Program Level Assessment Report for 2012-2013

PROGRAM NAME, DEGREE NAME
(e.g. Organizational Leadership, B.S.): Bachelor of Arts in English, Integrated Language Arts (ILA) Concentration

COLLEGE in which PROGRAM is housed: College of Liberal Arts

REPORT PREPARED by: Department of English Undergraduate Committee/Chair Andrew Strombeck

A. ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING
What actions did you take in 2012-2013, based on previous assessment findings, to improve student learning in your program? (Refer back to plans indicated in “Response to Assessment Findings” in 2011-2012 Assessment Report.)

This year, the department conducted two levels of assessment, one at the level of the individual concentration, Integrated Language Arts, and one at the level of the full department. Both assessments examined capstone papers from the program, and both reached nearly identical conclusions.

B. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSED AND EXAMINED
Which Program Level Student Learning Outcomes did you assess and examine during 2012-2013? List the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes using the format of “Graduates will be able to ___________________.”

ILA establishes the following outcomes for their students.

1. A comprehensive understanding of the five strands of Integrated Language Arts (reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing/visually representing) and how these pieces contribute to a content-rich classroom experience for middle and high school students.

2. Knowledge of diverse texts, including classic, young adult, graphic novels, multicultural texts, and non-print media and how teachers can use these texts to engage secondary students in rigorous experiential processes within the ILA classroom. In the portfolio, we judge this through the following pieces:

3. A thorough ability to write expository pieces with rhetorical competence (accuracy, coherence, clarity, and correctness). We assess this through the following portfolio documents:

4. An ability to plan comprehensive, experiential, and inquiry-based lessons that show an understanding of the Common Core State Standards (these portfolios bridge a standard transition in Ohio, so some use the Ohio Academic Content Standards), alignment, and adequate ability to scaffold instruction for a variety of learners.

The ILA level assessment examined all four areas. The department level assessment examined only the first three.

C. METHODS FOR COLLECTING DATA
Which students were included in the assessment? (For example, all seniors completing Course X in Spring 2013, all graduating seniors, etc.)

The ILA level assessment gathered capstone papers from ENG 486, the capstone class for the concentration, for the past three years. The department level assessment looked at a more limited set from 2011-2012.

D. ASSESSMENT MEASURES
- What key assessments/assignments/student work did you examine to directly assess the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes listed above?

Both assessments used the capstone portfolio as a basis for assessment. The ILA assessment examined all elements of the portfolio, while the department assessment examined only the reflective essay and literary analysis pieces of the portfolio.

E. SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS/ ACTIONS PLANNED TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING (sections combined)
The ILA findings, with which the department findings concur, are as follows:
We found that while our students do write coherently and accurately, they can fail to proofread and edit longer papers appropriately. We believe this stems directly from working on longer pieces with multiple outcomes (the portfolio). We would like to work more on this area with them, as they will often encounter it with their own students. We believe we can do this by assigning papers in all of our ILA classes as a process and scaffolding the various stages of work on one larger piece. So, instead of one final due date, we would have multiple due dates for the same piece, with accompanying dialogue journals between professors and students. In these journals, student writers will identify their specific areas of concern with each phase of the paper; we will then use these as guiding points in our feedback process. This increases ownership and dialogue with student writers. We already do a lot of this in select ILA courses (writing workshop, writing processes, and capstone), but we could do it in all of the courses in some capacity.

Another area of weakness, which we are not detecting from the portfolios, but have seen in the graduate year, is that our students need more foundational work in assessment. Currently, our portfolio rubric does not include an assessment piece. We would like to add this piece for future portfolios. The language we will use for this is as follows:

7. Student demonstrates a foundational understanding of formative and summative assessment in the ILA classroom

There is an assessment portion to the ILA lesson. Adding this specific piece to the rubric will help reviewers focus on this area in their own future reviews of the program. We have not included this in the past, as our students do more assessment work in their graduate year. We will continue to focus in the undergraduate experience on building content area mastery, but we do want them to have a working foundation concerning formative and summative assessment in ILA before entering the graduate year.

Although students include the CCSS or the ODE standards in their lessons, we also want them to have more of a critical understanding of these and how they align with a backwards design model. We’ve already started working on this with the introduction of the CCSS in Ohio. In ENG 3570, we’ve added a rationale section for the chosen CCSS in a lesson. This section offers candidates an opportunity to discuss their reasoning for choosing specific standards for their lessons; in addition, it asks them to demonstrate how the lesson will offer secondary students classroom experiences that introduce, reinforce, or assess chosen standards. This will be a new area of focus as we assess future portfolios.

F. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS
ILA results were discussed by the ILA committee in a meeting, while department results were discussed by the Undergraduate committee over email.

H. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (recommended)
Please attach minutes of program faculty meeting where discussion of results and action planning occurred and any other relevant documents.

Attached:
ILA Portfolio Reviews

Department of English: Assessment of Undergraduate Program Rubric for Evaluating Undergraduate Writing in ILA
ILA Portfolio Reviews

Overview of the Capstone Portfolio:
The capstone portfolio allows us to assess several key instructional goals for our 5- class sequence. We gauge student understanding in the following areas:

5. A comprehensive understanding of the five strands of Integrated Language Arts (reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing/visually representing) and how these pieces contribute to a content-rich classroom experience for middle and high school students. In the portfolio, we judge this through:
   a. The reflective essay
   b. Enclosed lesson plans that should touch on all five of these strands by paying specific attention to reading and writing processes in the classroom.

6. Knowledge of diverse texts, including classic, young adult, graphic novels, multicultural texts, and non-print media and how teachers can use these texts to engage secondary students in rigorous experiential processes within the ILA classroom. In the portfolio, we judge this through the following pieces:
   a. The reflective essay
   b. Lesson plans that include diverse texts and exemplify multiple ways for students to dissect these texts through classroom experiences.
   c. A literary analysis essay from the ILA Capstone course.

7. A thorough ability to write expository pieces with rhetorical competence (accuracy, coherence, clarity, and correctness). We assess this through the following portfolio documents:
   a. The reflective essay
   b. The analysis essay
   c. Supporting documents chosen by the student

8. An ability to plan comprehensive, experiential, and inquiry-based lessons that show an understanding of the Common Core State Standards (these portfolios bridge a standard transition in Ohio, so some use the Ohio Academic Content Standards), alignment, and adequate ability to scaffold instruction for a variety of learners. We assess this through the following documents:
   a. The enclosed lesson plans. These follow a specific ILA lesson plan format or a specific ILA process lesson format, so there should be similarities in lesson formats within our cross section of portfolios.

Recent Review:
The ILA professors reviewed a random selection of ILA capstone portfolios from the past 3 years (2009-2012).
We found that candidates scored consistently as “competent” or “excellent” in all six areas of the rubric.
Areas of Weakness:
1. From our reviews and subsequent meeting, we believe one of our areas of weakness is in area 6 of our rubric. We found that while our students do write coherently and accurately, they can fail to proofread and edit longer papers appropriately. We believe this stems directly from working on longer pieces with multiple outcomes (the portfolio). We would like to work more on this area with them, as they will often encounter it with their own students. We believe we can do this by assigning papers in all of our ILA classes as a process and scaffolding the various stages of work on one larger piece. So, instead of one final due date, we would have multiple due dates for the same piece, with accompanying dialogue journals between professors and students. In these journals, student writers will identify their specific areas of concern with each phase of the paper; we will then use these as guiding points in our feedback process. This increases ownership and dialogue with student writers. We already do a lot of this in select ILA courses (writing workshop, writing processes, and capstone), but we could do it in all of the courses in some capacity.

2. Another area of weakness, which we are not detecting from the portfolios, but have seen in the graduate year, is that our students need more foundational work in assessment. Currently, our portfolio rubric does not include an assessment piece. We would like to add this piece for future portfolios. The language we will use for this is as follows:

   7. Student demonstrates a foundational understanding of formative and summative assessment in the ILA classroom

There is an assessment portion to the ILA lesson. Adding this specific piece to the rubric will help reviewers focus on this area in our own future reviews of the program. We have not included this in the past, as our students do more assessment work in their graduate year. We will continue to focus in the undergraduate experience on building content area mastery, but we do want them to have a working foundation concerning formative and summative assessment in ILA before entering the graduate year.

3. Although students include the CCSS or the ODE standards in their lessons, we also want them to have more of a critical understanding of these and how they align with a backwards design model. We’ve already started working on this with the introduction of the CCSS in Ohio. In ENG 3570, we’ve added a rationale section for the chosen CCSS in a lesson. This section offers candidates an opportunity to discuss their reasoning for choosing specific standards for their lessons; in addition, it asks them to demonstrate how the lesson will offer secondary students classroom experiences that introduce, reinforce, or assess chosen standards. This will be a new area of focus as we assess future portfolios.
### Department of English: Assessment of Undergraduate Program

**Rubric for Evaluating Undergraduate Writing in ILA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Average Department Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflective essay indicates student’s familiarity with important elements and scholarship in ILA</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers reflect thoughtfulness and thoroughness</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers demonstrate ability to read, respond to, and interpret texts</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers demonstrate ability to write expository texts with rhetorical competence: accuracy, coherence, clarity, correctness</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper progresses by clearly ordered and necessary stages.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraphs are unified and developed effectively.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences are coherent and emphatic.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word choices are contextually appropriate and clear.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofreading is careful and complete.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Excellent
3 Good
2 Fair
1 Poor