



Academic English for Multilingual Students Program

ASSESSMENT REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2020/2021

I. LOGISTICS

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Doreen Ewert, dewert@usfca.edu
Program Director

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) an aggregate report for a Major & Minor (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

None of the above.

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Has there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

None

II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2020? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program

No changes

Program Mission

AEM's mission is to serve students for whom English is not the primary language primarily in developing their written and oral language proficiency and secondarily fostering dialogue that promotes awareness of expectations of the academy and a deeper understanding of the USF Mission.

2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2020? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

None

Program Learning Outcomes (outputs)

Students who have applied themselves rigorously in their AEM studies will be able to:

- A. *Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes.*
- B. *Intelligibly communicate orally for a variety of academic and personal purposes.*
- C. *Understand the rationale and demonstrate means for using reliable sources of information.*
- D. *Demonstrate and articulate typical expectations of a liberal arts education in US universities.*
- E. *Articulate knowledge of the USF Mission*

at the level expected of those who are not required to take any additional AEM courses when entering their first semester of studies at USF in RHET 106 or RHET 06N.

3. State the particular Program Learning Outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2020/21

PLOs A and B have been assessed directly in the past 5 years, and C-E have been assessed through prochievement activities prior to our last Departmental APR (report submitted in June 2019). In 2020, we engaged in indirect assessment of PLOs A and C by examining the results of our Skipping Policy. Results indicated that students who demonstrate the ability to communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes at a level higher than the one they are enrolled in are able to successfully complete the new level of composition they enroll in. We are satisfied that our method of evaluating student portfolios is such that the students who are given permission to skip a level are able to perform successfully. No changes in our policy or process were considered necessary.

We have not assessed a PLO directly since the Spring of 2019. This is primarily due to low enrollment in the program as a whole and thus, the inability to offer all of our curriculum. For example, we have not offered AEM 111 or 121 since Fall 2019 due to low enrollment. For this reason, we are not able to assess directly, PLO B, and this also limits our ability to assess PLO C-E, since those three are addressed in both literacy and oracy courses. AEM 102 Fluency Development has also not been offered since Fall 2019, and PLOs B-D are addressed in this course as well. Enrollment has continued to steadily decrease to the lowest point in over 10

years, with only 13 students completing our one section of AEM 124 in Spring 2021. All but three of those students moved on to non-AEM coursework or left USF.

Hampering recent assessment activity additionally, though, was the pivot to remote instruction in March 2020. Remote instruction continues through the end of this semester. Teaching language online is difficult in and of itself, but having new international students doing it online from their home first language environments has taken all the attention and energy of the faculty.

At this time, Fall 2021, we have 1 continuing student from Spring 2021 in our program and 29 new students (two of whom were twice deferred) for a total of 30 students, and we are offering one section of AEM 124 Academic Reading and Writing III, one section of AEM 120 Academic Reading and Writing II, and one section of AEM 121 Academic Oral Communication II. We are once again in a position to engage in program learning outcomes assessment.

Data collection for the next assessment will be at the end of the Fall 2021 semester. We will primarily be assessing PLO B in AEM 120 Academic Reading and Writing II and AEM 124 Academic Reading and Writing III. However, depending on the nature of the task as determined by individual instructors, assessment of PLOs C, D, and E is possible

In Fall 2019, along with the rest of the Department of Rhetoric and Language, we began to require a graded oral presentation in the composition courses in our program, and a graded written assignment in the oral communication courses in our program. This will be our first time assessing the integration of oral presentations into the composition courses. Our previous assessment of oral communication in AEM 121 Academic Oral Communication, revealed that students needed to develop stronger skills in presenting academic content, particularly in regard to oral citation. With the inclusion of an oral presentation in more than one course in the program, we anticipate that the PLO will be better met.

We will use the same data-driven approach common in our field. While we have established rubrics for placement purposes, these are less accurate for assessing proficiency and achievement simultaneously and with tasks that are instructor-designed. Since we have never assessed the oral presentations now integrated into composition courses, we will take a methodical process of developing our assessment categories and criteria. First, each presentation (audio/video) will be viewed independently by at least two faculty to identify relevant features and characteristics. Through conversation, this constant comparative method of analysis will lead to the topics and criteria for assessment. At that point, the presentations will be reviewed again by at least 2 faculty using the emergent rubric. Where assessments diverge, a third faculty will view the presentation. If this doesn't resolve the difference, we will discuss the presentation.

V. CLOSING THE LOOP

1. How will you close the loop between the implication of these results and your curriculum?

We will make changes in the curriculum depending on the results. The curriculum may need to indicate greater specificity in the guidelines for the presentation requirement.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2019/20, submitted in October 2020)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

Since we did not do direct assessment, we did not get feedback.

In the absence of direct assessment for this short period of time (Spring 2020-Spring 2021), indirect evidence is continuously gathered. Unlike other university programs, AEM's enrollment relies on semester by semester recruitment efforts. The dramatic drop in enrollment over the past 5-6 years has certainly been in large part the result of global issues, but it has also been the result of the lack of a recruitment strategy that understands the value of the AEM curriculum to overall international undergraduate student enrollment at USF, and a class size minimum requirement that does not allow the AEM program to provide the necessary courses for randomly recruited students at varying levels of academic English language proficiency. On average, over the past seven years, 28% of new international undergraduate students take courses in their first, and sometimes second, semesters in AEM. In other words, without the AEM program, we would have had about 1/3 fewer international undergraduate students in each of the past seven years. In addition, the retention of these students through their AEM courses (typically completed in one semester) and into the fourth semester at USF is higher than the overall student population. After two semesters, the retention rate is over 90%, and after 3 semesters, it is well over 80%. Furthermore, although these students begin their university studies with a considerable disadvantage in terms of academic English language proficiency, they maintain similar GPAs to their non-AEM international admit cohort throughout their required Rhetoric coursework. The data start to skew in the last two fall semesters when the numbers have been so low that individual variation has a greater impact on the average. Attached you will find a report given to the Provost in October 2021 that provides details for this summary.