UAA Academic Affairs
UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA ANCHORAGE

REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

Submission date: 11/15/2023

Assessment Plan covered in the report: English BA

College: College of Arts and Sciences

Campuses where the program(s) is delivered: ☒Anchorage ☒KOD ☒KPC ☒MSC ☒PWSC

Submitted by: Trish Jenkins, Professor of English: pmjenkins@alaska.edu

After responding to the questions below, the program should email this form to the dean, with a copy to the appropriate community campus director(s) if the program is delivered on a community campus.

1. **Please list and number the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed in AY23. For each outcome, indicate one of the following: Exceeded faculty expectations, Met faculty expectations, or Did not meet faculty expectations.**

   Example: 1. Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats – Exceeded faculty expectations; 2. Adopt critical perspectives for understanding the forces of globalization and diversity – Met faculty expectations.

   Engage in scholarly, professional, and public discourse in diverse communities -- Met faculty expectations.

2. **Describe your assessment process in AY23 for these Program Student Learning Outcomes, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty (and other, e.g., advisory board) conversations around the findings.** *(1000 words or less)*

   1. Participating faculty assessed this SLO: "Engage in scholarly, professional, and public discourse in diverse communities."

   2. Participants randomly selected three papers or projects.

   3. Classes represented: 1) introduction to the major and lower-division electives and 2) upper-division electives and capstone

   4. Participants had access to the assessment rubric from our assessment plan for this PLO.

   5. Participants were provided with prompts to guide assessments.

   6. We analyzed data by totaling the number of responses for each level (e.g., 5 being A-level work).

and by sorting lower-division responses from upper-division responses.

7. Faculty were asked to rate artifacts with expectations associated with the course level.

8. Department of English and Department of Writing Faculty were provided with findings prior to our submitting this report.

3. **What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? *(1000 words or less)***

Part One: Findings

Findings are based on responses for 14 courses. There were 18 responses total because some courses reported one had two sections. Nine courses were lower-division courses, and five were upper-division. Participants assessed three randomly selected artifacts for each course reported on. Fifty-four artifacts were assessed. Artifacts were rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score.

Four observations stood out:

1. A majority of the artifacts assessed were rated a 4 or 5.

2. None of the artifacts assessed were rated a 1 or 2.

3. Artifacts were rated noticeably high in both lower and upper-division courses.

4. Students are generally producing work that meets expectations for the course level.

Details are below.

1. Overall findings are as follows:

- 57.4% rated 5.

- 33.3% rated 4.

- 9.3% rated 3.

2. Findings for the two levels of courses are as follows:

Intro to major and lower-division electives: 9 different courses; 9 sections = 27 artifacts assessed

- 15 in the 5 range

- 9 in the 4 range

- 3 in the 3 range

Upper-division courses: 5 different courses; 9 sections = 27 artifacts assessed:

- 16 in the 5 range

- 9 in the 4 range

- 2 in the 3 range

Part Two: What findings tell faculty about student learning in our program

These findings show that students are learning and applying what we expect them to learn with regard to engaging with scholarly, professional, and public discourse in diverse communities in our lower-division courses. This suggests that by completing our lower-division courses, students are able to access, understand, and compose in various situations and contexts. Furthermore, the findings show that student performance related to this PLO advances appropriately in upper-division courses. In other words, knowledge and skills students learn in their lower-division courses related to this PLO transfer to their upper-division courses and provide a foundation for further learning.

Furthermore, this observation about students' ability to transfer knowledge and skills related to the PLO from their lower-division courses to their upper-division courses brings to mind the concept of "high road transfer," which "depends on deliberate, mindful abstraction of skill or knowledge from one context for application to another" (p. 25). Knowledge and skills do not automatically transfer across dissimilar contexts; therefore, high road transfer requires "reflective thought in abstracting from one context and seeking connections with others" (p. 26).

These observations suggest that we are meeting the goal of our BA in English program, which is to prepare students to succeed in an increasingly diverse world by encouraging lifelong learning, critical thinking, and effective writing.

Quoted material from: Perkins D.N., Salomon G. (1989). Teaching for transfer. Educational Leadership, 46 (1): 22-32.

4. **Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes?** No

   i. **Please describe the recommended action(s), what improvements in student learning the program hopes to see, the proposed timeline, and how the program will know if the change(s) has worked. If no recommendations for changes were made, please explain that decision.** *(1000 words or less)*
   With regard to the PLOs, students are acquiring knowledge and skills appropriately.

5. **In the past academic year, how did your program use the results of previous assessment cycles to make changes intended to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Please check all that apply.**

   ☐ Course curriculum changes
   ☒ Course prerequisite changes

☐Changes in teaching methods

☐Changes in advising

☐Degree requirement changes

☐Degree course sequencing

☐Course enrollment changes (e.g., course capacity, grading structure [pass/fail, A-F])

☐Changes in program policies/procedures

☐Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

☐College-wide initiatives (e.g., High-Impact Practices)

☐Faculty, staff, student development

☐Other

☐No changes were implemented in AY23. *(If no options above were selected)*

If you checked "Other" above, please describe. *(100 words or less)*

6. **Do you have any information about how well these or other past improvements are working? Are they achieving their intended goals? Please include any data or assessment results that help you demonstrate this. *(1000 words or less)***

   We reduced course prerequisites for upper-division courses to allow students to progress more easily through major.

   We have no data yet on the success of this action; however, anecdotal evidence from students and advisors assures us that this move has been successful.

DEAN SECTION (Due to the program on January 15)

After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean should email this form to the program, and copy uaa_oaa@alaska.edu for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campus, the dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and copy the appropriate community campus director(s) when emailing the response to the program.

1. **Based on the program's responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward? *(200 words or less)***

   The program should discuss more fully the collaboration with community campuses in the assessment process.

2. **Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc.** *(200 words or less)*

The assessment process is comprehensive and thorough, drawing from both lower and upper division courses. The discussion of the "high road transfer" is thoughtful and appreciated.

Dean's signature: Jenny McNulty   **Date:** 1/12/2024