

Weber State University  
Annual Assessment of Evidence of Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: English / Master of Arts in English (MENG)  
Academic Year of Report: 2015-16  
Date Submitted: Nov. 15, 2016  
Report author: Dr. Mali Subbiah

Contact Information:

Phone: Mali Subbiah 801-626-6335

Email: [msubbiah@weber.edu](mailto:msubbiah@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 outcomes listed on the website are correct for the 2015-16 assessment.

### 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 <sup>nd</sup>	X	X	X		X	X
MENG 6230 WRWP	Not offered					
MENG 6231 WRWP Advanced	Not offered	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	Not offered					
MENG 6330 Lit/Rhet Stylistics	Not offered					
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	Not offered					
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.

### **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.

The 2014-2015 committee expressed concern with the current rubric, feeling that the criteria did not fit every paper 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. (The outcomes were revised in Spring 2015 and shared with faculty teaching courses in Fall 2016)

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 the only class required of all MENG students. These artifacts are evaluated to determine if MENG 6010 is meeting all of the learning outcomes.

Beginning Spring 2015, 5000-level syllabi were requested. All assignments in the syllabi are directly linked to program learning outcomes.

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

**5000-level.** The BOR Program Review raised questions about the number of 5000-level courses begin offered. Policies were examined and MENG will now only offer a 5000-level course to a student who has a non-English undergraduate degree to widely broaden their knowledge of literature. They will not be regularly scheduled as before.

In Spring 2015, assessment of 5000-level classes was done for the first time. Four papers were collected and reviewed for this purpose. (Only four students were registered in 5000-level classes.) At the 5000-level, the threshold of 70% was not reached for any of the six learning outcomes

**6010 Intro to Grad Studies.** As MENG 6010 Intro to Grad Studies is the only class required of all MENG students, 6010 is assessed each year. All students are required to submit their final paper in a Canvas repository. A random sample of artifacts was conducted in April 2016. Six papers were reviewed from 6010 the artifacts. In 6010, learning outcomes 1, 5, and 6 were met the threshold of 70% but outcomes 2, 3, and 5 were not met.

**Portfolio.** Students not completing a thesis or master's project are required to submit three artifacts of their best writing. A random sample of artifacts was conducted in April 2016. Seven papers were reviewed from these artifacts. Assessment of the portfolio artifacts indicated that outcomes 1, 2, 5, and 6 were met, but 3 and 4 were not. Please see our response to the assessment results below with each table as well as in the last section of this report.

The portfolio reviews during Spring 2013, 2014 and 2015 indicated that Learning Outcome 4 “Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism did not reach the 70% threshold. During the Spring 2016 review, MENG once again did not meet the 70% threshold.

<b>Evidence of Learning: 5000-level Courses</b>					
<b>Measurable Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Method of Measurement</b>	<b>Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning</b>	<b>Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Interpretation of Findings</b>	<b>Action Plan/Use of Results</b>
<b>Students will...</b>	<b>Direct Measures</b>				
Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate an ability to gather, analyze, and communicate information effectively.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 9/15 Strong 60% 2/15 Adequate 13% 4/15 Not Adequate 27%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
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: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 7/15 Strong 46% 4/15 Adequate 27% 4/15 Not Adequate 27%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 3: Apply various theoretical perspectives and literary terminology to interpretations of literary texts to showcase an understanding of theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 7/15 Strong 47% 3/15 Adequate 20% 5/15 Not Adequate 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 6/15 Strong 40% 3/15 Adequate 20% 6/15 Not Adequate 40%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 5 : Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key primary texts in one specific literary genre, period, culture or style.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 9/15 Strong 60% 0/15 Adequate 0% 6/15 Not Adequate 40%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 6 : Demonstrate an ability to employ academic conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 9/15 Strong 60% 1/15 Adequate 7% 5/15 Not Adequate 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.



Note:

- 1) The assessment did not meet the 70% threshold for any of the six learning outcomes.
- 2) This was the first time 5000-level classes were assessed.
- 3)  $n=4$  Which is a small sample size.
- 4) The Steering Committee will discuss the finding Nov. 20, 2016 and devise appropriate measures to address these issues.
- 5) Based on this review, the Program Director will speak directly with the two faculty teaching 5000-level courses. One in Fall 2016 and one is Spring 2017. Artifacts will be collected and reviewed in April 2017.

<b>Evidence of Learning: 6010 Intro to Grad Studies</b>					
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: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 11/14 Strong 79% 3/14 Adequate 21%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
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: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 8/14 Strong 57% 5/14 Adequate 36% 1/14 Inadequate 7%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 3: Apply various theoretical perspectives and literary terminology to interpretations of literary texts to showcase an understanding of theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 7/14 Strong 50% 7/14 Adequate 50%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 7/14 Strong 50% 7/14 Adequate 50%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 5 : Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key primary texts in one specific literary genre, period, culture or style.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 11/14 Strong 79% 3/14 Adequate 21%	Measure 1: Met threshold	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: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 12/14 Strong 86% 2/14 Adequate 14%	Measure 1:Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.

Note:

- 1) LO 2: This is the first time, LO 2 wasn't met. We hope it is an anomaly; however, keep this on watch list, and if it continues to fall below in next year's assessment, devise concrete plan of action.
- 2) LO 3 and 4: Half of the faculty who assessed the sample papers considered them strong, but the other half adequate, leading to the speculation on my part that this could be a norming issue, or a lack of consensus about the meaning of the outcome. However, the MENG Steering Committee will meet Nov. 20, 2016 to discuss reasons for the problem and come up with suggestions to remedy the situation. The suggestions will be shared with the faculty who are currently teaching in the program and with the faculty who will teach in Spring 2017.

<b>Evidence of Learning: Portfolio</b>					
<b>Measurable Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Method of Measurement</b>	<b>Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning</b>	<b>Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Interpretation of Findings</b>	<b>Action Plan/Use of Results</b>
<b>Students will...</b>	<b>Direct Measures</b>				
Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate an ability to gather, analyze, and communicate information effectively.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 13/15 Strong 87% 2/15 Adequate 13%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.
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: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 11/15 Strong 73% 3/15 Adequate 20% 1/15 Inadequate 7%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Apply various theoretical perspectives and literary terminology to interpretations of literary texts to showcase an understanding of theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 8/15 Strong 54% 2/15 Adequate 13% 5/15 Not Adequate 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 10/15 Strong 67% 4/15 Adequate 27% 1/15 Not Adequate 6%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 5 : Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key primary texts in one specific literary genre, period, culture or style.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 12/15 Strong 80% 1/15 Adequate 7% 2/15 Not Adequate 13%	Measure 1: Met threshold	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: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score “strong”	Measure 1: 12/15 Strong 80% 3/15 Adequate 20%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.

Note:

LO 3 and 4: These two outcomes continue to not meet the threshold. This could be a norming issue or a lack of consensus on the meaning of the outcomes. The MENG Steering Committee will meet Nov. 20, 2017 to discuss reasons for the problem and come up with suggestions to remedy the situation. The suggestions will be shared with the faculty who are currently teaching in the program and with the faculty who will teach in Spring 2017.

### **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):

**Appendix B**

Please provide the following information about the faculty contracted by your department during the last academic year.

Faculty	
Headcount	24
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)	21
Full-time Tenured	21
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	
Part-time	
With Master's Degrees	3
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-Tenured	2
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	
<b>Total Headcount Faculty</b>	<b>24</b>
Full-time Tenured	<b>21</b>
Full-time Non-tenured	<b>2</b>
Part-time	<b>1</b>

**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. We met learning outcomes 1, 2, 5, and 6. Meeting outcomes 3 and 4 seems surprisingly elusive. We need to identify the underlying issue(s) and appropriate measures to remedy the situation. These issues do not, in any way, diminish our confidence in the program. Here are the reasons:

- a) All students must do an exit review with the program director. These exit interviews are an opportunity for students to provide the director with constructive criticism and positive feedback.
- b) We meet student needs by creating opportunities for them to do directed readings, thesis, and creative writing projects. We also provide excellent professional development opportunities in teaching, research, publication of journals, and internships.
- c) Our course evaluations are reviewed by the individual faculty member, the program director, the chair and the program assistant to identify areas for improvement within individual classes and across courses.
- d) The Steering Committee individual syllabus review ensures all 5000-level and 6000-level syllabi include the MENG learning outcomes.
- e) We anticipate 12 students graduating in the 2016-17 academic year. Nine of these students will complete the thesis/project option. The current tool used for assessment may need to be revised. Only students who do not complete a thesis/project submit artifacts for the portfolio.

- 2) With whom did you share the results of the year's assessment efforts?

- a) These findings will be shared with the MENG Steering Committee Nov. 20, 2016 and with the faculty at the next Department Meeting. The Program Director will share the details with faculty members who are currently teaching in the program by the end of November. Sharing this information with the faculty at this time may indirectly turn out to be beneficial as students begin to work on their final papers around this time.

- 3) Based on your program's assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?

- a) The Steering Committee will continue to review syllabi for all our courses to make ensure learning outcomes are incorporated in them.

- b) MENG consistently meets learning outcomes 1, 2, 5, and 6. The Steering Committee will discuss measures necessary to meet the threshold for outcomes 3 and 4. Drawing faculty attention to meeting the two learning outcomes and proving better norming session for the review of artifacts in Spring 2017.
- c) Working with Dr. Scott Rogers, MENG will design a rubric that clearly defines Strong, Adequate, and Inadequate. Dr. Rogers has extensive experience assessing the WSU Composition Program and MENG will tap into his expertise to improve.
- d) The onus of assessment has fallen to the MENG Steering Committee. After consulting with OIE, MENG may petition their office for funds to experiment with hiring readers to assist with the assessment review of artifacts.
- e) Surveys, focus groups, exit interviews with students, and course evaluations will continue to drive improvement initiatives at the individual class and program level.

Please note: MENG revised the learning outcomes to better aligned with the program objectives. These revised outcomes were implemented in the Fall 2016 syllabi review. Spring 2017 artifacts will be based on the revised outcomes. Here is the list of revised outcomes to update the OIE website for the 2016-17 assessment.

LO 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.

LO 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.

LO 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and /or analysis of data.

LO 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles, or theoretical perspectives.

LO 5: Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.

LO 6: Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.