



English [MA] [ENGL]

Cycles included in this report:

Jun 1, 2021 to May 31, 2022

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

Program Name: English [MA] [ENGL]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2021 to May 31, 2022

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

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.

2021-2022:

In an effort to improve students' critical writing abilities, the department has worked to encourage student participation in academic conferences. Two MA students, Brittany Reese Menefee and Rachel Pitman presented critical papers at local Louisiana academic conferences. The Best paper award for the Emerging Scholars Seminar concluding the Research Methods course continues to be a departmental event. This year, it was awarded to Abbie Skinner by popular vote. Encouraging both faculty and all graduate students to the beginning grad students' seminar has brought visibility and support to our graduates' academic writing.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

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 awarded the Emerging Scholars Outstanding Paper Award. The Program hopes that awards like these will celebrate student achievement and augment their developing CVs.

2021-2022:

Having social events at the beginning and end of the year helped build community about graduate students. Picnic at the Park in September was a modest success, but the party to celebrate our graduation candidates was a much larger success. We also held a clothing swap at the graduation event, which was surprisingly popular. I think a part to celebrate our graduate students is now a must-do every year!

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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	16%

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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	16%

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%	—	—
2021-2022	6/6	100%	0/6	0%

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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:

In order to engage students in real-life professional endeavors, 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. I attribute the 100% success rate on SLO 1, 2, and 3, to this real world engagement.

2021-2022:

While most students scored well on SLO 1, 2, and 3, some students had major setbacks on particular assignments. I had my first real challenges with students wholly unfamiliar with finding books on library shelves. Even after acquainting them with call numbers and books, students seemed resistant to use the library's holdings. I continued to find students citing papers that published in predatory journals or books not categorized under literary studies. Other students failed to embed footnotes or endnotes into their final papers, though it was a requirement and features in every secondary source. To improve course content, I added a module on predatory journals and conferences and showed students where to locate subject

terms on book covers. I'm also considering adding the MLA handbook to the course texts and requiring students to use it as they footnote.

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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	17%

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

I was pleased that students met the benchmark again this year. To improve upon last year, I showed students examples of the ways literary conferences organized papers under panel topics. Students submitted abstracts for their papers on Moodle, then read them in class so that we could draw connections between the subjects and group the papers under particular themes or methodologies. We titled these panels and published them on our schedule, which was emailed to the faculty, our English graduate students, and those students enrolled in English 410 (Capstone course) and potentially interested in graduate school.

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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	17%

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%
2018-2019	2/6	33%	4/6	67%
2019-2020	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	17%

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%	—	—
2021-2022	6/6	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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	17%

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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	17%

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

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.

2021-2022:

Students uniformly presented polished papers to an audience and used the same tools (a checklist) from last year to prepare. It's worth noting that this was the first face-to-face presentation since the pandemic, and every graduate student was visibly nervous. Also since we were face-to-face, most students thoughtfully prepared handouts for me to distribute to the

audience to aid in following the paper. I've saved the handouts so that I can show next year's students examples of helpful handouts.

Last year, I released incoming students needed to be acquainted with the CV and made it a project for our class. This year, to help students build their Curriculum Vitae, I supplied them with two in-class activities that resulted in entries for their CV (a transcription project with Patti Threat in the library's archives and our end-of-semester, public seminar). I also typed out how they should list each entry on their CV.

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
2021-2022	7/7	5/7	1/7	1/7

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

We nearly met our benchmark, but I'd argue that one portfolio was invalid: a student failed to submit within his portfolio a revised paper that included academic research. Since the portfolio is supposed to help professors evaluate a student's research ability upon graduation, I revisited the language on the instructions for the portfolio to make clear that students should submit a research paper as a sample of their work. I also included that footnotes and endnotes were preferred.

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
2021-2022	7/7	6/7	1/7	

10.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

Students met the benchmark and excelled in written communication above all other areas of the rubric. One professor argued that two of his examinees needed to support their claims and assertions with better historical research. We need to continue to insist on the connection between better writing and research.

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
2021-2022	7/7	4/7	3/7	

10.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022: Students met the benchmark for speaking ability. I hope that resuming face-to-face interactions will allow our students to develop confidence in speaking with professors during those exams that include oral interviews.

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	
2021-2022	7/7	3/7	3/7	1/7

10.4.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

Students met the benchmark again. However, we have added a new professor who doesn't seem to be analyzing students' knowledge of the MA discipline as much as the MFA discipline, and this confusion is affecting the scores for knowledge of discipline. I plan to meet with this professor to discuss the nature of MA candidate's portfolios and the accompanying rubric.

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
2021-2022	7/7	5/7		2/7

10.5.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

2/7 students scored 50% or better on their CVs. The formatting was pretty poor on one and the second was a resume. I will continue to address the issue of formatting a proper CV in Research Methods. (Neither of these students had the most recent version of the class in which the CV is an assignment and focus for one module.

11 Assessment and Benchmark Departmental Preliminary Objective Exam

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%
2021-2022	6/6	—*

*Could not find scantrons

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

Yes, we were able to test everyone entering the program, which is the benchmark. One problem that I did not foresee is trying to test incoming 4+1 undergrad/grad students. When should they test--when they're first entering the 4+1 degree plan or when they're in the first year of graduate school?

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: 100% of students will earn a minimum score of 69% on the exam.

Prior to 2021-2022, the benchmark was 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%
2022	8/8	81%

Academic Year	Students scoring 60% or higher	
	#	%
2018-2019	7/9	77.7%
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	4/4	78%
2021-2022	8/8	100%

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

I'd like to move the benchmark to 70% for this assessment tool. I added more medieval questions (obtained from our medievalist) to the exam to improve its breadth of reach.

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%
2021-2022	7/7	100%	7/7	100%

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

All students surveyed felt significant or tremendous improvement in their knowledge of literature and literary studies and in their ability to write critically. Our past success in hiring a trans-Atlantic specialist may be a result of these students' satisfaction, since she was able to offer a diversity of texts and foreground student research. As we move forward with new hires, we aim to select faculty who can broaden our students' knowledge of literature and refine their writing abilities, per our objective.

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%
2021-2022	7/9	78%	2/9	22%

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.

2021-2022:

The data suggests that the weakest papers are from students entering a seminar class before taking research methods. A glimpse at the two weakest papers reveals grammatically problematic sentences that try to incorporate literary jargon and a lack of familiarity with essay organization and paragraph development. One helpful exercise that could be worked into this class is to have students read a simple academic paper on a primary source and then show students the components of a scholarly article by dissecting its parts. These components are the same for a scholarly paper, and knowing them might help newer students.

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%	—	—
2021-2022	—	—	—	—

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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	17%

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%	—	—
2021-2022	6/6	100%	0/0	0%

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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	17%

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%	—	—
2021-2022	5/6	83%	1/6	17%

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

Students continue to meet the benchmark for independently preparing their papers and presenting them logically to an audience. The success of the students is hard-earned. Many struggled for weeks to formulate a thesis that responded to a problem or a gap in scholarship, and they continued to struggle at either expanding their eight-paged argument into a twelve-paged seminar paper or cutting a larger paper down into a smaller paper. This year, I added a couple of nights to serve as workshop/writing days and consults with the professor, and I think that these were tremendously helpful to students. I plan to continue this practice next year.

End of report