

## Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Report for Non-Accredited Programs

(updated 9/19/23)

Program Type: **Non-Accredited Program**

Program Name: English (BA)

Submitted By: Angela Vietto

Email: arvietto@eiu.edu

Submission Date: 10/15/2024

Review Cycle:

- Even Year
- Odd Year

Review Round:

- Round A** (Associate Dean review)
- Round B** (Associate Dean + VPAA review)

All SLO reports are archived here: <https://www.eiu.edu/assess/majorassessment.php>

DUE: **October 15<sup>th</sup>** to your Associate Dean or designee

Each academic program is expected to prepare a Summary of the Assessment Data by Student Learning Outcome. This summary may take the form of a chart or other means of presentation that describes the annual data collected, when it is collected, in which course(s), through which assignment or activity, and by whom. This summary should clearly indicate what the program seeks to discover in its students' learning. The summary should correspond to the record-keeping documents maintained by the academic program.

Program Name: English (BA)

**PART 1. OVERVIEW OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND MEASURES**

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	What <b>measures and instruments</b> are you using? This could be an oral or written exam, a regularly assigned paper, a portfolio—administered early and later in coursework.	How are you using this info to improve student learning? What are you hoping to learn from your data? Include <b>target score(s) and results</b> , and specify whether these were met, not met, or partially met for each instrument.	Does your SLO correspond to an <b>undergraduate learning goal (ULG)</b> : writing, speaking, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, responsible citizenship?
1. English majors will think and read attentively and critically.	Exit Survey of graduating majors; bi-annual evaluation of data collected over a two-year period of student writing in English courses in the core curriculum and across all concentrations at the 2000- and 4000-level. Sophomore rubric scores serve as a baseline to track continued improvement as students advance through the major.	To evaluate satisfaction of graduating students with their overall departmental experience and faculty and students' perceptions of the development and proficiency of their reading and critical thinking skills. Target is a majority of responses in the top two ranges.	CT, WCR, RC
2. English majors will write clearly, analytically, and expressively.	Exit Survey of graduating majors; bi-annual evaluation of data collected over a two-year period of student writing in English courses in the core curriculum and across all concentrations at the 2000- and 4000-level. Sophomore rubric scores serve as a baseline to track continued improvement as	To evaluate satisfaction of graduating students with their overall departmental experience and faculty and students' perceptions of the development and proficiency of their writing skills. Target is a majority of responses in the top two ranges.	CT, WCR, RC

	students advance through the major.		
3. English majors will interpret texts using appropriate critical vocabularies.	Exit Survey of graduating majors; bi-annual evaluation of data collected over a two-year period of student writing in English courses in the core curriculum and across all concentrations at the 2000- and 4000-level. Sophomore rubric scores serve as a baseline to track continued improvement as students advance through the major.	To evaluate satisfaction of graduating students with their overall departmental experience and faculty and students' perceptions of the development and proficiency of their interpretive skills and use of critical vocabularies. Target is a majority of responses in the top two ranges.	CT, WCR, RC
4. English majors will understand and be able to situate texts in diverse cultural and historical contexts.	Exit Survey of graduating majors; bi-annual evaluation of data collected over a two-year period of student writing in English courses in the core curriculum and across all concentrations at the 2000- and 4000-level. Sophomore rubric scores serve as a baseline to track continued improvement as students advance through the major.	To evaluate satisfaction of graduating students with their overall departmental experience and faculty and students' perceptions of the development and proficiency of their reading and contextualization skills. Target is a majority of responses in the top two ranges.	CT, WCR, RC
5. English majors will become skilled in using multiple technologies and research methods.	Exit Survey of graduating majors; bi-annual evaluation of data collected over a two-year period of student writing in English courses in the core curriculum and across all concentrations at the 2000- and 4000-level. Sophomore rubric scores serve as a baseline to track continued improvement as students advance through the major.	To evaluate satisfaction of graduating students with their overall departmental experience and faculty and students' perceptions of the development and ability to use multiple technologies and research methods. Target is a majority of responses in the top two ranges.	CT, WCR, RC
6. English majors will be able to speak clearly, analytically, and	Randomized evaluation of student presentations at annual English Studies Conference; university	To evaluate satisfaction of graduating students with their overall departmental experience and faculty and students'	CT, SL, RC

expressively, and will use active and critical listening skills to understand and evaluate ideas.	speaking and listening assessment in ENG 4300/4390, English Studies Capstone.	perceptions of the development and proficiency of their speaking and listening skills. Target is a majority of responses in the top two ranges.	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

## PART 2. IMPROVEMENTS AND CHANGES BASED ON ASSESSMENT

A. Provide a short summary (1-2 paragraphs) or bulleted list of any **curricular actions** (revisions or additions) that were approved over the past two years as a result of reflecting on the student learning outcomes data. Are there any additional future changes, revisions, or interventions proposed or still pending?

- **Revision of the English Major**

- In September of 2022 (our last assessment cycle), the Undergraduate Studies Committee (UGS) reviewed all assessment data and evaluations collected during AY 2020-2022 and shared this information with the department in a department meeting in November 2022. In October 2022, UGS requested that all the concentration committees (Professional Writing, Creative Writing, and ad hoc Literary and Cultural Studies Committees) undertake a curricular review and submit suggestions to UGS. This process involved student surveys, student focus groups, and faculty discussion both in committees and as a department. In late fall 2022 and early spring 2023, UGS developed a proposal for a revised English major. The proposal was revised multiple times based on feedback from the Executive Committee during spring 2023, and it was approved by the department in fall of 2023 and subsequently CLASCC and CAA. The curricular revision is now in effect, beginning AY 2024-2025. This proposal to revise the major based on assessment included the following key provisions:
  - Reduce the size of the English major core by 6 hours, bringing it down to 11 hours from 17 hours
  - Require an out-of-concentration English elective to ensure that all English majors have some experience in a concentration outside of their own
  - Change English electives to 12 hours and make the elective requirement the same for Professional Writing, Creative Writing, and Literary Studies

Altogether, these changes reduced the overall size of the major from 50-53 hours to 44 hours for Creative Writing and Literary and Cultural Studies, and to 41 hours for Professional Writing.

- **Implementation of NACE Career Competencies in Targeted Classes**

- In fall 2024, we have begun looking for ways to more explicitly teach English majors about career competency. To this end, a few select faculty who teach classes across the English curriculum have begun piloting ways to integrate teaching these competencies in our classes. This action builds on our discussion at our department retreat in May 2024 of the NACE Competencies. The group working on these met in October 2024 to discuss their progress and plans to report recommendations to the entire department in December 2024.

B. Provide a brief description or bulleted list of **any improvements (or declines)** observed/measured in student learning. Be sure to mention any intervention made that has not yet resulted in student improvement (if applicable).

- **Revised assessment process**

- In our last submitted assessment report, we indicated a need to nuance our assessment practices by broadening our assessment to include student writing from all three of our concentrations within the English major. This required the development of new rubrics and wider data collection. This assessment report includes data assessing the English major core curriculum and each of the three concentrations (Creative Writing, Literary & Cultural Studies, and Professional Writing) by evaluating undergraduate student work at the 2000- and 4000-level in each of these concentrations using concentration-specific rubrics.
- In addition, in our last assessment report we indicated that collecting exit surveys electronically was not yielding an acceptable number. To remedy this problem, we started administering surveys in face-to-face classes, as had been our pre-pandemic practice. This change has yielded considerably higher number of surveys for our data from graduating seniors.

- **Data Analysis**

Data from student writing from the English major core curriculum and the three concentrations reveals some interesting trends as detailed below.

- In the core curriculum (Fig. 1), we see marked improvement in scores from the 2000- to the 4000-level. This would indicate that students are gaining valuable skills related to SLOs 1-5 over the course of the major. It is also notable that less than 50% of majors are achieving SLOs 1-4, indicating room for improvement. In our last report, we noted that ENG 4300 (the English major capstone) was a newly revised course. Data here suggests that we should continue to discuss ways to improve the ways the course can best serve our students.
- In the Literary & Cultural Studies (Fig. 2), we again see marked improvement in scores from the 2000- to the 4000-level. Above 50% of students are achieving in the top two criteria (good, superior) at the 4000-level.
- Despite having rubrics designed for creative writing, the creative writing data (Fig. 3) is harder to assess, largely because of the number of "non-applicable" evaluations for criteria 2, 4, and 5. However, SLOs 1 and 3 show a tremendous amount of growth in student writing from the 2000- to the 4000-level, with over 50% of students achieving the top half of the evaluation criteria in those SLOs at the 4000-level. SLO 5, focused on active listening skills, was impossible to assess in nearly all data received.
- Professional Writing data (Fig. 4) also showed some variability, largely due to the difficulty of designing a rubric to adequately assess the variety of student writing produced in those courses. Over 50% of students achieved at or above the top half of the evaluation criteria for SLOs 1-4 at both the 2000- and the 4000-level. SLO 5 was an outlier, and perhaps an outcome worth discussing as we process the meaning of these assessment results for our department.
- Assessment for SLO 6 focused on Speaking and Listening (Fig. 5) reveals that 46% of students are scoring in the upper two categories (notably no students scored in the highest category).
- Finally, information from our senior exit survey (Fig. 6) suggests that students believe that they are leaving our program with high levels of achievement. SLO 5 received the lowest ratings, but even this SLO was scored at 4 points on a 5-point scale.

- **Reflection**

- UGS has begun initial discussions of this data set and the assessment process. After our previous assessment cycle, we made it a goal to broaden our assessment practices to include assessment of our concentrations separate from our core curriculum. The data

we collected and the rubrics we devised for this round of assessment reflect those altered practices. However, this round of assessment has also revealed that we need to continue to revise our assessment practices. One issue that arose during this assessment cycle was the large percentage of student writing that we received that had to be marked “non-applicable” on our rubric, which resulted in lower scores than is likely accurate. Though we realize we could have simply not counted the essays that did not allow us to assess certain criteria on the rubric, doing so would have unrealistically moved our assessment scores in the opposite direction, in many cases inflating them in ways that are also not accurate. After much deliberation about how to handle this issue for this report, we decided to keep the essays with several “non-applicable scores” in order to try to capture a more realistic assessment picture. In some cases, choosing to throw out the essays with NAs would have, in essence, meant throwing out one of our readers scores; in other cases, it would have meant, in effect, throwing out one of sets of student data we received for a class. Neither of these options seemed acceptable. We recognize that just because a data set does not check all boxes on a rubric does not mean that an assignment is not valuable, nor does it mean that all the SLOs are not being taught in any given course. This was particularly a problem for the creative and professional writing data, as well as some of the data sets for ENG 4300, the English major capstone course.

Upon reflection, UGS believes that we should use Fall 2024 to revisit our assessment practices and revise our practices. Additionally, we need to work with faculty teaching classes from which we draw student work to identify assignments and student writing that will allow us to assess the data using our rubrics. Finally, in some cases, it may be the rubric that needs some revision, or we need to find a different way to assess some of our SLOs. For instance, some rubrics had SLOs that were very hard to assess using writing (e.g., rubric criteria 5 on the creative writing rubric aimed at assessing listening, which was only possible in one portion of our data sets because the instructor included a reflective component as part of the assignment). Overall, UGS continues to find ways to develop accurate and meaningful assessment practices that will benefit our faculty and students.

### C. HISTORY OF DATA REVIEW OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS

Please document annual faculty and committee engagement with the assessment process (such as the review of outcomes data, revisions/updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs).

Date of annual (or periodic) review	Individuals or groups who reviewed the assessment plan	Results of the review (i.e., reference proposed changes from any revised SLOs or from point 2.A. curricular actions)
September 2022	Undergraduate Studies Committee	Collated and reviewed data collected from AY 2020-2022.
September 2022	Undergraduate Studies Committee	Trained graduate students facilitated focus group with a group of 13 undergraduate students using a set of questions developed by UGS. UGS then

		reviewed this data, which was collected in a way to protect student anonymity.
September-October 2022	Professional Writing Committee, Creative Writing Committee, Ad Hoc Literary Studies Committee	At the request of UGS, committees representing each emphasis in the major were asked to evaluate the core as it relates to their emphasis and the courses in their emphasis. Reports will be submitted to UGS by Oct. 15, 2022. UGS will review and make any recommendations necessary to the department to begin a curricular revision process.
November 2022	English Department	UGS presents results of assessment and focus groups and solicits feedback from the English department.
Spring 2023	Undergraduate Studies Committee and Executive Committee	UGS develops a proposal for curricular revision; this passes UGS in January, and is sent to the Executive Committee; the proposal goes through two rounds of revision before it is sent on to the English department for consideration.
Fall 2023	English Department	Faculty approve the new curriculum.
Spring 2024	English Department	UGS develops material for a department retreat focused on discussing core courses, the concentrations, and the NACE Competencies
Fall 2023 and Spring 2024	Undergraduate Studies Committee	In Fall 2023, UGS asked the Creative Writing and Professional Writing Committee to help develop rubrics appropriate for assessment of student work from their classes. For the first time, the assessment cycle includes assessing student writing collected from each of the concentrations.

Fall 2024	Select English Department faculty	Faculty in targeted classes begin implementing focused work with students on the NACE Competencies in order to improve student career consciousness and post-graduation outcomes.
Fall 2022 - Present	Undergraduate Studies Committee	Collects data each semester from targeted classes; distributes and collects English Major Exit Survey to graduating seniors each semester.
Fall 2024	English Department	UGS host three curricular discussions about overlap between concentrations, differentiating our 4000-level graduate/undergraduate classes, and implementing the NACE competencies in the major.



**Dean Review and Feedback**

This cycle's report for the BA has been submitted during the debut semester of a substantial revision to the curriculum, a process that spanned nearly two years and involved much reflection and discussion among the faculty. While good SLO/measures/results data were available (informing the curricular revision process), the Department has begun a re-visitation of assessment practices this semester (FA24) informed by limitations they discovered in the collection process thusfar. The data revealed improvements in scores between the 2000- and 4000-levels of courses in several areas, but it also revealed a few achievement percentages of concern to faculty, particularly with regard to majors in the core courses. Obviously, the dataset to come spanning 2024-2026 will give a good initial sense of the impact of the curricular and assessment-method revisions. As for the reporting in this forum, the presentation is clear (with the graphical analysis of data a plus) and easy for the external constituent to follow. One modest suggestion would be to identify the target top two ranges referenced in each results grid, and tie it to the graphic if possible. We applaud the whole-faculty concerted efforts to hone the curriculum and assessment process, which can only make students' writing, critical reading, and analytical skill-sets richer and stronger in an era where such skills are of supreme importance.



Dean or designee

12/6/24

Date

**VPAA Office Review and Feedback (for "Round B" SLO report only)**

VPAA or designee

Date