

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2013-2014**Due: June 1, 2016****Program:** English M.A.**Date:** May 5, 2016**Completed by:** Scott Gage

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (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 1, 2015. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2014-2015 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2015-2016 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2014-2015 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2013-2014. 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. | 2015-2016, 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" | 5 M.A. candidates | Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level. | 80% (4/5) 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). | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis defenses) | As for SLO #1 (see above). | 5 M.A. candidates | Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level. | 80% (4/5) scored > 3. | Expectations were met. Students are performing as desired. | None. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| 3. Reveals professional-level understanding of theories of writing and rhetoric (if relevant). | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis defenses) | As for SLO #1 (see above). | 5 M.A. candidates | Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level. | 60% (3/5) scored > 3. | Expectations were met. Students are performing as desired. | None. |
| 4. Reveals professional-level writing skills appropriate to the genre(s) of the work. | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis defenses) | As for SLO #1 (see above). | 5 M.A. candidates | Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level. | 40% (2/5) scored > 3. | Expectations were not met. Three students did not perform as desired. | The English M.A. program is not accepting new graduate students, and all students currently enrolled are completing theses and independent study projects. As such, no changes to the program will be made at this time. The graduate program coordinator will identify students whose thesis or independent study projects are relevant to this outcome and will talk with their committee chairs about strategies for helping students in this area. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| 5. Employs research strategies for English studies in a professional manner. | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis defenses) | As for SLO #1 (see above). | 5 M.A. candidates | Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level. | 40% (2/5) scored > 3. | Expectations were not met. Three students did not perform as desired. | The English M.A. program is not accepting new graduate students, and all students currently enrolled are completing theses and independent study projects. As such, no changes to the program will be made at this time. The graduate program coordinator will identify students whose thesis or independent study projects are relevant to this outcome and will talk with their committee chairs about strategies for helping students in this area. |
| 6. Manifests professional understanding of pedagogical theories and strategies appropriate to English. | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis defenses) | As for SLO #1 (see above). | 5 M.A. candidates | Average rating of between 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. students should be at this level. | 60% (3/5) 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 <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment? |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------|---|--|--|-------|
| The candidate has developed knowledge and skills to professional levels in the following: | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis 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. | 5 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. | All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO except for SLO #6 below, where students 75% of students scored below 3.00. Students are performing as desired. | None. |
| the study of literature in depth | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis 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 | 5 M.A. Candidates | 75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.) | Ratings for 4 candidates: 1.14, 3.00, 1.00, 2.00 One student was not evaluated on this SLO. | All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO. Students are performing as desired. | None. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------|---|--|--|-------|
| | | their performance, and their responses are tabulated cumulatively. | | | | | |
| aspects of literary history and cultural studies | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis 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. | 5 M.A. Candidates | 75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.) | Ratings for 4 candidates: 1.57, 3.00, 1.00, 2.00 One of the students was not evaluated on this SLO. | All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO. Students are performing as desired. | None. |
| literary criticism and theories of reading and interpretation | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis defenses) | All audience members at the oral defenses of theses or independent research | 5 M.A. Candidates | 75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = | Ratings for 4 candidates: 1.71, 3.00, 2.50, 2.00 One student was not | All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO. Students are performing as desired. | None. |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|---|--|--|-------|
| | | project papers comment in writing on the students' skills and knowledge as evidenced in their performance, and their responses are tabulated cumulatively. | | agree; 3 = disagree.) | evaluated on this SLO. | | |
| theories of writing and rhetoric | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis 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. | 5 M.A. Candidates | 75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.) | Ratings for 3 candidates: 1.50, 2.50, 2.00 Two students were not evaluated on this SLO. | All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO. Students are performing as desired. | None. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------|---|--|--|-------|
| practical writing skills in a range of professional and creative genres | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis 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. | 5 M.A. Candidates | 75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.) | Ratings for 3 candidates: 1.80, 1.00, 1.50 Two students were not evaluated on this SLO. | All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO. Students are performing as desired. | None. |
|---|--|--|-------------------|---|--|--|-------|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------|---|--|--|-------|
| research techniques for studying and understanding the discipline of English studies | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis 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. | 5 M.A. Candidates | 75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.) | Ratings for 4 candidates: 1.57, 4.00, 1.00, 2.00 One student was not evaluated on this SLO. | 75% of students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO. Students are performing as expected. | None. |
| pedagogical theories and techniques for various aspects and levels of English studies | 2015-2016, summer, fall, and spring (at thesis 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 | 5 M.A. Candidates | 75% of the students should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.) | Ratings for 2 candidates: 1.57, 1.33 Three students were not evaluated on this SLO. | All students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO. Students are performing as desired. | None. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | their performance, and their responses are tabulated cumulatively. | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Comments:

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: