Colorado	State	University	/ – Pueblo	Academic	Program	Assessment	Report for	AY 2016-2017

Program:	English M.A.	Date:	May 29, 2017
----------	--------------	-------	--------------

Completed by: ___Iver Arnegard_____

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 establish ed. 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	B. When	C. What meth	D. Who was	E. What is	F. What were	G. What were	H. What changes/impro
program SLOs w	was this SL	od was used fo	assessed? Ple	the expected	the results of	the department's	vements to the program
ere assessed du	O last asse	r assessing the	ase fully desc	achievement l	the assessme	conclusions ab	are planned based on th
ring this cycle?	ssed? Plea	SLO? Please in	ribe the stud	evel and	nt?	out student pe	is assessment?
Please include t	se indicate	clude a copy of	ent group(s)	how many or		rformance?	
he outcome(s) v	the semes	any rubrics use	and the num	what proporti			
erbatim from th	ter and ye	d in the assess	ber of studen	on of students			
e assessment pl	ar.	ment process.	ts or artifacts	should be at it			
an.			involved.	?			

Due: June 1, 2017

1.Demonstrates professional leve of competency in the study of literature.	mmer, fal	Students' M.A. theses or indep endent researc h project essay s were evaluated by the thesis dir ector and comm ittee members a gainst student I earning outcom es using the "Th esis or Indepe ndent Resear ch Project Ev aluation Shee t"	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. Stu dents are perf orming as desi red.	None.
2. Incorporates Theories and Te chniques of Lite rary Criticism at a Professional L evel (if relevant).	2015 2016, sum mer, fall, a nd spring (at thesis d efenses)	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. Stu dents are perf orming as desi red.	None.

3. Reveals prof essional— level understan ding of theorie s of writing and rhetoric (if rele vant).	2015 2016, sum mer, fall, a nd spring (at thesis d efenses)	As for SLO #1 (see above).	5 M.A. candidates	Average rat ing of betw een 3 and 4 and 100% of gra duating M.A. students sho uld be at this level.	60% (3/5) scored > 3.	Expectations were met. Stu dents are perf orming as desi red.	None.
4. Reveals prof essional— level writing ski lls appropriate to the genre(s) of the work.	2015 2016, sum mer, fall, a nd spring (at thesis d efenses)	As for SLO #1 (see above).	5 M.A. candidates	Average rat ing of betw een 3 and 4 and 100% of graduating M.A. student s should be a t this level.	40% (2/5) scored > 3.	Expectations we re not met. Thre e students did n ot perform as de sired.	The English M.A. program is not accepting new graduate students, and all students currently enrolled are co mpleting theses and inde pendent study projects. As such, no changes to th e program will be made a t this time. The graduate program coordinator will identify students wh ose thesis or independe nt study projects are rel evant to this outcome a nd will talk with their co mmittee chairs about str ategies for helping stude nts in this area.

5. Employs res	2015	As for SLO #1	5 M.A.	Average rat	40% (2/5)	Expectations we	The English M.A.
earch strategies	2016, sum	(see above).	candidates	ing of betw	scored > 3.	re not met. Thre	program is not
for English stud	mer, fall, a			een 3 and 4		e students did n	accepting new graduate
ies in a professi	nd spring (and		ot perform as de	students, and all students
onal manner.	at thesis d			100% of gra		sired.	currently enrolled are co
	efenses)			duating M.A.			mpleting theses and inde
				students sho			pendent study projects.
				uld be at this			As such, no changes to th
				level.			e program will be made a
							t this time. The graduate
							program coordinator
							will identify students
							whose thesis or indepen
							dent study projects are r
							elevant to this outcome
							and will talk with their c
							ommittee chairs about s
							trategies for helping stu
							dents in this area.
6. Manifests pr	2015	As for SLO #1	5 M.A.	Average rat	60% (3/5)	Expectations	None.
ofessional und	2016, sum	(see above).	candidates	ing of betw	scored > 3.	were met. Stu	
erstanding of p	mer, fall, a			een 3 and 4		dents are perf	
edagogical the	nd spring (and		orming as desi	
ories and strate	at thesis d			100% of gra		red.	
gies appropriat	efenses)			duating M.A.			
e to English.				students sho			
3				uld be at this			
				level.			

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	B. When	C. What meth	D. Who was	E. What is	F. What were	G. What were	H. What changes/impro
program SLOs w	was this SL	od was used fo	assessed? Ple	the expected	the results of	the department's	vements to the <u>program</u>
ere assessed du	O last asse	r assessing the	ase fully desc	achievement I	the assessme	conclusions ab	are planned based on th
ring this cycle?	ssed? Plea	SLO? Please in	ribe the stud	evel and	nt?	out student pe	is assessment?
Please include t	se indicate	clude a copy of	ent group(s)	how many or		rformance?	
he outcome(s) v	the semes	any rubrics use	and the num	what proporti			
erbatim from th	ter and ye	d in the assess	ber of studen	on of students			
e assessment pl	ar.	ment process.	ts or artifacts	should be at it			
an.			involved.	?			

The candidate	2015	All audience m	5 M.A. Can	75% of the st	Average rat	All students were	None.
has developed k	2016, sum	embers at the	didates	udents should	ings are sh	rated below 3.00 f	
nowledge and s	mer, fall, a	oral defenses o		be rated lowe	own below.	or this SLO except	
kills to professio	nd spring (f theses or inde		r than 3.00. (for SLO #6 below,	
nal levels in the	at thesis d	pendent resear		1		where students 7	
following:	efenses)	ch project pape		strongly		5% of students sc	
		rs comment in		agree; 2 =		ored below 3.00. S	
		writing on the s		agree; 3 =		tudents are perfor	
		tudents' skills		disagree.)		ming as desired.	
		and knowledge					
		as evidenced in					
		their performan					
		ce, and their re					
		sponses are tab					
		ulated cumulati					
		vely.					
	2045	A 11 1:	5.44.6	750/ 611	D 1: 6 4	AU	•
the study of	2015	All audience m	5 M.A. Can	75% of the st	Ratings for 4	All students were	None.
literature in	2016, sum	embers at the	didates	udents should	candidates:	rated below 3.00 f	
depth	mer, fall, a	oral defenses o		be rated lowe	1.14, 3.00,	or this SLO. Stude	
	nd spring (f theses or inde		r than 3.00. (1.00, 2.00	nts are performin	
	at thesis d	pendent resear		1	One student	g as desired.	
	efenses)	ch project pape rs comment in		strongly	was not evalu		
		writing on the s		agree; 2 = agree; 3 =	ated on this S		
		tudents' skills		disagree.)	LO.		
		and knowledge		uisagi ee.j	LO.		
		as evidenced in					
		as evidenced iii					

aspects of liter ary history and cultural studies	2015— 2016, sum mer, fall, a nd spring (at thesis d efenses)	their performance, and their responses are tabulated cumulatively. 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. Can didates	75% of the st udents should be rated lower than 3.00. (1	Ratings for 4 candidates: 1.57, 3.00, 1.00, 2.00 One of the st udents was n ot evaluated on this SLO.	All students were rated below 3.00 f or this SLO. Stude nts are performin g as desired.	None.
literary criticism and theories of r eading and inter pretation	2015 2016, sum mer, fall, a nd spring (at thesis d efenses)	All audience members at t he oral defen ses of theses or independe nt research	5 M.A. Can didates	75% of the st udents should be rated lowe r 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 f or this SLO. Stude nts are performin g as desired.	None.

		project papers comment in writing on the students' skills and k nowledge 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, sum mer, fall, a nd spring (at thesis d efenses)	All audience m embers at the oral defenses of theses or independent resear ch 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. Can didates	75% of the st udents should be rated lower than 3.00. (1	Ratings for 3 candidates: 1.50, 2.50, 2.00 Two students were not eval uated on this SLO.	All students were rated below 3.00 f or this SLO. Stude nts are performin g as desired.	None.

practical writing	2015	All audience m	5 M.A. Can	75% of the st	Ratings for 3	All students were	None.
skills in a range o	2016, sum	embers at the	didates	udents should	candidates:	rated below 3.00 f	
f professional an	mer, fall, a	oral defenses o		be rated lowe	1.80, 1.00,	or this SLO. Stude	
d creative genre	nd spring (f theses or inde		r than 3.00. (1.50	nts are performin	
S	at thesis d	pendent resear		1		g as desired.	
	efenses)	ch project pape		strongly	Two students		
		rs comment in		agree; 2 =	were not eval		
		writing on the s		agree; 3 =	uated on this		
		tudents' skills		disagree.)	SLO.		
		and knowledge					
		as evidenced in					
		their performan					
		ce, and their re					
		sponses are tab					
		ulated cumulati					
		vely.					

research techniq ues for studying and understandi ng the discipline of English studie s	2015- 2016, sum mer, fall, a nd spring (at thesis d efenses)	All audience m embers at the oral defenses of theses or inde pendent resear ch project pape rs comment in writing on the students' skills and knowledge as evidenced in their performance, and their responses are tabulated cumulati	5 M.A. Can didates	75% of the st udents should be rated lowe r 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 evalu ated on this S LO.	75% of students were rated below 3.00 for this SLO. Students are performing as expect ed.	None.
pedagogical the ories and techni ques for various aspects and lev els of English st udies	2015— 2016, sum mer, fall, a nd spring (at thesis d efenses)	All audience m embers at the oral defenses o f theses or inde pendent resear ch project pape rs comment in writing on the s tudents' skills and knowledge as evidenced in	5 M.A. Can didates	75% of the st udents should be rated lower than 3.00. (1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree.)	Ratings for 2 candidates: 1.57, 1.33 Three student were not evaluated on this SLO.	All students were rated below 3.00 f or this SLO. Stude nts are performin g as desired.	None.

their performa			
nce, and their			
responses are			
tabulated cum			
ulatively.			

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.

d you address? PI	B. When was this S LO last assessed? PI ease indicate the se mester and year.	C. What were the recommend ations for change from the pre vious assessment?		E. What were the results of the chan ges? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
NA	NA	None	NA	NA

Comments: