

**Assurance of Student Learning Report
2022-2023**

PCAL	English
Masters of English 067	
Trini Stickle	
Is this an online program? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Assessment Cycle)

Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages. Add more Outcomes as needed.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1: LITERATURE: The student can describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.		
Instrument 1	Direct: A random sample of final paper from the FA22 graduate literature course ENG 504, ENG 524, and ENG 482G.	
Instrument 2		
Instrument 3		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.		<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met

Program Student Learning Outcome 2: LITERATURE: The student can evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works for literature.		
Instrument 1	Direct: A random sample of final paper from the FA22 graduate literature course ENG 504, ENG 524, and ENG 482G.	
Instrument 2		
Instrument 3		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.		<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met

Program Student Learning Outcome 3: LITERATURE: The student can apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.		
Instrument 1	Direct: A random sample of final paper from the FA22 graduate literature course ENG 504, ENG 524, and ENG 482G.	
Instrument 2		
Instrument 3		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.		<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met

Assessment Cycle Plan:
 In AY2223, we elected to assess SLOs 1, 2, and 3, and not assess SLOs 4-10. The rationale for our decision is to 1) focus on SLOs that could be best assessed with a random selection of coursework targeted to the SLOs underassessment; 2) select a manageable number of random assessment artifacts that captured our graduate students across the two-year program; 3) begin a baseline assessment and reassessment schedule for a five-year protocol to better ensure we address deficits and to have sufficient data for the MA program review each 5 years. The tentative five-year assessment plan is as follows:
MA Assessment AY2223—YR 1

Courses: Literature—final paper (n=9)

SLO 1	LITERATURE: The student can describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.	The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate literature classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports
SLO 2	LITERATURE: The student can evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works for literature.	The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate literature classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports
SLO 3	LITERATURE: The student can apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.	The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate literature classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports.

Baseline score for SLO 1, 2, 3

MA Assessment AY2324—YR 2

Course: ENG 520 (n = 10-12)

Baseline score for SLO 9 and 10

SLO 9	GENERAL: The student can demonstrate a command of written academic English and the language conventions of their subfield.	The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports.
SLO 10	GENERAL: The student can describe a 5-year plan for continuing education/professional development appropriate to the English profession.	Students participate in a series of lectures and follow-up assignments on this topic in ENG 520.

MA Assessment AY2425—YR 3

Courses: Comp Rhet/PW (n = 8-14)

Baseline score for SLOs 5 and 6

SLO 5 COMPOSITION: The student can construct rhetorical analyses of multiple forms of text using appropriate terminology and methodology.

The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate composition classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports

SLO 6 COMPOSITION: The student can describe emerging trends in digital communication and alternative publishing platforms to contribute to ongoing scholarly communications in writing studies.

The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate composition classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports.

The program also collects data on how many students participate in literary conferences and/or present literary criticism in a variety of scholarly settings.

Recheck SLO 1, 2, and/or 3 if insufficient results from year 1
Select a random sampling (20%) of literature papers from this year's courses.
Data will be used for MA program assessment occurring this year.

MA Assessment AY2526—YR 4

Course: Linguistic, pedagogy, and/or theory (n = 8-15)

Baseline score for SLO 7, 8, 9

SLO 7 GENERAL: The student can inventory credible academic sources in the fields of literature and composition and in linguistics or creative writing if applicable to the student's program of study.

The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports.

SLO 8 GENERAL: The student can construct an original argument using their inventory of credible sources.

The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports.

Recheck SLOs 9 with this year's selection of papers.

SLO 9 GENERAL: The student can demonstrate a command of written academic English and the language conventions of their subfield.

The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports.

MA Assessment AY2627—YR 5

Courses: A random selection (20%) of Comp/Rhet or PW courses

Recheck SLOs 5 and 6

SLO 5 COMPOSITION: The student can construct rhetorical analyses of multiple forms of text using appropriate terminology and methodology.

The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate composition classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports

SLO 6 COMPOSITION: The student can describe emerging trends in digital communication and alternative publishing platforms to contribute to ongoing scholarly communications in writing studies.

The learning objective is formatively assessed through assignments and in-class activities in graduate composition classes. The learning objective may be summatively assessed on 1 to 3 levels: (1) by individual faculty members on a final paper or project (2) by the capstone or thesis committee members at the end of the program (3) through graduate committee blind assessments of a random sample of student artifacts from year 1 and year 2 of the program in the spring semester on a rotating basis with all other program learning outcomes appropriate for annual ASL reports.

The program also collects data on how many students participate in literary conferences and/or present literary criticism in a variety of scholarly settings.

Course: 520
Recheck SLO 10

SLO 10 GENERAL: The student can describe a 5-year plan for continuing education/professional development appropriate to the English profession.

Students participate in a series of lectures and follow-up assignments on this topic in ENG 520.

Data will be stored for the next MA program assessment. After year 5, the graduate committee should review the SLO assessment sequence and process for improvement.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1

Program Student Learning Outcome	LITERATURE: The student can describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.																										
Measurement Instrument 1	<p>Direct: A random sample of final paper from the FA22 graduate literature course ENG 504, ENG 524, and ENG 482G.</p> <p>With the revised MA program available in catalog AY2324, our plan for the next five years is to establish a benchmark rating for all 10 of the SLOs, address deficits, and redress those deficits with course development plans. We also plan to evaluate/re-evaluate each SLO within the five-year assessment cycle.</p> <p>This first assessment begins this new cycle. The assessment of a random assortment of final papers across three literature courses aligns with the learning outcomes chosen for assessment this year—SLO 1, 2, and 3 (description of the three SLOs are located in the rubric below).</p> <p>The literature courses are designed to develop students’ literary analyses skills toward a professional level. The three courses chosen represent the scope of literature—time periods, genres, themes—and these three courses are a sampling of our literature instructors. The papers also represent students at various stages within the two-year program (see import of this selection in result section, p. 12).</p> <p>The rubric used to measure this and each SLO is shown below and can also be found at this link:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 35%;"></th> <th style="width: 10%;">This SLO applies to this internship, but the paper displays no evidence of this SLO 0</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Displays novice understanding of this SLO 1 pt</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Displays developing understanding of this SLO 2 pts</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Displays sufficient understanding of this SLO 3 pts</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Displays professional understanding of this SLO 4 pts</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Demonstrates the ability to describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.</td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Demonstrates the ability to evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works of literature.</td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Demonstrates the ability to apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to the ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.</td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				This SLO applies to this internship, but the paper displays no evidence of this SLO 0	Displays novice understanding of this SLO 1 pt	Displays developing understanding of this SLO 2 pts	Displays sufficient understanding of this SLO 3 pts	Displays professional understanding of this SLO 4 pts	Demonstrates the ability to describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.	<input type="radio"/>	Demonstrates the ability to evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works of literature.	<input type="radio"/>	Demonstrates the ability to apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to the ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.	<input type="radio"/>												
	This SLO applies to this internship, but the paper displays no evidence of this SLO 0	Displays novice understanding of this SLO 1 pt	Displays developing understanding of this SLO 2 pts	Displays sufficient understanding of this SLO 3 pts	Displays professional understanding of this SLO 4 pts																						
Demonstrates the ability to describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																						
Demonstrates the ability to evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works of literature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																						
Demonstrates the ability to apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to the ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																						
Criteria for Student Success	Criteria for student success is a score of 3 or higher across all three literature SLOs or an overall average of 3 or higher.																										
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target success is 70% of students meet this measure. Since students may take literature	Percent of Program Achieving Target	22% or 2 of the 9 students met our success threshold for the individual measure for																								

	courses any semester across the two-year program, this percentage allots for students in their still developing these skills.		SLO 1. No student met the 3 or higher threshold for a combined measure of all 3 SLOs.
Methods	<p>Literature courses were identified for AY2223. A sampling of three of the five literature courses were chosen, in part, to ensure a final paper was available for assessment and to ensure MA graduate students were in attendance. Additionally, the random sampling of literature papers (by the program coordinator) assured that only one paper per graduate student was assessed, that is, if a graduate student attended and completed course papers for more than one literature course, only one paper was selected for the assessment process. This selection process yielded nine MA student papers from a total population of eleven MA students, for a sampling of 81.8% of MA graduate students.</p> <p>The nine papers were anonymized and posted for assessment (see rubric above). Four independent raters—the English department’s three graduate committee faculty members and the program coordinator—scored each paper according to the rubric above. The average scores for each SLO per student were calculated as well as a composite score for all three SLOs combined.</p>		
Measurement Instrument 2	Do you have other measures of assessment for SLO 1? If so, please add those here along with all the information below. If not, you may delete this section and move on to “... whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.”		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Measurement Instrument 3	Do you have other measures of assessment for SLO 1? If so, please add those here along with all the information below. If not, you may delete this section and move on to “... whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.”		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.		<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met
Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)			
See below under SLO 3.			
<u>Results:</u> Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle? Explain			
<u>Conclusions:</u> What worked? What didn’t? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail			

modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

****IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:** As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met; Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided. Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results.**

Program Student Learning Outcome 2

Program Student Learning Outcome	LITERATURE: The student can evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works for literature.
Measurement Instrument 1	<p>Direct: A random sample of final paper from the FA22 graduate literature course ENG 504, ENG 524, and ENG 482G.</p> <p>With the revised MA program available in catalog AY2324, our plan for the next five years is to establish a benchmark rating for all 10 of the SLOs, address deficits, and redress those deficits with course development plans. We also plan to evaluate/re-evaluate each SLO within the five-year assessment cycle.</p> <p>This first assessment begins this new cycle. The assessment of a random assortment of final papers across three literature courses aligns with the learning outcomes chosen for assessment this year—SLO 1, 2, and 3 (description of the three SLOs are located in the rubric below).</p> <p>The literature courses are designed to develop students' literary analyses skills toward a professional level. The three courses chosen represent the scope of literature—time periods, genres, themes—and these three courses are a sampling of our literature instructors. The papers also represent students at various stages within the two-year program (see import of this selection in result section, p. 12).</p> <p>The rubric used to measure this and each SLO is shown below and can also be found at this link:</p>

Methods			
Measurement Instrument 3			
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.			<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn't, and plan going forward)			
See below under SLO 3.			
<u>Results:</u> Are the results what was expected or not? Explain			
<u>Conclusions:</u> What worked? What Didn't? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.			
<u>Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u> As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met; Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. All changes need not lead to quantitative results.			

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	LITERATURE: The student can apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.
Measurement Instrument 1	<p>Direct: A random sample of final paper from the FA22 graduate literature course ENG 504, ENG 524, and ENG 482G.</p> <p>With the revised MA program available in catalog AY2324, our plan for the next five years is to establish a benchmark rating for all 10 of the SLOs, address deficits, and redress those deficits with course development plans. We also plan to evaluate/re-evaluate each SLO within the five-year assessment cycle.</p> <p>This first assessment begins this new cycle. The assessment of a random assortment of final papers across three literature courses aligns with the learning outcomes chosen for assessment this year—SLO 1, 2, and 3 (description of the three SLOs are located in the rubric below).</p>

	<p>The literature courses are designed to develop students' literary analyses skills toward a professional level. The three courses chosen represent the scope of literature—time periods, genres, themes—and these three courses are a sampling of our literature instructors. The papers also represent students at various stages within the two-year program (see import of this selection in result section, p. 12).</p> <p>The rubric used to measure this and each SLO is shown below and can also be found at this link:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="562 277 1633 870"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="562 277 821 483"></th> <th data-bbox="821 277 1079 483">This SLO applies to this internship, but the paper displays no evidence of this SLO 0</th> <th data-bbox="1079 277 1205 483">Displays novice understanding of this SLO 1 pt</th> <th data-bbox="1205 277 1331 483">Displays developing understanding of this SLO 2 pts</th> <th data-bbox="1331 277 1457 483">Displays sufficient understanding of this SLO 3 pts</th> <th data-bbox="1457 277 1633 483">Displays professional understanding of this SLO 4 pts</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="562 483 821 597">Demonstrates the ability to describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.</td> <td data-bbox="821 483 1079 597" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1079 483 1205 597" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1205 483 1331 597" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1331 483 1457 597" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1457 483 1633 597" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="562 597 821 711">Demonstrates the ability to evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works of literature.</td> <td data-bbox="821 597 1079 711" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1079 597 1205 711" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1205 597 1331 711" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1331 597 1457 711" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1457 597 1633 711" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="562 711 821 870">Demonstrates the ability to apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to the ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.</td> <td data-bbox="821 711 1079 870" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1079 711 1205 870" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1205 711 1331 870" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1331 711 1457 870" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="1457 711 1633 870" style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					This SLO applies to this internship, but the paper displays no evidence of this SLO 0	Displays novice understanding of this SLO 1 pt	Displays developing understanding of this SLO 2 pts	Displays sufficient understanding of this SLO 3 pts	Displays professional understanding of this SLO 4 pts	Demonstrates the ability to describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.	<input type="radio"/>	Demonstrates the ability to evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works of literature.	<input type="radio"/>	Demonstrates the ability to apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to the ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.	<input type="radio"/>												
	This SLO applies to this internship, but the paper displays no evidence of this SLO 0	Displays novice understanding of this SLO 1 pt	Displays developing understanding of this SLO 2 pts	Displays sufficient understanding of this SLO 3 pts	Displays professional understanding of this SLO 4 pts																							
Demonstrates the ability to describe the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																							
Demonstrates the ability to evaluate the cultural and intellectual significance of individual works of literature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																							
Demonstrates the ability to apply the terminology, methodology, and practices of literary criticism to contribute to the ongoing scholarly conversations in literary studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																							
Criteria for Student Success	Criteria for student success is a score of 3 or higher across all three literature SLOs or an overall average of 3 or higher.																											
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target success is 70% of students meet this measure. Since students may take literature courses any semester across the two-year program, this percentage allots for students in their still developing these skills.	Percent of Program Achieving Target	11% or 1 of the 9 students met our success threshold for the individual measure for SLO 3. No student met the 3 or higher threshold for a combined measure of all 3 SLOs.																									
Methods	<p>Literature courses were identified for AY2223. A sampling of three of the five literature courses were chosen, in part, to ensure a final paper was available for assessment and to ensure MA graduate students were in attendance. Additionally, the random sampling of literature papers (by the program coordinator) assured that only one paper per graduate student was assessed, that is, if a graduate student attended and completed course papers for more than one literature course, only one paper was selected for the assessment process. This selection process yielded nine MA student papers from a total population of eleven MA students, for a sampling of 81.8% of MA graduate students.</p> <p>The nine papers were anonymized and posted for assessment (see rubric above). Four independent raters—the English department's three graduate committee faculty members and the program coordinator—scored each paper according to the rubric above. The average scores for each SLO per student were calculated as well as a composite score for all three SLOs combined.</p>																											
Measurement Instrument 2																												

Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Measurement Instrument 3			
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.			<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met
Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn't, and plan going forward)			
<p>Results: The assessment results for SLO 1, 2, and 3 are lower than expected. Of the 9 students, 4 were students in their last year of the program; 3 were in their first year of the program, and 2 are mid-degree, part-time students.</p> <p>Of the 4 graduating students, not all received top scores, and I received one of the lowest overall ratings of 1.66/4. The complete range of scores for the 4 graduating students is as follows: 1.66; 2.49; 2.65; 3.91.</p> <p>Of the 3 first-semester students, 1 accounted for a lower score, 1.91, but the other first-semester MA students received mid to high overall ratings: 2.49 and 2.91—the latter nearly reaching our expectation.</p> <p>The other 2 are mid-degree, part-time students with the following scores: 1.74; 2.49.</p> <p>Since students can begin the degree program without having an undergraduate degree in English or with a degree that has not focused on literature, these results are cause for re-evaluating the information we provide in our introduction to the English graduate degree, our Eng 520 course. Additionally, these first-year students were not given the opportunity to take ENG 520 their first semester due to insufficient student counts—based on the new population minimums. This is an issue addressed in the next section.</p> <p>Conclusions: Since the study of literature and the teaching of literature are key goals for many of our MA students, the need for a routine ENG 520 in the fall semester of every academic year is essential. Additionally, this course needs to provide extensive introduction to the practices of literary analysis at the graduate level. Our projected solution to the enrollment requirements for courses to make is two-fold; 1) we are increasing our recruitment efforts; and 2) we are considering combining our MA and MFA students into a single introduction to English graduate studies course, co-listing ENG 520 (Introduction to English Graduate Studies) and ENG 507 (Introduction to Creative Writing Studies), merging the two populations. For the goals of increasing graduate students' ability to conduct literary analysis—using terminology, adding to the professional conversation—both populations have SLOs related to these skills (MAs—SLO 1, 2, and 3; MFAs—SLO 3). A blended introduction to English graduate studies would hone the requisite skills of both populations.</p> <p>Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: With our recent instantiation a new 5-year assessment plan in tandem with a more rigorous assessment process, we will be 1) closely examining these first benchmark SLO assessments within the MA program and 2) adjusting content of so that each SLO is both addressed and assessed in multiple areas of the program. We will also limit our assessment to second-year student artifacts.</p>			

***** Please include Curriculum Map (below/next page) as part of this document
See attachment.**