Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2013-2014   **Due: June 2, 2014**

Program:____English M.A._____   **Date:** __May 15, 2014_____

Completed by:___Ted Taylor_____

Please complete this form for <u>each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program</u> (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. 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? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? **Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.**	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of 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 to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?

1.Demonstrates professional level of competency in the study of literature.	2013-2014, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis defenses)	Students' M.A. theses or independent research project essays were evaluated by the thesis director and committee members against student learning outcomes, using the "Thesis or Independent Research Project Evaluation Sheet" (see below).	8 M.A. candidates	Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level.	100% (8/8) scored > 3.	Expectations were met. Students are performing as desired.	None.
2. Incorporates Theories and Techniques of Literary Criticism at a Professional Level (if relevant).	2013-2014, summer, fall, and spring	As for SLO #1 (see above).	8 M.A. candidates	Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level.	100.0% (8/8) scored > 3.	Expectations were met. Students are performing as desired.	None.

3. Reveals professional-level understanding of theories of writing and rhetoric (if relevant).	2013-2014, summer, fall, and spring	As for SLO #1 (see above).	8 M.A. candidates	Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level.	100% (6/6) scored > 3. The SLO was not relevant for two of the theses.	Expectations were met. Students are performing as desired.	None.
4. Reveals professional-level writing skills appropriate to the genre(s) of the work.	2013-2014, summer, fall, and spring	As for SLO #1 (see above).	8 M.A. candidates	Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level.	100% (8/8) scored > 3.	Expectations were met. Students are performing as desired.	None.
5. Employs research strategies for English studies in a professional manner.	2013-2014, summer, fall, and spring	As for SLO #1 (see above).	8 M.A. candidates	Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level.	100% (8/8) scored > 3.	Expectations were met. Students are performing as desired.	None.

| 6. Manifests professional understanding of pedagogical theories and strategies appropriate to English. | 2013-2014, summer, fall, and spring | As for SLO #1 (see above). | 8 M.A. candidates | Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level. | 100% (8/8) scored > 3. | Expectations were met. Students are performing as desired. | None. |

Comments: All the assessment goals were met. Every student performed at the desired level with respect to every one of the SLOs.

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

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? **Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.**	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of 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 to the program are planned based on this assessment?

The candidate has developed knowledge and skills to professional levels in the following:	Summer, Fall, and Spring 2013-2014, again and again, with 8 defenses.	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.	With the exception of one student, all were rated below 3.00 for all SLOs, i.e. all but one student performed as desired.	See below..
the study of literature in depth	See above.	See above.	M.A. Candidates	75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.)	Ratings for 8 candidates: 1.00, 1.50, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.50, 2.00, 2.00	All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO.	None.

aspects of literary history and cultural studies	See above.	See above.	M.A. Candidates	75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.)	Ratings for 8 candidates: 1.00, 1.50, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.50, 2.00, 1.00	All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO.	None.
literary criticism and theories of reading and interpretation	See above.	See above.	M.A. Candidates	75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.)	Ratings for 8 candidates: 1.00, 1.33, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 2.00, 2.00, 1.00	All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO.	None.
theories of writing and rhetoric	See above.	See above.	M.A. Candidates	75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.)	Ratings for 8 candidates: 1.33, 1.67, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.50, **3.00**, 1.00	All but one student were rated below 3.00 for this SLO, i.e. all but one student performed as desired.	None. See comments below.
practical writing skills in a range of professional and creative genres	See above.	See above.	M.A. Candidates	75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 =	Ratings for 8 candidates: 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.50, no basis to judge, 1.00	All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO.	None.

				agree; 3 = disagree.)			
research techniques for studying and understanding the discipline of English studies	See above.	See above.	M.A. Candidates	75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.)	Ratings for 8 candidates: 1.00, 1.67, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 2.50, 1.00	All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO.	None.
pedagogical theories and techniques for various aspects and levels of English studies	See above.	See above.	M.A. Candidates	75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.)	Ratings for 8 candidates: 1.00, 2.00, 1.00, 1.00, 1.00, 2.00, **3.00**, 2.00	All but one student were rated below 3.00 for this SLO, i.e. all but one student performed as desired.	None. See comments below.

Comments: One audience member at one of the thesis defenses, but not the faculty evaluators (see the results for Part A), found one of the M.A. candidates to be (possibly) weak with respect to theory. This was that evaluator's comment: "The concept and anecdotal evidences were useful and well-presented, but I may [emphasis added] have noticed an inability to allude to or reference any particular theory." Given the discrepancy between the judgment of the faculty evaluators (who as readers of the thesis had much greater exposure to the candidate's knowledge of theory) and that of the audience member in question and given the tentativeness of the audience member's judgment, we conclude that no changes or improvements in our teaching of theory are called for.

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? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	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?
NA	NA	None	NA	NA

Comments:

CSU-Pueblo M.A. in English
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 techniques 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.

Colorado State University-Pueblo Department of English and Foreign Languages
M.A. Program in English

Thesis or Research Project Presentation Audience Comment Form

Please help us with our efforts to assess and improve the English M.A. Program by giving your impression of how well today's candidate seems to have mastered the program's stated goals, as they are incorporated in the questions below. If more than one candidate presented today, please fill out a form for each. This feedback is anonymous and confidential; neither the evaluator nor the candidate is identified on the form, and the data will be published only in the aggregate for each year.

Please circle the number at the left of each item that corresponds to your opinion:

1. Strongly agree   2. Agree   3. Disagree   4. Strongly disagree   5. No basis to judge

On the basis of his or her performance today I think the candidate has developed knowledge and skills to professional levels in—

1 2 3 4 5   --the study of literature in depth.

1 2 3 4 5   --aspects of literary history and cultural studies.

1 2 3 4 5   --literary criticism and theories of reading and interpretation.

1 2 3 4 5   --theories of writing and rhetoric.

1 2 3 4 5   --practical writing skills in a range of professional and creative genres.

1 2 3 4 5   --research techniques for investigating and understanding of the discipline of English
                              Studies

1 2 3 4 5   --pedagogical theories and techniques for various aspects and levels of
                              English studies.

Please add any further comments you wish to make. Your insights are valuable and appreciated. Thanks.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____