

English [MA] [ENGL]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018

Program Name: English [MA] [ENGL]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Distance and Traditional

2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?

No

2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.

3 Example of Program Improvement

2016-2017:

Prior to 2016, student surveys revealed that students did not find the reading list helpful because they had not received the reading list in a timely manner. In fall 2015, the director of the program finished updates to the program's reading list and comprehensive examination. So that students will be tested on materials significant to their professors, the reading list is kept dynamic and changed every three to five years, as professors join or leave the faculty.

Since 2016, students are presented with the reading list immediately upon their enrollment in several ways: the director of the English MA program attends the beginning-of-the-year meeting for all incoming MFA students; and, the director uploads the reading list to the ENGL 500 Moodle classroom, the gateway course to the program.

Norton anthologies have been placed on reserve at the campus library and are available to graduate students studying for the exam.

2017-2018:

In an effort to better advise students, the director invites students with printed handouts in office mailboxes to sign up for a fifteen-minute office-hour slot during Registration. Other students are reached by email and encouraged to call the director on office or personal phone.

The director has begun meeting all incoming graduate students before the school year starts for an informal introduction to the program.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2016-2017:

Graduate portfolios indicate that the program is producing graduates with well-rounded skill sets. Two MA students presented original work as lectures for the Women's Studies Lecture Series.

2017-2018:

Two MA students and a former MA graduate presented their original work at the McNeese State University Women's Studies Lecture Series in spring 2018.

Two students who graduated with MA degrees in spring 2018 were hired to teach at Sowela Technology Community College during the summer.

5 Program Mission

The Master of Arts in English program will prepare graduate students for further graduate study and/or for the practice of their discipline by providing them with skills in advanced scholarly research; in clear, concise, and persuasive writing; in the analysis and evaluation of literature, with emphasis on the canon of great works in the English language; and in effective teaching.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The MA in English program supports McNeese's mission to serve residents of southwest Louisiana who are seeking continuing professional education and as a program primarily related to education and arts and sciences.

7 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 651 Bibliography and Library Research

Assessment: ENGL 651 SLO 1, 2, and 3 are assessed by course grades on library assignments including:

- Editing assignment
- Book/Critical Literature Review
- Annotated Bibliography of Criticism
- Seminar paper and Symposium (which will also include an abstract of your own paper and written responses to other papers)

ENGL 651: Student Learner Outcomes

On completion of this course students will be able to do the following:

1. Understand nature and practice of various scholarly pursuits.
2. Locate relevant research material.
3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate critical literature of the profession.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the profession through the production of scholarly work.
5. Articulate and negotiate the “problems” that face scholars, including the changes in traditional research issues that have resulted from literary theory and cultural studies.
6. Engage in practical professional activities such as applying to doctoral programs, submitting work for presentation/publication, and entering the job market.

Benchmark: 100% of ENGL 651 students should score at least “average proficiency” on 601’s SLOs 1, 2, and 3.

Course Links

ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Research [Program]

Students will engage prevailing trends in literary, critical, and theoretical research and produce their own scholarly contributions.

7.1 Data

SLO 1:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	80%	–	20%
2014-2015	–	33%	–	67%
2015-2016	–	–	–	–
2016-2017	–	50%	–	50%
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

SLO 2:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	80%	–	20%
2014-2015	–	33%	–	67%
2015-2016	–	–	–	–
2016-2017	–	82%	–	18%
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

SLO 3:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	60%	–	40%
2014-2015	–	100%	–	–
2015-2016	–	–	–	–
2016-2017	–	82%	–	9%
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

Course Links

ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Approved]**

2016-2017:

A new method of assessment is needed. The instructor that taught the course left the university in 2015-2016. When a professor is assigned to teach Bibliography, department head will meet with the professor to discuss ways of assessing this objective.

2017-2018:

Because of the ambiguity of the course title, the professor had difficulty envisioning a syllabus. Despite this, the course was a success. Individual assignments included seminar papers, blog postings, symposium presentations, annotated bibliographies, journal profiling papers, and abstracts. Group presentations were on the history of a particular book.

The program is considering changing the course title to Research Methods to better clarify its nature. The department head plans on meeting with the slated instructor of this course to offer guidance in developing the syllabus, weekly schedule, and assignments for this course.

Course Links

ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**8 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 651 Scholarly Paper**

Assessment: SLO 4 is assessed by the scholarly paper in ENGL 651.

ENGL 651: Student Learner Outcomes

On completion of this course students will be able to do the following:

1. Understand nature and practice of various scholarly pursuits.
2. Locate relevant research material.
3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate critical literature of the profession.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the profession through the production of scholarly work.
5. Articulate and negotiate the “problems” that face scholars, including the changes in traditional research issues that have resulted from literary theory and cultural studies.
6. Engage in practical professional activities such as applying to doctoral programs, submitting work for presentation/publication, and entering the job market.

Benchmark: 100% of ENGL 651 students should score at least “average proficiency” on SLO 4 as determined by the rubric for the scholarly paper.

Course Links

ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Research [Program]

Students will engage prevailing trends in literary, critical, and theoretical research and produce their own scholarly contributions.

8.1 Data

SLO 4:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	80%	–	20%
2014-2015	–	22%	–	88%
2015-2016	–	–	–	–
2016-2017	–	50%	–	50%
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

Course Links**ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]****8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Approved]**

2016-2017:

A new method of assessment is needed.

The instructor that taught the course left the university in 2015-2016. When a professor is assigned to teach Bibliography, department head will meet with the professor to discuss ways of assessing this objective.

2017-2018:

The professor for this course did not supply a rubric. The director of the MA program will encourage the next professor who teaches the course to supply a general rubric.

Course Links**ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]****9 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 651 Self-directed Learning and Presentation**

Assessment: Student presentations should demonstrate at least "average proficiency" on SLO 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

ENGL 651: Student Learner Outcomes

On completion of this course students will be able to do the following:

1. Understand nature and practice of various scholarly pursuits.
2. Locate relevant research material.
3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate critical literature of the profession.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the profession through the production of scholarly work.
5. Articulate and negotiate the "problems" that face scholars, including the changes in traditional research issues that have resulted from literary theory and cultural studies.
6. Engage in practical professional activities such as applying to doctoral programs, submitting work for presentation/publication, and entering the job market.

Benchmark: 100% of ENGL 651 students should score at least "average proficiency" on SLO 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on the self-directed learning and presentation component of the course.

Course Links**ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]****Outcome Links**

Research [Program]

Students will engage prevailing trends in literary, critical, and theoretical research and produce their own scholarly contributions.

Presentation [Program]

Graduates demonstrate ability to engage in self-directed learning and then explain and present their processes and products in a classroom setting.

9.1 Data

SLO 1:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	80%	–	20%
2014-2015	–	33%	–	67%
2015-2016	–	33%	–	67%
2016-2017	–	50%	–	50%
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

SLO 2:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	80%	–	20%
2014-2015	–	33%	–	67%
2015-2016	–	33%	–	67%
2016-2017	–	82%	–	18%
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

SLO 3:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	60%	–	40%
2014-2015	–	100%	–	–
2015-2016	–	100%	–	–
2016-2017	–	82%	–	9%
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

SLO 4:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	80%	–	20%
2014-2015	–	22%	–	88%

2015-2016	–	–	–	–
2016-2017	–	50%	–	50%
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

SLO 5:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	–	80%	–	20%
2014-2015	–	–	–	100%
2015-2016	–	–	–	100%
2016-2017	–	–	–	–
2017-2018	–	55%	–	45%

Course Links

ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]**

2016-2017:

The professor who teaches the course supplied response: The course is successful.

The instructor that taught the course left the university in 2015-2016. When a professor is assigned to teach Bibliography, department head will meet with the professor to discuss ways of assessing this objective.

2017-2018:

The professor hosted a symposium and published the students' paper titles in the department. Other faculty members and students attended to the symposium. Afterward, professors ended up informally ranking student performances and thereby discussed their expectations.

Course Links

ENGL651 [Bibliography and Literary Historiography (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]**10 Assessment and Benchmark** Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio Review Form [Approved]

Assessment: Professors use the Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio Review Form to rank research ability, writing ability, speaking ability, knowledge of the discipline, and student CVs.

Benchmark 1: Any candidate should average a rank of top 50% on the research ability sections of the Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio Review Form.

Benchmark 2: Any candidate should average a rank of top 50% on the writing ability sections of the Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio Review Form. This is assessed through a revised essay from a graduate course that the candidate has taken.

Benchmark 3: Any candidate should average a rank of top 50% on the Speaking ability sections of the Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio Review Form.

Benchmark 4: Any candidate should average a rank of top 50% on the knowledge of the discipline section of the Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio Review Form.

Benchmark 5: The portfolio requirement asks graduating students to submit a CV in which they catalog activities they have participated in and professional work they have completed (e.g., seminar papers, creative work, review of others' creative work, awards, attendance or participation

in conferences, etc.). Professors use this CV to rank students on the Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio Review Form. Faculty members evaluate the CV with the Candidate Review Rubric.

Outcome Links

Research [Program]

Students will engage prevailing trends in literary, critical, and theoretical research and produce their own scholarly contributions.

Presentation [Program]

Graduates demonstrate ability to engage in self-directed learning and then explain and present their processes and products in a classroom setting.

Content Knowledge [Program]

Graduates demonstrate knowledge of the development of literary traditions.

10.1 Data

Research Ability:

Academic Year	# of candidates that completed the portfolio	Top 5% or 10%	Top 20%	Top 50%
2013-2014	13/13	-	9/13	4/13
2014-2015	6/6	5/6	1/6	0/6
2015-2016	10/10	3/10	6/10	1/10
2016-2017	5/5	3/5	2/5	-
2017-2018	7/7	3/7	4/7	-

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

Continue to monitor students' research ability. Make adjustments to courses as needed to improve students' research ability. Reevaluate benchmark and raise it before next cycle.

2017-2018:

Current benchmark seems adequate.

10.2 Data

Writing Ability:

Academic Year	# of candidates that completed the portfolio	Top 5% or 10%	Top 20%	Top 50%
2013-2014	13/13	6/13	5/13	2/13
2014-2015	6/6	6/6	-	-
2015-2016	10/10	4/10	5/10	1/10
2016-2017	5/5	4/5	1/5	-
2017-2018	7/7	3/7	3/7	1/7

10.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Continue to monitor students' research ability. Make adjustments to courses as needed to improve students' writing ability. Reevaluate benchmark and raise it before next cycle.

2017-2018:

Discussions have begun to revise benchmark. Faculty will be asked to consider language for a new benchmark: Most candidates should average 20% or better on the rubric to assess writing ability.

10.3 Data

Speaking Ability:

Academic Year	# of candidates that completed the portfolio	Top 5% or 10%	Top 20%	Top 50%
2013-2014	13/13	6/13	3/13	4/13
2014-2015	6/6	6/6	-	-
2015-2016	10/10	7/10	1/10	2/10
2016-2017	5/5	2/5	3/5	-
2017-2018	7/7	4/7	3/7	-

10.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Continue to monitor students' research ability. Make adjustments to courses as needed to improve students' speaking ability. Reevaluate benchmark and raise it before next cycle.

2017-2018:

Discussions about raising the benchmark have begun. Director is concerned that not every graduating class will have students of better-than-average speaking ability, as the 2013 and 2014 years show.

10.4 Data**Knowledge of the Discipline:**

Academic Year	# of candidates that completed the portfolio	Top 5% or 10%	Top 20%	Top 50%
2013-2014	13/13	5/13	5/13	3/13
2014-2015	6/6	6/6	-	-
2015-2016	10/10	4/10	5/10	1/10
2016-2017	5/5	4/5	1/5	-
2017-2018	7/7	2/7	4/7	1/7

10.4.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Continue to monitor students' research ability. Make adjustments to courses as needed to improve students' knowledge of the discipline. Reevaluate benchmark and raise it before next cycle.

2017-2018:

Why is current benchmark inadequate? Should language be shifted to say that candidates should collectively average at least 20% or better on the rubric assessing research ability? Not all students would have been able to meet an average of 20% or better.

10.5 Data**Student CVs:**

Academic Year	# of candidates that completed the portfolio	Top 5% or 10%	Top 20%	Top 50%
2016-2017	5/5	2/5	2/5	1/5
2017-2018	7/7	3/7	2/7	1/7

10.5.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Will work to develop a better ranking system for CVs.

2017-2018:

Consider this language for benchmark: All students should supply CVs that score 50% or better than other students of same rank.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Departmental Preliminary Objective Exam [Not Approved]

Assessment: Departmental Preliminary Objective Exam. Specific questions on the exam assess students' knowledge of the canon.

Benchmark: Students are required to complete the Departmental Preliminary Objective Exam.

Outcome Links

Content Knowledge [Program]

Graduates demonstrate knowledge of the development of literary traditions.

11.1 Data

Academic Year	# of students that completed the Departmental Preliminary Objective Exam	Average Score
2013-2014	11/11	63%
2014-2015	10/10	57%
2015-2016	6/6	59%
2016-2017		
2017-2018	9/9	54%

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2015-2016:

All students have completed the exam. Over the last three years the average has been approximately 60%. The department will continue to administer this exam to assess the knowledge and needs of incoming students. Establish benchmark for next year.

2017-2018:

Students' shared knowledge of a broad number of canonical authors from different countries and periods upon entering the program seems more and more uncertain.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Departmental Comprehensive Objective Exam

Assessment: Departmental Comprehensive Objective Exam. Specific questions on the exam assess students' knowledge of the canon.

Benchmark: Students must score 60% on the exam.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was students are required to complete the Departmental Comprehensive Objective Exam.

Outcome Links

Content Knowledge [Program]

Graduates demonstrate knowledge of the development of literary traditions.

12.1 Data

Academic Year	# of students that completed the Departmental Comprehensive Objective Exam	Average Score
2013-2014	11/11	73%
2014-2015	10/10	69%
2015-2016	6/6	74%

2016-2017	5/5	81%
2017-2018	7/7	73%

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2015-2016:

All degree candidates have completed the exam. The average score for the last three years is in the mid 70s. This shows that the program is improving students knowledge of the canon.

In fall 2015, the director of the program finished updates to the program's reading list and comprehensive examination. We hope to keep the reading list dynamic and to change it every three or five years.

Students are presented with the reading list immediately upon their enrollment into the MA program.

Norton anthologies have been placed on reserve at the campus library and are available to graduate students studying for the exam.

Establish benchmark for next year.

2017-2018:

All students must score a 60% on the exam.

13 Assessment and Benchmark Graduate Exit Survey

Assessment: Survey given to candidates in their last semester. Allows for students to give feedback about the program.

Benchmark: 75% of MA graduates should rank their level of improvement as at least "(2) significant improvement."

Outcome Links

Content Knowledge [Program]

Graduates demonstrate knowledge of the development of literary traditions.

13.1 Data

Academic Year	# of candidates that completed the program survey	Candidates with at least "significant improvement"	
		#	%
2013-2014	8/13	8/8	100%
2014-2015	6/6	5/6	83%
2015-2016	10/10	7/10	70%
2016-2017	5/5	3/5	60%
2017-2018	6/6	4/6	67%

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

In fall 2015, the director of the program finished updates to the program's reading list and comprehensive examination. We hope to keep the reading list dynamic and to change it every three or five years.

Students are presented with the reading list immediately upon their enrollment into the MA Program.

Norton anthologies have been placed on reserve at the campus library and are available to

graduate students studying for the exam.

2017-2018:

Both students said they improved significantly in when students comment on the "slight improvement" they've demonstrated in their career here, they refer to the lack of inclusion of contemporary twenty-first century authors. The focus on twenty-first century authors is not a particular focus of courses or seminars framed around particular time periods (Modernist/ Renaissance/ Medieval.)

Perhaps the question could be reframed so as to direct students to consider their scores on the pretest in comparison to the comprehensive exam and to the reading lists of their coursework when answering the question. For instance, one student commented that he wished he could have read more works from living writers and rated his improvement as "slight" because of this perceived lack.

14 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 630 American Literature Seminar

Assessment: ENGL 630 American Literature Seminar.

Benchmark: 100% of students in ENGL 630: American Literature Seminar should score at least "average proficiency" on their scholarly paper.

Files:

The Conference Paper

14.1 Data [Approved]

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	–	50%	–	50%

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2017-2018:

The Conference Paper handout, which both defines and creates a rubric, was helpful for both professor and student.

15 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 630 Self-directed Learning and Presentation

Assessment: ENGL 630 Self-directed Learning and Presentation.

Benchmark: 100% of ENGL 630 students should score at least "average proficiency" on SLO 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on the self-directed learning and presentation component of the course.

Files:

Presentation Rubric

15.1 Data [Not Approved]

SLO 1:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	–	87.5%	–	12.5%

SLO 2:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	

	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	–	87.5%	–	12.5%

SLO 3:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	–	87.5%	–	12.5%

SLO 4:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018				

SLO 5:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	–	87.5%	–	12.5%

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The rubric was helpful to students and professors. The professor for Bibliography and the director used the same rubric to assess student presentations. Future rubrics may be some variation of this rubric.

Program outcomes

Research

Students will engage prevailing trends in literary, critical, and theoretical research and produce their own scholarly contributions.

Presentation

Graduates demonstrate ability to engage in self-directed learning and then explain and present their processes and products in a classroom setting.

Content Knowledge

Graduates demonstrate knowledge of the development of literary traditions.

End of report