

**Institutional Effectiveness  
2022-2023**

**Program:** English MA

**College and Department:** College of Arts & Sciences, Department of English

**Contact:** Linda Null

**Mission:**

The Master of Arts degree program in the Department of English prepares graduates for success in any further graduate and professional education that might require superior analytical and communication skills, as well as for careers outside the academic world wherever superior analytical and communication skills and knowledge of literary and cultural traditions are essential. Our English MA also provides superb grounding for seeking a PhD in English by increasing students' knowledge of literary history and improving their skills in writing, literary analysis, and research. Graduates can also become effective high-school or college-level teachers by improving their knowledge of writing pedagogy and theory.

**Attach Curriculum Map (Educational Programs Only):**

Other 6000-level courses included in the curriculum build on the skills students developed in ENGL 6000. The chart below provides a curriculum map to show the progression of core courses in relation to learning outcomes for the graduate program.

Key: I = Introductory R = Reinforced M = Mastery

Learning Outcomes	Required Courses	ENGL 6---	ENGL 6---
	ENGL 6000 Introduction to Graduate Studies	American Literature	British Literature
Interpret texts (from both American and British literature) from a variety of approaches and perspectives		R,M	R,M
Analyze and synthesize disciplinary, scholarly conversations and participate in them	I	R, M	R,M
Analyze the writing conventions and write in a discipline-specific genre	I	R,M	R,M
Analyze communication strategies and implement them in their discipline	I	R,M	R,M

## **SLO1: INTERPRET TEXTS**

### **Define Outcome:**

Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of approaches and perspectives with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" in the thesis/nonthesis rubric.

### **Assessment Methods:**

1. Comprehensive Exam
2. Thesis Evaluation (assessed through the thesis and non-thesis rubric)
3. Digital artifacts, client project, critical reflection for non-thesis option in the PTC concentration (assessed through thesis and non-thesis rubric)
4. Course project for ENGL 6000 (assessed through 6000 final project rubric)
5. Exit interview

### **Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis rubric.

### **Results and Analysis:**

Spring 2023 was the first year for the English Department to use a rubric to assess students' work. We created a Thesis/Nonthesis rubric which we used in the Spring 2023 semester. Four students were assessed in the spring semester; one student was assessed in the summer. The results of the two semesters are described below

We assessed SLOs one, two, and three using this rubric. The threshold was for 80% of students to score "At Expectations" or above. ALL students met this threshold.

SLO 1 Interpret Texts: 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. The average score on SLO One was 4.7 of 5.

A copy of the Thesis/Non-thesis rubric is attached.

We have results of the rubric from ENGL 6000 in Fall 2022, before we adopted the current SLOs. Students were evaluated in four areas. 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. Four students were evaluated.

Students will be able to conduct graduate-level research in ENGL studies. The average was 3 of 5 in the areas of scholarly conversation, 3 of 5 in the area of sources, and 4 of 5 in the area of integration of sources into the student's own writing.

Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of critical approaches. The average was 4 of 5 in Theory/Critical Approach, 3 of 5 in Interpretation, and 3 of 5 in Application.

Students will be able to use the conventions of scholarly writing in English studies, including MLA-style documentation. The average was 4 of 5 in Writing, 3 of 5 in Conventions, and 3 of 5 in Documentation.

The ENGL 6000 final project rubric is attached. \*See Appendix 1.

**Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

We are proud of the achievement of our students. We should probably set the bar higher for the Thesis/Non-thesis evaluation. The evaluation of the ENGL 6000 final project involves students in the first semester of the graduate program. Perhaps the undergraduate program should place more emphasis on use of secondary sources. These first-semester students need opportunities to hone their research and literary interpretation skills even before they come to graduate school. If more research opportunities are needed, it is not surprising that documentation skills also need improvement. (All four of these students have undergraduate degrees from the TTU English Department.) The fact that the students had higher scores on the Thesis/Non-thesis evaluation perhaps indicates how much they learned about research and use of sources in the MA program.

**SLO2: ANALYZE AND SYNTHESIZE**

**Define Outcome:**

Students will be able to analyze and synthesize disciplinary, scholarly conversations and participate in them with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis rubric.

**Assessment Methods:**

1. Comprehensive Exams
2. Thesis Evaluation (assessed through thesis and non-thesis rubric)
3. Digital artifacts, client project, critical reflection for non-thesis option students in the PTC concentration (assessed through thesis and non-thesis rubric)
4. Course project for ENGL 6000 (assessed through 6000 final project rubric)
5. Exit Interview

**Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis rubric

**Results and Analysis:**

Spring 2023 was the first year for the English Department to use a rubric to assess students' work. We created a Thesis/Nonthesis rubric which we used in the Spring 2023 semester. Four students were assessed in the spring semester; one student was assessed in the summer. The results of the two semesters are described below

We assessed SLOs one, two, and three using this rubric. The threshold was for 80% of students to score "At Expectations" or above. ALL students met this threshold.

SLO 2 Analyze and Synthesize: 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. The average score on SLO Two was 4.6 of 5.

A copy of the Thesis/Non-thesis rubric is attached.

We have results of the rubric from ENGL 6000 in Fall 2022, before we adopted the current SLOs. Students were evaluated in four areas. 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. Four students were evaluated.

Students will be able to conduct graduate-level research in ENGL studies. The average was 3 of 5 in the areas of scholarly conversation, 3 of 5 in the area of sources, and 4 of 5 in the area of integration of sources into the student's own writing.

Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of critical approaches. The average was 4 of 5 in Theory/Critical Approach, 3 of 5 in Interpretation, and 3 of 5 in Application.

Students will be able to use the conventions of scholarly writing in English studies, including MLA-style documentation. The average was 4 of 5 in Writing, 3 of 5 in Conventions, and 3 of 5 in Documentation.

The ENGL 6000 final project rubric is attached. \*See Appendix 1.

#### **Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

We are proud of the achievements of our students. We should probably set the bar higher for the Thesis/Non-thesis evaluation. The evaluation of the ENGL 6000 final project involves students in the first semester of the graduate program. Perhaps the undergraduate program should place more emphasis on use of secondary sources. These first-semester students need opportunities to hone their research and literary interpretation skills even before they come to graduate school. If more research opportunities are needed, it is not surprising that documentation skills also need improvement. (All four of these students have undergraduate degrees from the TTU English Department.) The fact that the students had higher scores on the Thesis/Non-thesis evaluation perhaps indicates how much they learned about research and use of sources in the MA program.

### **SLO3: WRITING CONVENTIONS AND GENRES**

#### **Define Outcome:**

Students will be able to analyze the writing conventions of and write in discipline-specific genres with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis rubric.

**Assessment Methods:**

1. Comprehensive exams
2. Thesis evaluation (assessed through thesis and non-thesis rubric)
3. Digital artifacts, client project, critical reflection for non-thesis option students in the PTC concentration (assessed through the thesis and non-thesis rubric)
4. Course project for ENGL 6000 (assessed through 6000 final project rubric)
5. Exit interview

**Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis option

**Results and Analysis:**

Spring 2023 was the first year for the English Department to use a rubric to assess students' work. We created a Thesis/Nonthesis rubric which we used in the Spring 2023 semester. Four students were assessed in the spring semester; one student was assessed in the summer. The results of the two semesters are described below

We assessed SLOs one, two, and three using this rubric. The threshold was for 80% of students to score "At Expectations" or above. ALL students met this threshold.

SLO 3 Writing Conventions and Genres: 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. The average score on SLO Three was 4.6.

A copy of the Thesis/Non-thesis rubric is attached.

We have results of the rubric from ENGL 6000 in Fall 2022, before we adopted the current SLOs. Students were evaluated in four areas. 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. Four students were evaluated.

Students will be able to conduct graduate-level research in ENGL studies. The average was 3 of 5 in the areas of scholarly conversation, 3 of 5 in the area of sources, and 4 of 5 in the area of integration of sources into the student's own writing.

Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of critical approaches. The average was 4 of 5 in Theory/Critical Approach, 3 of 5 in Interpretation, and 3 of 5 in Application.

Students will be able to use the conventions of scholarly writing in English studies, including MLA-style documentation. The average was 4 of 5 in Writing, 3 of 5 in Conventions, and 3 of 5 in Documentation.

The ENGL 6000 final project rubric is attached. \*See Appendix 1.

**Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

We are proud of the achievements of our students. We should probably set the bar higher for the Thesis/Non-thesis evaluation. The evaluation of the ENGL 6000 final project involves students in the first semester of the graduate program. Perhaps the undergraduate program should place more emphasis on use of secondary sources. These first-semester students need opportunities to hone their research and literary interpretation skills even before they come to graduate school. If more research opportunities are needed, it is not surprising that documentation skills also need improvement. (All four of these students have undergraduate degrees from the TTU English Department.) The fact that the students had higher scores on the Thesis/Non-thesis evaluation perhaps indicates how much they learned about research and use of sources in the MA program.

**SLO4: COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES****Define Outcome:**

Students will be able to analyze communication strategies and implement them in their disciplines with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the defense/presentation rubric.

**Assessment Methods:**

1. Oral presentation (if applicable) in ENGL 6000, ENGL 6010, and PTC 6030
2. Defense/presentation rubric
3. Exit interview

**Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the defense/presentation rubric

**Results and Analysis:**

- We used a Defense/Presentation Rubric to evaluate SLO Four. Results for four students were reported.
- Defense: 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. The average score was 4.5 out of 5.
- Presentation: 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. The average score was 5 out of 5.

A copy of the Thesis/Non-thesis rubric is attached.

We have results of the rubric from ENGL 6000 in Fall 2022, before we adopted the current SLOs. Students were evaluated in four areas. 100% of the students scored "At Expectations" or above. Four students were evaluated.

Students will be able to conduct graduate-level research in ENGL studies. The average was 3 of 5 in the areas of scholarly conversation, 3 of 5 in the area of sources, and 4 of 5 in the area of integration of sources into the student's own writing.

Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of critical approaches. The average was 4 of 5 in Theory/Critical Approach, 3 of 5 in Interpretation, and 3 of 5 in Application.

Students will be able to use the conventions of scholarly writing in English studies, including MLA-style documentation. The average was 4 of 5 in Writing, 3 of 5 in Conventions, and 3 of 5 in Documentation.

The ENGL 6000 final project rubric is attached. \*See Appendix 1.

### **Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

We are proud of the achievements of our students. We should probably set the bar higher for the Thesis/Non-thesis evaluation. The evaluation of the ENGL 6000 final project involves students in the first semester of the graduate program. Perhaps the undergraduate program should place more emphasis on use of secondary sources. These first-semester students need opportunities to hone their research and literary interpretation skills even before they come to graduate school. If more research opportunities are needed, it is not surprising that documentation skills also need improvement. (All four of these students have undergraduate degrees from the TTU English Department.) The fact that the students had higher scores on the Thesis/Non-thesis evaluation perhaps indicates how much they learned about research and use of sources in the MA program.

## **SLO5: INTERCULTURAL FACTORS**

### **Define Outcome:**

Students will be able to articulate how intercultural factors shape the creation of texts, with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the Critical Reflection rubric.

### **Assessment Methods:**

Critical Reflection rubric

### **Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):**

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the Critical Reflection rubric

### **Results and Analysis:**

SLO Five was created in Spring 2023. We have not yet assessed this SLO, except through comments on the Exit Survey. We have Exit Surveys for the five students who graduated in Spring 2023. All five students felt that the program met the SLOs we established in 2023, which

are included in this report. One student wrote that she had learned how to apply "intercultural factors" into her own work as well as analyze its use in texts.

**Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:**

The MA Exit Survey Form is attached. \*See Appendix 3.

**Summative Evaluation:**

The English MA program exceeded its thresholds in each of the categories where we had data. We should set the thresholds higher.

**Assessment Plan Changes:**

Some of the assessments were just created in the spring semester before faculty members knew about them. We should have additional data next year.

Appendix 1: English 6000 project rubric

Appendix 2: Thesis and nonthesis rubric

Appendix 3: MA exit interview form



Appendix 1: English 6000 project rubric

	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)	N/A
<b>1. Students will be able to conduct graduate-level research in English studies. (Tied to Program SLO 2 and 3)</b>				
Scholarly Conversation	The project is well-grounded in an ongoing scholarly conversation. This may include previous scholarship about the primary text(s) and/or existing scholarship about a critical/theoretical discourse. The writer has clearly researched the background of the text/issue being considered.	The project shows an awareness of the scholarly conversation surrounding the text or issue. Cites major critics or secondary sources.	The project lacks awareness of the scholarly conversation surrounding the text, genre, or issue. Few to no secondary sources cited.	
Sources	The project engages with a variety of appropriate sources, from academic works and peer-reviewed journals (or other sources, if relevant). The project engages relevant sources at length and with thorough consideration.	The project engages with the required amount of sources, from academic works and peer-reviewed journals (or other sources, if relevant.) The project engages relevant sources at a minimally-acceptable length.	The project does not engage with the required amount of sources, or the sources are not appropriately rigorous or scholarly. The project does not engage its secondary sources at an acceptable length.	
Integration	The writer demonstrates mastery by integrating secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing in a fluid and professional manner.	The writer integrates secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing.	The writer engages with secondary sources or their ideas and concepts, but in a disjointed way, without establishing why they are necessary for the writer's own project.	
<b>2. Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of critical approaches. (Tied to Program SLO 1, 4, and 5)</b>				

Appendix 1: English 6000 project rubric, cont.

Theory/Critical Approach	The project is strongly grounded in one or more existing critical approaches, traditions, or theoretical frameworks. It is well-versed in key ideas, vocabulary, and arguments from said approach(es).	The project engages with one or more existing critical approaches, traditions, or theoretical frameworks. It shows awareness of key terms or issues in said approach(es).	The project seems to lack a critical or theoretical focus. While it may contain scholarship and analysis, there is no unifying methodology/framework.	
Interpretation	The writer shows strong interpretive skills, practicing close reading / analysis of the subject matter at an advanced level for a first-semester M.A. student.	The writer demonstrates an ability to close read / analyze the subject matter at a level acceptable for a first-semester M.A. student. The writer makes clear claims, and does not simply rely on summary or repeating others' insights.	The writer does not close read / analyze the subject matter at a level acceptable for a first-semester M.A. student. The writer relies heavily on summary or repeating others' insights.	
Application	The writer clearly connects their critical approach to their primary analysis. The project shows how the primary analysis contributes to a larger theoretical or critical conversation.	The writer makes efforts to connect their critical approach to their primary analysis. There are linkages between the close reading / analysis and the theoretical or critical conversation.	The writer fails to connect their critical approach to their primary analysis. The project may contain both, but it is unclear how the close reading / analysis is grounded in or contributes to a larger theoretical or critical conversation.	
<p><b>3. Students will be able to use the conventions of scholarly writing in English studies, including MLA-style documentation. (Tied to P. 5)</b></p>				

Appendix 1: English 6000 project rubric, cont.

Writing	The project is well-written, with a clear logic and progression, a clearly articulated argument, and strong control over the prose at both the global (overall essay) and local (individual sentences) levels.	The project is adequately written, with efforts at logic and progression, an effort to create an overall argument, and with adequate control over the prose at both the global and local levels.	The project loses focus sustaining its logic and progression, or the argument gets confused or lost. Connections or transitions between paragraphs are unclear. There are an unacceptable amount of problems at either the global or local levels (or both).	
Conventions	The project follows all conventions for English academic writing, both in terms of style and of grammar. This includes incorporating sources, formatting issues, and rhetorical conventions common to writing in this field.	The project has a few places where it does not follow all conventions for English academic writing, both in terms of style and grammar. This includes incorporating sources, formatting issues, and rhetorical conventions common to writing in this field.	The project has numerous places where it does not follow all conventions for English academic writing, both in terms of style and grammar. This includes incorporating sources, formatting issues, and rhetorical conventions common to writing in this field.	
Documentation	The project has no errors in citation and documentation, as specified by the instructor (most commonly MLA style).	The project has few errors in citation and documentation, as specified by the instructor (most commonly MLA style).	The project has many errors in citation and documentation, as specified by the instructor (most commonly MLA style).	

## Appendix 2: Thesis and nonthesis rubric

	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)	N/A	Rating
<b>1. Students will demonstrate a broad and integrated knowledge of history, theory, and/or pedagogy.</b>					
History	The project is thoroughly grounded in the traditions of the text, genre, or issue. The student has clearly engaged with the ongoing scholarly/artistic conversations surrounding the text or issue.	The project shows an awareness of the scholarly/artistic conversations surrounding the text, genre, or issue. Cites major critics or secondary sources.	The project lacks awareness of the scholarly/artistic or professional conversations surrounding the text, genre, or issue. Few to no secondary sources cited.		
Theory	The project has a clear theoretical/craft framework, and demonstrates mastery of the relevant critical theories. Not only cites theorists (if applicable), but engages with their ideas and arguments.	The project engages with appropriate craft/critical theory. Cites major figures and concepts in the field or fields (if applicable).	The project lacks a clear theoretical/craft framework. It may fail to integrate or have awareness of theory/craft or rush through it in a cursory manner. Lacks awareness of major figures and concepts in the field or fields.		
Pedagogy and/or Industry Application (if applicable)	The writer demonstrates they are well-prepared to consider how their work would apply or be relevant in a classroom or professional setting. They show a mastery of their content/practice that indicates a larger awareness of the requirements and conventions of their chosen field.	The writer demonstrates awareness of the conventions of their respective profession/craft, and that they would be prepared to either teach or apply their work to that profession. They have clearly thought beyond just the specifics of their project and considered its application for teaching or industry.	The writer does not consider the implications of the project beyond itself, demonstrating a lack of awareness/preparation for a career in teaching or industry. Regardless of the content of the project, the writer seems unprepared to apply this work to a chosen field.		
Integration (if applicable)	The writer demonstrates mastery by integrating secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing in a fluid and professional manner.	The writer integrates secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing.	The writer engages with secondary sources or their ideas and concepts, but in a disjointed way, without establishing why they are necessary for the writer's own project.		
<b>2. Students will be prepared for success in Ph.D. programs in English.</b>					
<b>3. Students will be prepared for success in other areas of advanced graduate education.</b>					
Content	The author demonstrates advanced analytical skills, original and exciting ideas, rigorous thought, creativity/innovation, and a clear sense of payoff/importance for the work.	The author demonstrates good analysis, ideas that move beyond just summarizing, independent thought, some creativity/innovation, and gestures towards the larger significance of the project.	The author lacks sufficient analysis, engages in too much summary/rehashing others' ideas, and fails to realize the project or establish why it matters.		
Organization	The project is clearly an integrated whole, with connections made across chapters/components/answers. Not only is each individual piece well organized, but these pieces clearly fit together into a larger project with an integrated vision.	Individual chapters/components/answers are well-organized and cohesive, with clear structure, logic, and progression, but there are inconsistencies or incongruities in the project viewed as a whole.	Individual chapters/components/answers lack organization. There may be good content, but the project overall lacks a clear structure, logic, or progression.		

Appendix 2: Thesis and nonthesis rubric, cont.

Audience	The project is written/designed with a strong understanding of audience. The tone is that of an advanced academic or confident artistic practitioner communicating with an educated audience, difficult concepts are explained at an appropriate level, and the writing anticipates and addresses potential audience questions or concerns.	The project is written/designed with a decent understanding of audience. The tone is suitable for a developing academic or artist communicating to more advanced academics. Difficult concepts are explained (though perhaps overexplained), and the writing recognizes potential audience questions or problems but may not entirely resolve them.	The project is written/designed without a good awareness of audience or problems in reception. The tone is not suitable for graduate-level writing, concepts are either overexplained or underexplained, and the writing fails to anticipate potential audience questions or difficulties.		
Genre Conventions	The project demonstrates a strong understanding of the conventions of the genre(s) involved. It not only follows all appropriate formatting and style conventions, but also indicates knowledge of the broader socio-cultural context and dynamics behind formatting and style choices, including audience expectations and purposes of the project.	The project follows all formatting and style conventions.	The project has numerous errors in terms of formatting and style conventions.		

**4. Students will be prepared for teaching careers in high schools and community colleges.**

**5. Students will be prepared for careers outside academe that require advanced analytical and communication skills.**

Analysis	The project demonstrates strong analysis of the texts/objects of study, or of the workings of the creative genre and subject matter. The work is intellectually stimulating and demonstrates advanced independent thought, rather than simply reproducing the thoughts/work of others.	The project demonstrates acceptable analysis of the texts/objects of study, or of the workings of the creative genre and subject matter. The work demonstrates an ability to read and think critically/creatively.	The project does not show strong analytic skills. It primarily involves summary/reproducing the work of others, mimicking the style/ideas of others, or simply relying on others' thought instead of producing something original.		
Defense	The author displays confidence and poise in answering questions. The author presents as a peer and an authority in the field, not as a subordinate. The author facilitates an engaging dialogue about the topic or artistic endeavor, instead of just responding to questions.	The author answers questions and responds to comments with clarity and insight. The author is comfortable dealing with critique and supporting their own ideas in a dialogue.	The author struggles to answer questions or challenges. The author seems uncomfortable if pushed off script, hesitates to provide answers, and engages in the conversation as a subordinate, not as an authority.		
Presentation (if applicable)	The author has designed a professional presentation, considering the genre conventions of their chosen field. The author presents with confidence and poise, displaying authority over their subject matter and engaging the audience both during their presentation and during the Q&A.	The author has designed a presentation that has no errors and conveys the content adequately. The author has developed and practiced a clear presentation, with few <u>fumblings</u> or hesitations. The author responds to audience questions with acceptable answers.	The author has not put adequate design or rehearsal into the presentation. The presentation is disjointed and confusing, particularly to audience members unfamiliar with the work. The author struggles to respond to questions from the audience.		

Appendix 3: MA Exit Interview Form  
**Survey for Graduating English MA Students**

Name:

Email address: (address to be used after you graduate):

Graduation date: \_\_\_\_December \_\_\_\_May \_\_\_\_August \_\_\_\_\_ (year)

Concentration: \_\_\_\_Literature \_\_\_\_ PTC \_\_\_\_ Creative Writing

Thesis or Non-Thesis Option:

Address after graduation:

Plans immediately following graduation:

1. What factors led you to pursue your MA at TTU?
2. What aspects of the MA program do you consider its strengths?
3. In what areas do you think the MA program might be improved?
4. Are you satisfied with the quality of advisement and other support you received?
5. Has the English MA program helped you clarify your career goals?
6. If you held a TA/GA position, to what extent did that position help prepare you for future career options?
7. Review the learning outcomes (below) of the English MA program. Do you feel that your work in the program has enabled you to meet any or all of these outcomes? Please explain.
  - a. Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of approaches and perspectives.
  - b. Students will be able to analyze and synthesize disciplinary, scholarly conversations and participate in them.
  - c. Students will be able to analyze the writing conventions of and write in a discipline-specific genre.
  - d. Students will be able to analyze communication strategies and implement them in their disciplines.
  - e. Students will be able to articulate how intercultural factors shape the creation of texts.