

Program: English M.A.Date: Jun3, 2013Completed 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, 2013. 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. Assessment of Theses (and Defenses) by Thesis Directors and Committee Members

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?
	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. (Applies to all.)	Total students: 11	Almost met expectations (see below). Students are performing as desired.	None.
1. Demonstrates Professional Level of Competency in the Study of Literature					Average: 3.33 (down .08 from last year)		

2. Incorporates Theories and Techniques of Literary Criticism at a Professional Level					Average: 3.40 (up .07 from last year).		
3. Reveals Professional Level of Understanding Theories of Writing and Rhetoric					Average: 3.43 (up .32 from last year)		
4. Reveals Professional-Level Writing Skills Appropriate to the Genre(s) of the Work					Average: 3.38 (same as last year)		
5. Employs Research Techniques for English Studies in a Professional Manner					Average: 3.23 (down .08 from last year)		
6. Manifests professional Understanding of Pedagogical Theories and					Average: 3.37 (up .28 from last year)		

Techniques Appropriate to English Studies							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comments: Average scores were about the same for most of the SLOs this year as compared to last year. We seem to have improved a little with respect to theories of writing, rhetoric, and pedagogy (see #3 & #6). Assessment Goals were almost met: The average ratings were between 3 and 4 for all SLOs and all but one of our graduating M.A. students were at this level.

B. Assessment of Skills and Knowledge by Audience Members at Oral Defenses

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?
The candidate has developed knowledge and skills to professional levels in the following:	N/A	All audience members at the oral defenses of theses or independent research project papers comment in writing on the students' skills and knowledge as evidenced in their performance, and their responses are tabulated cumulatively.	M.A. Candidates	75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.)	Average ratings are shown below.	The students more than met expectations: all were rated much below 3.00 for all SLOs.	None.
the study of literature in depth				Ratings for 10 candidates: 2.00. 1.33, 1.33,			

				2.33, 1.6, 2.33, 1.22, 1.00, 1.25, 1.00			
aspects of literary history and cultural studies				Ratings for 10 candidates: 3.00, 1.33, 1.33, 2.25, 2.00, 2.67, 1.33, 1.00, 1.25, 1.33			
literary criticism and theories of reading and interpretation				Ratings for 10 candidates: 2.00, 1.33, 1.83, 2.00, 2.00, 2.40, 1.33, 1.00, 1.33, 1.33			
theories of writing and rhetoric				Ratings for 10 candidates: 2.00, 1.33, 1.67, 1.75, 1.800, 2.30, 1.38, 1.00, 1.20, 2.00			
practical writing skills in a range of professional and creative genres				Ratings for 10 candidates: 1.00, 1.00, 1.67, 1.75, 1.60, 2.00, 1.50, 2.00, 1.00, 1.50			
research techniques for studying and understanding the discipline of English studies				Ratings for 10 candidates: 1.50, 1.00, 1.00, 1.5, 1.60, 1.80, 1.22, 1.00, 1.20, 1.33			

pedagogical theories and techniques for various aspects and levels of English studies				Ratings for 10 candidates: 2.00, 1.00, 1.5, 1.25, 1.40, 1.80, 1.33, NA, 1.00, 1.00			
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

II. 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.	Based on scores for the last two years, it seems that our enrolling all incoming students in Research Methods and Theories of Writing during their first semester is paying off.

Comments: We have not altered the assessment process.