

Weber State University
Annual Assessment of Evidence of Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: English / Master of Arts in English (MENG)
Academic Year of Report: 2014-15
Date Submitted: May 2015
Report author: Dr. Gary Dohrer, Genevieve Bates

Contact Information:

Phone: Gary Dohrer 801-626-7318 / Genevieve Bates 801-626-7179

Email: gdohrer@weber.edu / gbates@weber.edu

A. Brief Introductory Statement:

Please review the Introductory Statement and contact information for your department displayed on the assessment site: <http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if this information is current, please indicate as much. No further information is needed. We will indicate "Last Reviewed: [current date]" on the page.
If the information is not current, please provide an update:

The Mission statement for MENG currently displayed on the website listed above is current.

B. Mission Statement

Please review the Mission Statement for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

If the information is not current, please provide an update:

The Mission statement for MENG currently displayed on the website listed above is current.

C. Student Learning Outcomes

Please review the Student Learning Outcomes for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if they are current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

If they are not current, please provide an update:

The MENG student learning outcomes displayed on the website listed above are current.

D. Curriculum

Please review the Curriculum Grid for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed: [current data]”. No further information is needed.

Curriculum Map

| | Department/Program Learning Outcomes | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| | LO 1 | LO 2 | LO 3 | LO 4 | LO 5 | LO 6 |
| | Gather, analyze, communicate effectively | Cultivated skills in careful reading, critical thinking, etc. | Theoretical approaches | Scholarly criticism | Key primary texts | Conventions and protocols |
| Core Courses in Department/Program | | | | | | |
| MENG 6010 Intro to Grad Studies | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6030 Theory/Criticism | Not offered | | | | | |
| MENG 6110 Writing for Teachers | X | X | X | | X | X |
| MENG 6210 Teaching Lit in 2 nd | X | X | X | | X | X |
| MENG 6230 WRWP | X | X | | | X | X |
| MENG 6231 WRWP Advanced | X | X | | | X | X |
| MENG 6240 Seminar American Lit | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6250 Seminar British Lit | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6260 Seminar in World Lit | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6280 TESOL Practicum | Not offered | - | - | - | - | - |
| MENG 6310 Language/Ling Teach | Not offered | - | - | - | - | - |
| MENG 6320 World Languages | X | | | X | | X |
| MENG 6330 Lit/Rhet Stylistics | X | X | X | X | | X |
| MENG 6400 Multicult Persp YA Lit | Not offered | - | - | - | - | - |
| MENG 6410 Strategies/ ESL | X | X | | | X | X |

| | Department/Program Learning Outcomes | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| | LO 1 | LO 2 | LO 3 | LO 4 | LO 5 | LO 6 |
| | Gather, analyze, communicate effectively | Cultivated skills in careful reading, critical thinking, etc. | Theoretical approaches | Scholarly criticism | Key primary texts | Conventions and protocols |
| Core Courses in Department/Program | | | | | | |
| MENG 6420 Phono & Syntax ESL | X | X | | | X | X |
| MENG 6450 ESL Assessment | X | X | | | X | X |
| MENG 6510 Eminent Writers | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6520 Shakespeare | X | X | | | X | X |
| MENG 6610 Genre | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6710 Variable Topics | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6821 Teach Dev Read/Write | Not offered | - | - | - | - | - |
| MENG 6822 Teach College Writing | X | X | | X | | |
| MENG 6823 Teaching Practicum | X | X | | | | |
| MENG 6830 Directed Readings | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6920 Course/Workshops | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6940 Masters Project | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| MENG 6960 Thesis | X | X | X | X | X | X |

The nature of the MENG curriculum does not lend itself to scaling across classes. In other words, because MENG does not have a fixed progression of courses, it would not be useful to identify Introduction, Application, or Mastery of concepts.

--MENG 6010 is the only class that all MENG students are required to take; it is offered every fall and every spring semester and is usually taught by the Program Director.

E. Assessment Plan

Please review the Assessment Plan for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if the plan current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

MENG piloted an assessment plan Spring 2012. We have used the same learning outcomes and procedures to assess the program for the last three years. A portfolio of 3 artifacts for all graduating students has been required. Initially, the papers and faculty critiques were to be archived in Canvas. Canvas was still relatively new at that time, and some of the faculty on the Steering Committee were very resistant to critiquing the artifacts using Canvas. As such, Genevieve Bates has been gathering the artifacts, removing names of students from the artifacts, printing the documents, and generating a random sample of the artifacts. The MENG Steering Committee—an advisory board—then meets to review the papers. Each paper gets read by three committee members and is cross-referenced with our learning outcomes to see if they are being met. The 2014-2015 committee expressed concern with the current rubric, feeling that the criteria did not fit every paper students submitted and therefore did not necessarily represent an accurate assessment of the skills indicated. They suggested that the learning outcomes be revised during Fall 2015. It was also suggested that a separate meeting of the graduate faculty be convened to discuss changes to policies and update all faculty about the revised learning outcomes during Fall 2015.

All students enrolled in the required MENG 6010 Introduction to Graduate Studies class are required to upload to Canvas a writing sample of 12-15 pages. This class is generally taught by the program director and is the only class required of all MENG students. These artifacts are evaluated to determine if MENG 6010 is meeting all of the learning outcomes. During the 2014-2015 academic year, the threshold of 70% strong was reached.

In 2012-13 the Steering Committee began requiring that all 6000-level syllabi be submitted and reviewed the semester before class was taught; this will continue.

Beginning Spring 2015 5000-level syllabi were requested. All assignments in the syllabi will have to be directly linked to a program learning outcome.

F. Report of assessment results for the previous academic year:

The portfolio reviews during Spring 2013 and 2014 indicated that Learning Outcome 4 “Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism did not reach the 70% threshold. During the review during Spring 2015, MENG once again did not meet the 70% threshold. The committee felt that tweaking the collection of artifacts would change the reported outcome. Many students submitted papers from their MENG 6010 Introduction to Graduate Studies class. This is the first graduate paper they write, and while they may think it represents some of their best work, the faculty believe it the students may feel that this way because it is a significant improvement in their writing and they are aware of the increase. Artifacts that are submitted from later classes are much stronger in relation to LO 4. The committee suggested that the guidelines for students be modified and that the three best papers from their final 12 credit hours be collected.

Brief discussion about changing the nature of the portfolio was heard. Another approach would be to continue collecting all 6010 papers and then require two other papers for comparison. It should be evident that student writing had improved as they progressed through the program. The discussion was tabled until Fall 2015 when Dr. Mail Subbiah will be the new program director, and Dr. Hal Crimmel has returned from sabbatical to offer his advice.

Below is the summary of the artifact review from Spring 2015:

| Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Master of Arts in English Program | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Measurable Learning Outcome | Method of Measurement | Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning | Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes | Interpretation of Findings | Action Plan/Use of Results |
| Students will... | Direct Measures | | | | |
| Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate an ability to gather, analyze, and communicate information effectively. | Measure 1: Portfolio | Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong” | Measure 1: 10/11 Strong 91% | Measure 1: Expectations for master level work have been clearly communicated to faculty and students. | Measure 1: No action at this time. |
| | | | | | |

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Master of Arts in English Program

| Measurable Learning Outcome | Method of Measurement | Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning | Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes | Interpretation of Findings | Action Plan/Use of Results |
|---|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Students will... | Direct Measures | | | | |
| Learning Outcome 2: Demonstrate in your texts that you have cultivated skills in careful reading, critical thinking, logical argument from evidence presented, creative expression, and persuasive writing. | Measure 1: Portfolio | Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong” | Measure 1: 8/11 Strong 73% | Measure 1: | Measure 1: No action at this time. |
| | | | | | |

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Master of Arts in English Program

| Measurable Learning Outcome | Method of Measurement | Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning | Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes | Interpretation of Findings | Action Plan/Use of Results |
|--|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Students will... | Direct Measures | | | | |
| Learning Outcome 3: Apply various theoretical perspectives and literary terminology to interpretations of literary texts to showcase an understanding of theoretical perspectives. | Measure 1: Portfolio | Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong" | Measure 1: 8/11 Strong 73% | Measure 1: Discussion of the place of theory in the program. Should this be included in LO? | Measure 1: Research peer institutions and Utah institutions to determine how much theory is being taught in similar programs. (MENG completed a BOR program review during Fall semester and Program Director Crimmel was on sabbatical Spring 2015. This fell through the cracks during 2014-2015, but will be addressed 2015-2016.) |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism.</p> | <p>Measure 1: Portfolio</p> | <p>Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”</p> | <p>Measure 1: 8/15 Strong 53%</p> | <p>Measure 1: The committee felt that this measure was unclear and did not constitute an expectation for every paper students write. Therefore there were papers without a critical focus that were judged on this outcome</p> | <p>Measure 1: The steering committee will reevaluate this learning outcome and clarify the expectation and broaden it to fit all papers submitted.</p> |
| | | | | | |

| Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Master of Arts in English Program | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Measurable Learning Outcome | Method of Measurement | Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning | Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes | Interpretation of Findings | Action Plan/Use of Results |
| Students will... | Direct Measures | | | | |
| Learning Outcome 5 : Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key primary texts in one specific literary genre, period, culture or style. | Measure 1: Portfolio | Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong” | Measure 1: 8/11 Strong 73% | Measure 1: | Measure 1: No action at this time. |
| Learning Outcome 6 : Demonstrate an ability to employ academic conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations... | Measure 1: Portfolio | Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong” | Measure 1: 9/12 Strong 75% | Measure 1: | Measure 1: No action at this time. |
| | | | | | |

G. Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

Artifacts are submitted by students through Canvas or email. Names are removed from the papers, so the Steering Committee reader does not know the name of the student. They are then critiqued. Electronic files are stored in Canvas.

Appendix A

Report of progress on 'non-learning-outcome recommendations' from previous 5 year program review (optional):

MENG completed its first 5 year Board of Regents Program review during Fall 2014. The review committee recommended that the program take a closer look at the 5000-level dual designation courses. The undergraduate program is debating revisions to the curriculum. This may have an impact on the dual designation courses available to MENG students. The dual designation syllabi are now being reviewed by the Steering Committee to ensure that they include the MENG Learning Outcomes and that assignments are aligned with these outcomes.

Summary of classes offered during 2014-2015:

| Course Offerings | Number of classes | Number of class with students | Enrollment | | Number of classes | Number of class with students | Enrollment | | Number of classes | Number of class with students | Enrollment | | Number of classes | Number of class with students | Enrollment | |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-----|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|----|
| Summer semester | 20 | 17 | 82 | | Fall semester | 43 | 30 | 108 | | Spring semester | 36 | 25 | 86 | | 2014-2015 Summary | |
| 5000-level | 5 | 2 | 4 | | 5000-level | 14 | 4 | 6 | | 5000-level | 15 | 5 | 7 | | 5000-level | 34 |
| 6000 FTF | 5 | 5 | 55 | | 6000 FTF | 8 | 6 | 66 | | 6000 FTF | 7 | 7 | 56 | | 6000 FTF | 18 |
| 6000 WRWP | 3 | 3 | 10 | | 6000 WRWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 6000 WRWP | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 6000 WRWP | 3 |
| 6000 ESL | 2 | 2 | 8 | | 6000 ESL* | 4 | 4 | 15 | | 6000 ESL | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 6000 ESL | 8 |
| 6000 TA | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 6000 TA | 1 | 1 | 6 | | 6000 TA | 1 | 1 | 8 | | 6000 TA | 2 |
| 6000 Individualized | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 6000 Individualized | 16 | 15 | 15 | | 6000 Individualized | 11 | 11 | 13 | | 6000 Individualized | 32 |
| 6830 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 6830 | 11 | 10 | 10 | | 6830 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | Enrollment | 99 |
| 6940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 6940 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 6940 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| 6930 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 6930 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 6930 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | | |
| | | | | | *Byrd section for 8 MED | | | | | 6005/6710 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | |

6000 FTF Average class size

Summer: $55/5=11$ students

Fall: $66/6=11$ students

Spring $56/7=8$ students

2014-2015 $177/18=9.8$ students

Appendix B

Please provide the following information about the full-time and adjunct faculty contracted by your department during the last academic year (summer through spring).

| | |
|---|-----|
| Faculty | |
| Headcount | 25 |
| With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution) | 24 |
| Full-time Tenured | 23 |
| Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track) | 1* |
| Part-time | |
| | |
| With Master's Degrees | |
| Full-time Tenured | |
| Full-time Non-Tenured | |
| Part-time | 1** |
| | |
| With Bachelor's Degrees | |
| Full-time Tenured | |
| Full-time Non-tenured | |
| Part-time | |
| | |
| Other | |
| Full-time Tenured | |
| Full-time Non-tenured | |
| Part-time | |
| Total Headcount Faculty | 25 |
| Full-time Tenured | 23 |
| Full-time Non-tenured | 1* |
| Part-time | 1** |

*Dr. Jennifer Mitchell

** Debbi Sheridan Ph.D. expected Dec 2015

Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Reflecting on this year's assessment(s), how does the evidence of student learning impact your faculty's confidence in the program being reviewed; how does that analysis change when compared with previous assessment evidence?

We assessed the learning outcomes we defined and are confident we are reaching our goals both at the course level and program-wide, because:

- a) We have done assessment of the artifacts as discussed in this report; the result indicate that we are reaching our goals;
 - b) All students must do an exit review with the program director. These exit interviews are an opportunity for students to suggest improvements, make recommendations, and let the director know what is going well;
 - c) We are receptive to student needs; supported by the 20 students in MENG 6830 courses. We also offered MENG 6005 Intercultural Discourse and MENG 6710 Reading Seminar in American History at the request of students.
 - d) Our course evaluations are reviewed by the individual faculty member, the program director, and the program assistant to identify areas for improvement within individual classes and across courses;
 - e) The Steering Committee individual syllabus review ensures all 5000-level and 6000-level syllabi for every semester include the MENG learning outcomes, and that the workload is consistent with the MENG expectation of 3-4 hours of work outside of class for every 1 hour in class, among other items.
- 2) With whom did you share the results of the year's assessment efforts?
- a) We shared the results of the BOR Program Assessment with the Dean and all English Faculty and discussed the findings in depth with the Steering Committee.
- 3) Based on your program's assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?
- a) Some faculty are resistant to the review of syllabi. Strong support from the BOR Program Review Team have reinforced the need for this to continue.
 - b) Actively participate in the discussion and revision of the undergraduate Literary and Textual Studies as it will impact the 5000-level courses available to MENG students.

- c) Surveys, focus groups, exit interviews with students, and course evaluations will continue to drive improvement initiatives at the individual class and program level.
- d) Course evaluations moved to chi tester; response rate decline dramatically, but we are getting good feedback on the evaluations that are completed.