

## REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

**Submission date:** 11/15/2023

**Assessment Plan covered in the report:** Professional Writing OEC

**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 upper-division courses: ENGL A312, ENGL A313, ENGL A414, and ENGL A495.

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).

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 four upper-division courses: ENGL A312, ENGL A313, ENGL A414, and ENGL A495. There were nine responses total because some courses reported on had two sections. Participants assessed three randomly selected artifacts for each course reported on. Twenty-seven artifacts were assessed. Artifacts were rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score.

Two 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.

Details are below.

1. Overall findings are as follows:

- 51.9.0% rated 5
- 33.3% rated 4
- 14.8% rated

2. Of the 27 artifacts assessed:

- 14 in the 5 range
- 9 in the 4 range
- 4 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 upper-division courses affiliated with the Occupational Endorsement in Professional Writing. This suggests that by completing these courses, students are able to access, understand, and compose in various situations and contexts.

These observations suggest that we are meeting the goal of the Occupational Endorsement Certificate (OEC) in Professional Writing, which seeks to provide students focused training in writing, offering skills in multiple genres and styles of written communication used in the workplace. While

the focus of the OEC is on workplace writing, acquiring the knowledge and skills associated with this type of writing requires engaging with scholarly, professional, and public discourse in diverse communities.

**4. Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Yes**

- 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)**

This program includes courses from both the Department of English and Department of Writing; however, the Department of English has easy access only to data for courses with an ENGL prefix.

To gain a full understanding of student achievement in the OEC in Professional Writing, the Department of English needs to develop a method by which courses with a WRTG prefix that are included in the course options can be included in the assessment process. The Department of English intends to work with the Department of Writing to develop a method to do so. This will be in effect for the next assessment cycle.

**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 do not have any information regarding past improvements or intended goals because this is the first assessment cycle for this program.

---

**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\\_ooo@alaska.edu](mailto:uaa_ooo@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)**

I agree with the report that it would be good to collaborate with Writing to assess this OEC across both WRIT and ENG courses. I encourage the program to do so.

- 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)**

This is a solid start for the assessment of this new program. It is good to see students writing well in professional setting.

Dean's signature: Jenny McNulty

Date: 1/12/2024