of the English Language (what used to be ENG 404), we have no course that ESTs take that would provide them with the knowledge of the development of spoken and written language. A Subset of students who opt to take the new ENG 404, Global Englishes, would have opportunity to gain this skill. However, an understanding of the spoken and written use of English remains a measurable skill considering all ESTs must take ENG 204, which covers standardized and other dialect features of English.

Measurement Instruments	While this learning objective is summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels by evaluation of (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through undergraduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from program courses in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports. The most appropriate measurement instrument should come from ENG 204, when assessed. Any written assessment that is not completed in the presence of the instructor is subject to AI effects; however, we do not endorse reverting to in-class, hand written assessments as they do not instill good and appropriate practices in our students. Therefore, we continue to work on process-based, multimodal measurement instruments which allow students to demonstrate mastery of this and other SLOs.
Criteria & Targets	We have no ASL data to confirm mastery of this skill; however, all EST majors must pass their Language Arts Praxis for Secondary Teaching in order to be licensed as in-service teachers within the public (and most private) schools. The three year Praxis data serves as an indirect measure of EST student mastery of this SLO: 2022 n = 9 89% (n = 8) pass; 11% fail (n = 1) 2023 n = 5 100% pass 2024 n = 5 100% pass
Results & Conclusion	Praxis data support our expectations of EST performance for SLO 1. Based on Praxis pass rates, we attest that the ENG 204, English Language, requirement is successful for student to achieve mastery of this SLO; however, we need to revise our assessment plan to ensure routine assessment of this SLO.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 1, we will: 1) revise SLO 1 to reflect the skills recognized as relevant; 2) devise an assessment schedule that ensures this (and all) SLOs are evaluated.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Analyze, interpret, and critically discuss a diverse variety of texts.
Evaluation	SLO 2 This SLO was not assessed in the last 3 assessment cycles. This SLO is triple-barreled in Bloom's Taxonomy verbs. While each is measurable, we need to revise this SLO, selecting out the measurable skill we, as a Department, feel is the one essential for the ENG major graduate to acquire and/or add to our SLOs by developing individual SLOs from the three skills included in this single SLO.
Measurement Instruments	The learning objective of SLO 2 (or any of the 3-part assessment) is summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels from any of the following measurement instruments: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through undergraduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from program courses in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports. We will change SLO 2 to assess only 1 skill and, thus, discussions amongst the faculty will take place as a first step.

	Any written assessment that is not completed in the presence of the instructor is subject to AI effects; however, we do not endorse reverting to in-class, hand written assessments as they do not instill professional and ethically-informed practices in our students. Therefore, we continue to work on process-based, multimodal measurement instruments which allow students to demonstrate mastery of this and other SLOs, while also exploring useful platforms and software to help us in our assessment processes.
Criteria & Targets	We have no ASL data to confirm mastery of this skill; we do have some indirect confirmation from the yearly Praxis pass rates.
Results & Conclusion	Praxis rates indirectly support student mastery of this SLO. What stands out is the need for a 3 or 5 year plan for assessing all SLOs. We must begin discussions to determine where we are best preparing ESTs and where we might look to revise curriculum, SLOs***, and assessment practices. ***Resulting from the APR and this reflection ASL, it has come to our attention that we have no SLO designated to assess secondary pedagogical proficiency.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 2, we will: break apart the three measures to create 1 or more SLO from SLO 2; discuss adding a pedagogical-focused SLO; and create a schedule to assess this and all the SLO.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Analyze argumentative and persuasive techniques in a variety of genres.
Evaluation	SLO 3 was assessed in AY24 and is deemed still relevant to the degree. The SLO employs a measurable verb from Bloom's Taxonomy.
Measurement Instruments	The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through undergraduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from program courses in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports. In AY24, the measurement instrument chosen were student writing samples from Rhetoric courses (ENG 301), a direct measure. Given that the courses chosen were from a composition rhetoric /professional writing course, the instruments is appropriate. Any written assessment that is not completed in the presence of the instructor is subject to AI effects; however, we do not endorse reverting to in-class, hand written assessments as they do not instill professional and ethically-informed practices in our students. Therefore, we continue to work on process-based, multimodal measurement instruments which allow students to demonstrate mastery of this and other SLOs while also exploring useful platforms and software to help us in our assessment processes.

Criteria & Targets	A total of nine (9) students from the Fall 2023 section of ENG 301: Argument and Analysis submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. 83% (7 of the 9) received an average rating of 4 or higher, meeting our expectations. No change is warranted.
Results & Conclusion	Results are expected, yet we find nothing remarkable to report. We find no challenges or exceptions to report, and, so, we feel this SLO and the courses to which it is linked require no changes.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 3, we do not expect to: include it or the courses linked to it or the measurement instrument in our discussions of curricular map or SLO changes.

Program Student Learning Outcome 4	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Compose successfully in multiple genres, media, and formats.
Evaluation	While we have not assessed this SLO within the past 3-year assessment cycle, we do deem this skill to be relevant to the skillset of the program graduates. The SLO is measurable and it employs a verb from Bloom's Taxonomy.
Measurement Instruments	According to the curriculum map, the learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through undergraduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from program courses in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports. We believe these measurement instruments to be appropriate. Any written assessment that is not completed in the presence of the instructor is subject to AI effects; however, we do not endorse reverting to in-class, hand written assessments as they do not instill professional and ethically-informed practices in our students. We do believe this SLO and its skill is particularly vulnerable to the effects of AI. Therefore, we continue to work on process-based, multimodal measurement instruments which allow students to demonstrate mastery of this and other SLOs while also exploring useful platforms and software to help us in our assessment processes.
Criteria & Targets	We have no current data.
Results & Conclusion	We have no current data. We plan to assess this SLO in the coming ASL report.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 4, we will: work on prophylactic measures to guard against AI effects; and schedule the assessment of this SLO.

Program Student Learning Outcome 5

Program Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate a strong understanding of the history and development of literature in the English language in a global context.
Evaluation	We have not assessed this SLO in the previous 3-year ALS period. SLO 5 is measurable as it employs a Bloom's Taxonomy verb; however, changes expected in the curricular map beginning in AY26 require this SLO be subject to review, revision, and possible removal.
Measurement Instruments	While the current curricular map states that this learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through undergraduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from program courses in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports, we have no course in which such a measurement instrument exists. With projected changes to the curricular map, we see this SLO in need of review, revision, or removal. Any written assessment that is not completed in the presence of the instructor is subject to AI effects; however, we do not endorse reverting to in-class, hand written assessments as they do not instill professional and ethically-informed practices in our students. We do believe this SLO and its skill is particularly vulnerable to the effects of AI. Therefore, we continue to work on process-based, multimodal measurement instruments which allow students to demonstrate mastery of this and other SLOs while also exploring useful platforms and software to help us in our assessment processes.
Criteria & Targets	We have no current data.
Results & Conclusion	We have no current data. If we choose to keep this SLO, then we will revise a means to assess, aligning it with a particular course and measurement instrument, and, then, we will devise a proper rubric.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 5, we will: consider whether in the curricular mapping revision, this SLO is still relevant; revise as needed, if so; determine which course and what measurement instrument would serve to assess this SLO; and create both a proper rubric and schedule for assessment. Alternatively, we may remove this SLO in our revision.

Program Student Learning Outcome 6	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Analyze a diverse variety of texts through multiple theories and histories.
Evaluation	We have no assessment data from the last 3 years of ALS reports. SLO 6 does employ a measurable verb from Bloom's Taxonomy.
Measurement Instruments	?

	The current curricular map states that this learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through undergraduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from program courses in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports. We confirm that any number of courses and course papers could serve as the measurement instrument for this SLO. Any written assessment that is not completed in the presence of the instructor is subject to AI effects; however, we do not endorse reverting to in-class, hand written assessments as they do not instill professional and ethically-informed practices in our students. We do believe this SLO and its skill is particularly vulnerable to the effects of AI. Therefore, we continue to work on process-based, multimodal measurement instruments which allow students to demonstrate mastery of this and other SLOs while also exploring useful platforms and software to help us in our assessment processes.
Criteria & Targets	We have no current data.
Results & Conclusion	We have no current data. We plan to assess this SLO in the coming ASL report.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 6, we will: assess this SLO in the coming AY as this SLO is core to the program's outcomes; we will proof the rubric; and we will set a recurring assessment schedule of this SLO.

Program Student Learning Outcome 7	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Conduct academic research and document it appropriately.
Evaluation	SLO 7 was not assessed using the wording posted in the curricular map in either AY24 or AY22. SLO 7 is double-barreled in its verbs and neither of the verbs employed are from Bloom's Taxonomy, and are, consequentially, suspect for its measurability.
Measurement Instruments	The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through undergraduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from program courses in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports. In AY24, the measurement instrument chosen were student writing samples from the Capstone course (ENG 416), a direct measure. Given that the courses chosen were from the EST capstone course, the instrument is appropriate.

	Any written assessment that is not completed in the presence of the instructor is subject to AI effects; however, we do not endorse reverting to in-class, hand written assessments as they do not instill professional and ethically-informed practices in our students. Therefore, we continue to work on process-based, multimodal measurement instruments which allow students to demonstrate mastery of this and other SLOs while also exploring useful platforms and software to help us in our assessment processes.
Criteria & Targets	Four (4) EST students were part of the Fall 2023 ENG 416 Capstone course, and all 4 writing sample were used as appropriate measurements instruments for this learning outcome. 50% (2 of 4) met our expectations, which was below our 70% expectations. Due to the small sample size, we do not believe our criteria of success needs adjusting.
Results & Conclusion	While the results were lower than we expected, we realize that 4 students in a single course may not be indicative of any systemic curricular problems. We need to broaden out our writing sample pool to other courses taken by senior EST majors across both semesters—FA and SP—in order to assess our ESTs’ abilities regarding this SLO.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 7, we will: reassess this SLO in AY26 using both capstone and other senior EST course papers; and reassess the structure of our capstone courses in terms of content and assignments for this and other data reported in the ARP AY25.

Program Student Learning Outcome 8	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Convey the core values and competencies of the discipline of English to wider audiences.
Evaluation	SLO 8 was not assessed in the previous 3-year cycle. While this SLO could be assessed, it does not employ a verb from Bloom’s Taxonomy.
Measurement Instruments	While the program catalog states that the learning objective of this SLO may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through undergraduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from program courses in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports, we do not believe such a course with an appropriate measurement instrument is currently exists. Given the charge to link professional skills (the QEP, Topper Rise) set for AY26 along with our plan to revise the curriculum map for 561, we see this as the perfect opportunity to develop ways in which student are able to practice articulating—in written and oral production—this SLO. While the measurable instrument, like any written and oral production, is subject to AI affect, student use of AI could, in this instance, be guided to helpful, productive, and ethical ways.
Criteria & Targets	We have no current data.
Results & Conclusion	We have no current data.

	We do see an opportunity to develop both measurable instruments and the appropriate rubric for this SLO in AY26.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 8, we will: reword this SLO to employ a verb from Bloom’s Taxonomy; develop opportunities across courses that allow students opportunity to master articulating the skills they are acquiring in the ENG BA for potential employers; develop measurable instruments to capture student skills doing so; develop the appropriate rubric to assess those skills; and institute a schedule in which SLO 8 is assessed.

Program Student Learning Outcome 9	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Participate in extra-curricular activities and show awareness of educational and professional opportunities after graduation.
Evaluation	We have not assessed SLO 9 in the last three year period. This double-barreled SLO employs one of its two verbs from Bloom’s Taxonomy. The measure of this SLO—of either verb/skill—is challenging in terms of evaluating the measurable instrument as stated.
Measurement Instruments	While the learning objective may be summatively assessed by individual faculty members on a final paper or project, no such assignment currently exists in a course. If in our curriculum map revision we deem this to be a worthy program outcome, then such a measurable instrument needs to be created and embedded within the proper course (e.g., capstone courses). Such a written or oral measurement instrument would be subject to the effects of AI, but in this case, there may be value in guiding students to how AI could help them develop their knowledge of professional opportunities that they could explore locally. The other instrument described in the curricular map as a measurable instrument is the data the department collects on how many students participate in extra-curricular activities and professional opportunities related to the discipline of English, broadly conceived. This is indirect measure does not seem sufficient. This second measure is not affected by AI given it is on student actions and attendance to events.
Criteria & Targets	We have no data.
Results & Conclusion	We have no data. In our curricular mapping revision, we need to consider if and/or how this SLO is relevant to the program and if a measurement instrument can be created, along with an appropriate rubric.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	For SLO 9, we will: explore if and how this SLO fits within the program review for EST majors; what an appropriate measurement instrument would be; what the rubric for such a measurement instrument would be; a schedule to assess, need be.