English [MA] [ENGL]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

Program Name: English [MA] [ENGL]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

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 is 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.

2018-2019:
The director worked extensively with the director of University Marketing and Licensing to update the MA English website, advertise on social media, and mail circulars to teachers in five parish area. The director of the program also created a business page on Facebook for the English MA program. She also spent time in the McNeese archives in order to research the history of the MA program at McNeese and compose a historical narrative for the university's English MA website.

The director also created bulletin boards in Kaufman 101 that advertise opportunities for students to submit abstracts or original creative works to national conferences or academic publications. These notices are placed under the "Submit" heading. There is also a section called "News" that lets current students hear from former students, who send cards, emails, or photographs.

2019-2020:
We had seven new graduate students enroll in the program this year, 4 of which are from our region. I am hoping that the MA Facebook page, its advertisement, and the circulars sent by the media department attracted these students.

We've also begun guiding more of our most successful undergraduates into the graduate program. The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, the chair of English and Foreign Languages, and the coordinator for the MA English Program designed the BA/MA dual degree program.

Students in their last year as undergraduates can apply to the program and earn 12 graduate credit hours as seniors. They can complete a master's degree in one more year by completing two more semesters of 12 graduate hours. The program is listed in the 20/21 catalog.

2020-2021:
The director and the department chair have been setting up processes to identify successful undergraduates with a focus in English in their junior year and recruit them into the BA/MA program. Faculty are emailed a reminder at the end of each semester to recommend names to the director, and the director contacts these students.

Improvements in long-distance, virtual learning has made keeping students displaced by the hurricanes tethered to the program. Graduate students leaving Lake Charles permanently are asking to stay in the program, and the director has assured them that some classes will allow Big Blue Button or Zoom attendance.

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.

2018-2019:
Laneisha Brown, a graduating MA/MFA student, presented a paper titled "Examining the Complexities of Motherhood with Gwendolyn Brooks" for the university's Women's Studies Lecture Series in Spring 2019.

Sarah Harshbarger, a second-year MA student, presented a paper on Bonnie Jo Campbell at the Society for the Study of Midwestern Literature entitled "Bone Tired." Campbell herself was at the panel and approved Harshbarger's paper.

Lee Matalone, a graduate of the MA program in Fall 2018, was hired by Clemson University to teach as a lecturer for the Fall 2019 semester. She is responsible for four preparations: one composition course and three gen. ed. literature courses.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Students in the Research Methods class (S21) held the first Emerging Scholars Seminar live on Zoom. Attendance just exceeded 25 persons, a record number of participants. One student, Rachel Pittman, was award the Emerging Scholars Outstanding Paper Award. The Program hopes that awards like these will celebrate student achievement and augment their developing CVs.

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.

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

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.

2018-2019:
The director changed the title of Bibliography to Research Methods in the Catalog to better indicate the goals of the course and to conform with the titles of other such courses at other universities.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
English 651 incorporated a few assignments that interacted with crowd-sourced initiatives, like The Library of Congress's By The People Initiative. Students deciphered handwritten texts in pairs and uploaded their documents to the Library of Congress's website as contributions to the Library's larger project. Real world engagement shows students the value of literary scholarship, editing, and archiving, and students truly appreciated these opportunities.

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.

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	7/10	70%	1/10	10%
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

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, the 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.

2018-2019:
The department has hired a specialist in literary theory and research to replace the emergency-hire professor who taught Research Methods. The program coordinator has made copies of the master plan for the new hire, and the program coordinator will work with the new hire to define the department's expectations for graduate student research.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The director restructured English 651 by adding a textbook, The Handbook to Literary Research, and required readings. In-class, small group assignments tasked students with putting their knowledge to practice, and larger, individual assignments were given to students to display mastery. Graphic organizers were attached to more abstract assignments to make the research and writing processes more concrete. Faculty who participated in the Emerging Scholars Seminar said the research papers were some of the best they'd seen in the past four years.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

Copy of Paper checklist

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.

Outcome Links

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

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

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

SLO 2:

| | Students that scored: | |
| | "above average | "average |

Academic Year	proficiency"		proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	—	80%	—	20%
2014-2015	—	33%	—	67%
2015-2016	—	33%	—	67%
2016-2017	—	82%	—	18%
2017-2018	—	55%	—	45%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

Emerging scholars Conference 2021

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [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, the 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.

2018-2019:
In part because of the clarity of the new course title, the emergency-hire professor who took over the course in the spring had students write papers with an aim at presenting them at a departmental conference, which the students organized. They selected a theme for the conference, designed and printed the conference schedule, and invited professors and other graduate students to the event. The director was invited to give the keynote paper, which was meant to display the standard quality of an academic conference paper. A few faculty members attended and approved of the students' progress.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The checklist for writing a research paper included a section on audience engagement. Students were asked to speak slowly, make repeated eye-contact, add inflection to their voices, and emphasize topic sentences and concluding sentences to orient their audiences. Asking students to practice reading their papers in pairs helped them to experience both being a captive audience member and a presenter. Students were also asked to time their papers, record their time, and mark language that they stumbled over.

10 Assessment and Benchmark Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio Review Form

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 20% 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.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 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: All students should supply CVs that score 50% or better than other students of same rank.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 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

Content Knowledge [Program]
Graduates demonstrate knowledge of the development of literary traditions.

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

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

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	—
2018-2019	9/9	5/9	3/9	1/9
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	4/4	3/4	—	1/4

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [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.

2018-2019:
Professors' confidence in student research ability exceeds students' confidence (as self-reported on survey).

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

We missed our benchmark by one student; however, the student was asked to revise her thesis continuously for her committee members. In the end, the committee worked successfully to outline research failings and encourage changes.

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
2018-2019	9/9	6/9	3/9	—
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	4/4	2/4	1/4	1/4

10.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Approved]

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.

2018-2019:
All students met the benchmark of averaging 20% or better than the average graduate student in their writing ability.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
One student commented that he had learned more about academic writing from composing his comprehensive exams and discussing their responses with his professors than he had in his graduate career. My sense is that a poorly designed Research Methods course contributed to his unmooring, but I am pleased that the processes of the examination committee can catch and correct student deficits before it's too late.

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	—
2018-2019	9/9	4/9	4/9	1/9
2019-2020	—	—	—	—

2020-2021	4/4	2/4	1/4	1/4

10.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Approved]

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.

2018-2019:
If we were to raise the benchmark, then one student would not have reached it.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Since speaking ability is sometimes linked to a deficit in the organization of one's ideas I have added graphic organizers to English 651. I hope to build these organizers into my other graduate classes and share them with my colleagues.

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
2018-2019	9/9	6/9	2/9	1/9
2019-2020				
2020-2021	4/4	3/4	1/4	

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.

2018-2019:
One student scored a 50% or better with all three evaluators.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Students seem to uniformly display knowledge of the discipline by performing original critical analyses, presenting them according to MLA guidelines, and displaying a wide knowledge of literary authors across time and the English-speaking world. I attribute this to the degree

plan's requirement of breadth of study and to individual faculty members' skill at demonstrating and fostering textual analysis.

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
2018-2019	9/9	4/9	3/9	2/9
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	4/4	3/4	—	1/4

10.5.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Approved]

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.

2018-2019:
The majority of CVs show students with many academic and/or creative accomplishments laid out in a professionally designed format.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The Program director had become aware that graduate students had not been exposed to the CV, nor asked to write one. The director worked with two students closely this semester to prepare their CVs, but has since included an assignment to write a CV in Research Methods class.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Departmental Preliminary Objective Exam [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%
2018-2019	4/4	50%

2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	4/4	100%

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
All students have 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.

2018-2019:
Students without a background in English literature perform in the 30-49% range.

2019-2020:

2020-2021: Students averaged a 60% on the preliminary exam. Because I had neglected to advise students already in the MFA program to enroll in English 500, one had to be added late. I am never really sure of who is in the program or not at any given point, since I am not listed as every graduate student's advisor and students are reported in only one of the MA or MFA graduate programs though they might be in both. Thus data from the university helps to skew the actual number in the program. I need a more definite way to catalog students.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Departmental Comprehensive Objective Exam [Approved]

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

Benchmark: 100% of students will earn a minimum score of 60% on the exam.

Prior to 2018-2019, 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%

Academic Year	Students scoring 60% or higher	
	#	%
2018-2019	7/9	77.7%
2019-2020	—	—

2020-2021	4/4	78%

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2018-2019:
Only 7/9 students scored above a 60% on the exam. Most students scored well over the 60% required, but two students scored below the mark. These students' examination committee members discussed their students' weaknesses and coordinated to produce three more pointed essay questions that required students to revisit a few key concepts and produce in-depth, researched essays in response. For example, one student who couldn't tell the difference between an Emily Dickinson quote and a Gwendolyn Brooks's quote was required to read a substantial amount of Brooks and discuss notable characteristics of her particular lyric voice. The objective exam, then, became a tool to strengthen particular weaknesses in these students.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
I'd like to move the benchmark to 69% for this assessment tool. The exam has added more skills-based questions, which students seem to appreciate, to the identification questions measuring recognition of famous works and authors.

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

SLO 1:

Academic Year	Candidates ranking at least "significant improvement"			
	Knowledge of literature		Critical Writing	
	#	%	#	%

2013-2014	8/13	62%	8/8	100%
2014-2015	6/6	100%	5/6	83%
2015-2016	10/10	100%	7/10	70%
2016-2017	5/5	100%	3/5	60%
2017-2018	6/6	100%	4/6	67%
2018-2019	9/9	100%	7/9 ranked their background knowledge of literature as significantly improved or excellent; 5/9 ranked their critical writing as significantly improved	78%; 56%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	4/4	100%	3/4	75%

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.

2018-2019:
Seven of nine students reported that their background in literature as a whole had improved significantly. This response confirms that courses are continuing to introduce students to gaps in their knowledge of canonical authors. (One student reported that he **did not** want knowledge of the canon but felt thoroughly grounded in it after graduating.)

Students report that their critical writing is not improving at significant levels. This is something the faculty needs to hear at faculty meetings, especially since many MFA students also pursuing the MA opt for creative finals or final projects rather than critical researched papers. I have made an Excel spreadsheet compiling the students scoring of their own abilities and plan to present it to faculty at the next faculty meeting.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
I feel that the textbook, the assignments, and the graphic organizers in Research Methods will help students like these develop the skills they need sooner and feel more secure in their knowledge.

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: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

The Conference Paper

14.1 Data

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	—	50%	—	50%
2018-2019	9/12	75%	3/12	25%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	5/6	83%	1/6	16%

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
In the past, students were not clear on the differences between a seminar paper, a conference paper, and an eight-paged researched literary analysis. The Conference Paper handout, which explains the reasons for academic conferences, the nature of panels, and the expectations of panel audiences, was helpful for both professor and student. For the first time, the handout also provided a rubric spelling out the necessary aspects of a successful academic conference paper. This handout will be included in every American literature seminar class.

2018-2019:
Students who only performed with average proficiency tended to display a lack of preparation and often had poorly organized and arranged slideshows or little to add beyond the text on the slides. Often their delivery suffered from their apparent nervousness. It might be a good idea to emphasize proper preparation of slides and accompanying notes or to demonstrate to students a fifteen-minute presentation.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The instructor will continue to provide students with instructions on how to include voice accompaniment to electronic slideshows and rubrics with expectations for a successful presentation. In the future, students might be asked to use screen-cast-o-matic, which better simulates in-person delivery.

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: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

Presentation Rubric

15.1 Data

SLO 1:

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

	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	—	87.5%	—	12.5%
2018-2019	2/6	33.3%	4/6	66.6%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	5/6	83%	—	—

SLO 2:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	—	87.5%	—	12.5%
2018-2019	2/6	33.3%	4/6	66.6%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	5/6	83%	—	—

SLO 3:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	—	87.5%	—	12.5%
2018-2019	2/6	33.3%	4/6	66.6%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	5/6	83%	—	—

SLO 4:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	—	—	—	—
2018-2019	2/6	33.3%	4/6	66.6%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	5/6	83%	—	—

SLO 5:

Academic Year	Students that scored:			
	"above average proficiency"		"average proficiency"	
	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	—	87.5%	—	12.5%
2018-2019	2/6	33.3%	4/6	66.7%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	5/6	83%	—	—

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Approved]

2017-2018:
The presentation rubric , which the professor of Bibliography and the director designed, was helpful to students and professors. Future rubrics may be some variation of this rubric, which still needs revisions.

2018-2019:
The professor of the Bibliography course for the 2017-2018 year reinstated student presentations and invited faculty to listen to student's research. Faculty were unhappy with the conversational, informal nature of the presentations and wanted more of the qualities of the papers read at traditional symposiums. Papers presented in the 2018 symposium were better at meeting the criteria: there was a podium, written papers that students read from, and a traditional question-and-answer portion of the symposium. Students still seemed unclear about the strict form of conference papers: a pointed academic argument and knowledge of the scholarship on the more general context of the argument. A talk with the new professor hired for this course is in order.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
One student from the class took an incomplete because of housing instability. She was unable to provide a research paper and make up her lost work. Knowing that even graduate students seem unable to manage their own time without outside discipline is helpful to faculty moving forward.

End of report