



Academic English for Multilingual Students Program

ASSESSMENT REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2021-2022

I. LOGISTICS & Program Learning Outcomes

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. AEM is a program that offers credit-bearing courses for academic language development of students for whom English is not the primary language.

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

None. The AEM Curricular Map is Appendix A. The AEM Assessment Plan is Appendix B.

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

PLO A. Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes.

PLO C. Understand the rationale and demonstrate means for using reliable sources of information.

It has been 6 years since we have assessment what many would say is the primary program learning outcome: Each of the AEM literacy courses includes writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes (i.e., summaries, annotated bibliographies, business and personal letters, formal email). However, the personal writing is not “high-stakes” writing as is the academic writing. For this reason, our primary concern is source-based writing, which is the primary genre of most disciplines especially at introductory levels. The final assignment in AEM 124 is typically a multi-source persuasive argument or multi-source information text. Of critical importance is whether the students are able to produce academic discourse that is at least equal to the lowest level of academic discourse considered acceptable for the RHET sequence of composition courses.

III. METHODOLOGY

The English Placement Exam is designed to place students into the three levels of the AEM program as well as into the first level of the RHET composition sequence (RHET 106 or 106N). The EPT holistic rubric (Appendix C) has been in use for almost a decade and has been validated by the accuracy of placements (measured by how few students need to change levels up or down after first week diagnostic activity in the courses, and in their passing rates from the courses). The EPT holistic rubric was used to evaluate end of semester writing in each section of AEM 124 for AY 21-22. Since the data was collected from different sections of AEM 124, the assignment sheets for the final written assignment were considered in the development of the analytic rubric.

In addition, an analytic rubric (Appendix D) was used to more closely investigate the students' ability to quote, cite, and reference external sources in these multi-source persuasive essays. Since this rubric was being used for the first time, the results should be seen as provisional, but the data will be used to develop the rubric for future use.

Due to very low enrollment, the total data set includes 22 papers (approximately 3 pages each). The three AEM faculty currently teaching are all trained in holistic assessment and in particular in EPT assessment. Each person read each paper independently and assigned two “grades”: one holistic score for the EPT Level and one analytic score for Source-Use (made up of three criteria in the analytic rubric). Two raters had to give the same score, with the third scorer only different by 1 point, or the middle score of three consecutive scores were used.

With so few data points, only descriptive statistics were prepared.

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

Two sections of AEM 124 were taught in AY 20-21, with a total of 22 students. Interrater reliability was .82. The results of the applying the EPT holistic rubric to the final essays of students in these two classes, indicated that 77% (17/22) of the students produced essays that placed them into the next composition level in the sequence of courses in the Department of Rhetoric and Language; thus, fulfilling PLO A.

Of course, these results do not represent the percentage of students who passed the AEM 124 course and proceeded to the next level or even skipped the next level since those decisions are based on grades for the entire course, which includes much more evidence of their abilities in both reading, writing, providing feedback, multimodal presentations, and editing. Additionally, with such a small *N*, individual variations in motivation, participation, and proficiency have a large impact on the total score. Had this outcome been based on twice as many papers, it would be somewhat concerning.

An initial review of the source-use analytic rubric results for PLO C were more enlightening than the full essay holistic assessment results since these results ranged from 0-6, with only 4/22 achieving a total score of 6. Some of this variation is due to the second criterion "quoting" since many students did not quote at all. The two assignments did not require quoting, but required proper format if quotes were used. This led, unfairly, to many students receiving a 0 in this category. A secondary analysis was done without the second criterion. The same process for scoring was used as in the holistic essay assessment. Interrater reliability for criterion 1 was .77 and for criterion 3, .67. The results indicated that 10/22 (45%) students received a 4/4, 8/22 (36%) received a 3/4, and 4/22 (18%) received scores below 3.

V. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

In terms of PLO A, we will need a larger data set to reduce individual variation, before initiating a review/revision of the PLO or course objectives. If instructors use similar final assignments in the coming year, we could use the same rubric and put the data of the two years together. If the passing rate is still less than 80%, course outcomes and objectives need to be analyzed and possibly adjusted.

As for PLO C, the wide variety of source types used, source uses (or lack thereof), as well as degree of awareness of citation and reference basics was quite surprising. While 100% accuracy was not part of the scoring criteria, there were very few if any students who came close to that standard. The parenthetical and narrative in-text citations were better than the reference list citations in format, but there seemed to have been insufficient in-text citation overall. In other words, a lot of specific information, which was not general knowledge, was not cited. Understanding full well the developmental (and cultural) nature of source-based writing, it seems important to establish some coherent criteria to use for this PLO in courses at each level in the AEM program when engaging in source-based writing.

As such, developing more specific attributes (along a developmental cline) for PLO C will be on the agenda for AEM Faculty activity in Spring 2023 and then to be implemented and tested again in Fall 2023. This analysis and rubric development will also increase interrater reliability for this analytic assessment component.

- 2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2020/2021 submitted in October 2021)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?**

We did not engage in direct assessment last year so we did not receive any assessment feedback. The report prepared regarding the state (demise) of the AEM program was shared with the Provost, the VP for Enrollment Management, and the Director of International Recruitment.

APPENDIX A

Curriculum Map of AEM PLOs and AEM Required Courses

Required AEM Courses	Academic Literary			Academic Oracy	
	AEM 110	AEM 120	AEM 124	RHET 106/N	AEM 111 / AEM 121
A. Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes.	I	M	M	C	I / M
B. Intelligibly communicate orally for a variety of academic and personal purposes.					I / M
C. Understand the rationale and demonstrate means for using reliable sources of information.	I	M	M	C	I / M
D. Demonstrate and articulate typical expectations of a liberal arts education in US universities.	I	M	M	C	I / M
E. Articulate knowledge of the USF Mission	I	M	M	C	I / M

Key

I = Introduced with minimal coverage

M = Moderate Coverage

C = Comprehensive Coverage

AEM Assessment Plan 2015-Present

APPENDIX B

Report	PLO	Description	Data Source	Method
2015/2016	A	Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes.	AEM 124 Final Written Assignment	AEM FT and PT faculty using the English Placement Test Rubric
2016/2017	A,C,D	A. Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes. C. Understand the rationale and demonstrate means for using reliable D. Demonstrate and articulate typical expectations of a liberal arts	AEM 124 Literacy Prochievement Task	AEM FT and PT faculty using a data-driven rubric
2017/2018	B, C	B. Intelligibly communicate orally for a variety of academic and personal purposes. C. Understand the rationale and demonstrate means for using reliable	AEM 121 Recorded Planned Speeches	AEM FT faculty using a data-driven rubric
2018/2019	D	D. Demonstrate and articulate typical expectations of a liberal arts	AEM 120, 121, 124 Written response to 1 sentence prompt re: Liberal Arts Education	AEM FT faculty using a data-driven rubric
2019/2020	COVID	Indirect assessment of Skipping Policy	Grades in subsequent RHET courses	Within and between group comparisons
2020/2021		Assessment precluded by low enrollment		
2021/2022	A,C	A. Communicate successfully in writing for a variety of academic and personal purposes. C. Understand the rationale and demonstrate means for using reliable	AEM 124 Final Written Assignments	AEM FT faculty using the English Placement Test Rubric
2022/2023	B and ?	B. Intelligibly communicate orally for a variety of academic and personal purposes.	AEM 124, AEM 121 Recorded Speeches	
PLOs				
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				

APPENDIX C

EPT Writing Rating Rubric

Please note: The bullets indicate a hierarchy, with the items at the top receiving more weight than the bullets at the bottom of each category

Rhet 106	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strongly indicates the ability to write a logical response• Well organized, all elements are unified and cohesive• Well developed with specific examples that support the main idea• Sentence structure variety• Sophisticated vocabulary• Infrequent but present errors
Level III	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indicates the ability to write a logical response• Organized adequately• Adequate supporting details• Sentence structure less varied than a 106 response• Vocabulary less sophisticated than a 106 response
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indicates some ability to write a logical response• Weak organization• Weak development/support for main idea• Sentence structure lacks sophistication• Vocabulary lacks sophistication• Frequent mechanical and grammatical errors
Level I	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indicates a very weak ability to write a logical response• Weak organization• Few supporting details, may be inappropriate/off-topic• Significant and frequent sentence-level errors that impede understanding
Intro	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strongly indicates inability to write an acceptable response• No apparent organization• No apparent development• Sentences may be brief and fragmentary• Very significant grammatical and mechanical errors

APPENDIX D

Criteria	Does not meet 0 Barely meets 1 Meets 2
In-text citation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Adequate use</u>: whether narrative or parenthetical, cited when needed • <u>Adequate form</u>: Close to APA expectations 	
Quotation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Adequate use</u>: not over used; appropriate content (not just avoiding paraphrase) • <u>Adequate form</u>: punctuation, cited, page number 	
Reference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Adequate form</u> Close to APA expectations 	
<u>Total</u>	