Colorado State University – Pueblo   Graduate Program Assessment Report for AY 2011-2012   Due June 1, 2011

Program:__English M.A._____   **Date:** __May 31, 2012_____

Completed by:__Ted Taylor

Please complete this form for each undergraduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S.) in your department and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2011. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle?	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO?	D. Who was assessed?	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements are planned based on this assessment?
1. Demonstrates Professional Level of Competency in the Study of Literature	Last year (applies to all)	M.A. Thesis or Research Project and Oral Defense (applies to all)	M.A. Candidates	Between 3 and 4 for all SLOs and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level.	Total students: 12 Average: 3.41 (up .22 from last year)	Meet expectations but would like to continue to improve performance in all areas and increase the average.	Altering core offerings so as to enroll all incoming students in Research Methods and Theories of Writing during their first semester. (We started this in Fall 2011.)
2. Incorporates Theories and Techniques of Literary Criticism at a Professional Level					Average: 3.33 (up .33 from last year).		

3. Incorporates Theories and Techniques of Literary Theories of Writing and Rhetoric					Average: 3.11 (up .11 from last year)		
4. Reveals Professional-Level Writing Skills Appropriate to the Genre(s) of the Work					Average: 3.38 (up .23 from last year)		
5. Employs Research Techniques for English Studies in a Professional Manner					Average: 3.31 (up .26 from last year)		
6. Manifests professional Understanding of Pedagogical Theories and Techniques Appropriate to English Studies					Average: 3.09 (up .01 from last year)		

Comments: Average scores were higher for all the SLOs this year as compared to last year. It's too early to attribute the increase in scores to our enrolling all incoming students in Research Methods and Theories of Writing during their first semester. The increases are probably due to our increasing selectiveness in admitting new students.

B. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address?	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
Demonstrates Professional Level of Competency in the Study of Literature	Last year.	Altering core offerings so as to enroll all incoming students in Research Methods and Theories of Writing during their first semester.	Yes.	We won't be able to see the results of these changes until our 2013-2014 assessment, when students who are affected by the changes have moved through the program.

Comments: We have not altered the assessment process. We have ensured that all committee members submit assessment forms at the time of the final oral presentation (research project) or thesis defense.

CSU English General M.A. in English Offered in Pueblo

Thesis or Independent Research Project Evaluation Sheet

Thesis Author: _____   Scorer: _____

Rate the work in each category on a scale of 0 to 4, 4 being the highest. The rubrics are explained on the reverse. If a category is inappropriate for the thesis or reseach project under review, leave that row blank.   ¬

	0	1	2	3	4
Demonstrates Professional Level of Competency in the Study of Literature					
Incorporates Theories and Techniques of Literary Criticism at a Professional Level (if relevant)					
Reveals Professional Level of Understanding Theories of Writing and Rhetoric (if relevant)					
Reveals Professional-Level Writing Skills Appropriate to the Genre(s) of the Work					

Employs Research Techniques for English Studies in a Professional Manner

Manifests Professional Understanding of Pedagogical Theories and Techniques Appropriate to English Studies (if relevant)

Notes:

M.A. Thesis or Research Project Evaluation Standards for Program Assessment

Demonstrates Professional Level of Competency in the Study of Literature.

4.   The work embodies original and persuasive insights into the text(s) it studies and is of publishable quality.

3.   The work presents a valid argument and is of near-publishable quality.

2.   The work is weakened by less-than-professional level competency in the study of literature.

1.   The work makes significant errors in its study of literature.

0.   The work is entirely unsatisfactory in meeting professional standards for the study of literature.

Incorporates Theories and Techniques of Literary Criticism at a Professional Level.

4.   The work embodies literary theories and critical techniques in a fully professional manner.

3.   The work makes no significant errors in employing theories and techniques of literary criticism.

2.   The work is weakened by less-than-professional competency in using the theories and techniques of literary criticism.

1.   The work makes significant errors in using the theories and techniqes of literary criticism.

0.   The work is entirely unsatisfactory in meeting professional standards in using the theories and techniques of literary criticism.

Reveals Professional Level of Understanding Theories of Writing and Rhetoric.

4.   The work embodies an understanding of theories of writing and rhetoric at a professional level.

3.   The work makes no significant errors regarding theories of writing and rhetoric.

2.   The work is weakened by inadequate understanding of theories of writing and rhetoric.

1.   The work contains significant errors regarding theories of writing and rhetoric.

0.   The work is entirely unsatisfactory in meeting professional standards in understanding or applying theories of writing and rhetoric.

Reveals Professional-Level Writing Skills Appropriate to the Genre(s) of the Work

4.   The work is noteworthy for its polished, eloquent, and/or effective writing.

3.   The work reflects professional-level competency in writing.

2.   The work is weakened by inadequate skill in writing.

1.   The work contains significant errors in writing.

0.   The work does not manifest adequate skills in writing.

Employs Research Techniques for English Studies in a Professional Manner

4.   The work is fully professional in its incorporation and documentation of research.

3.   The work makes no significant errors in its incorporation and documentation of research.

2.   The work is weakened by inadequate incorporation and documentation of research.

1.   The work makes significant errors in its research and documentation.

0.   The work does not manifest adequate skills in research or documentation.

Manifests Professional Understanding of Pedagogical Theories and Techniques Appropriate to English Studies

4.   The work embodies an understanding of pedagogical theories and techniques at a professional level.

3.   The work makes no significant errors regarding pedagogical theories and techniques.

2.   The work is weakened by incorrect or inadequate understanding of pedagogical theories or techniques.

1.   The work makes significant errors regarding pedagogical theories or techniques.

0.   The work does not manifest adequate understanding of pedagogical theories and techniques.