

CHICO STATE UNIVERSITY
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY UPDATE

PROGRAM: MA in English

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
2012 - 2013	SLO 2: Student work demonstrates advanced skills in reading, evaluating, and writing critically on various subjects in the field of English language, literature, and the literary arts.	Members of the English Department Assessment Committee and program faculty used a rubric to evaluate 15 student theses/projects. An assessment rubric was used that focused on critical reading, writing, and thinking skills. Each area was scored according to a simple 4-point system where 0 = not applicable/non-existent; 1 = Acceptable; 2 = Good; 3 = Exemplary.	We found that, on average, our students' M.A. theses/projects rate as "good" (between 2.0 - 3.0) in each of the three categories measured. This suggests that, overall, the culminating activity is a successful learning experience for our students and that they demonstrate critical reading, writing, and thinking skills. However, there were definitely areas where we saw higher achievement than in others. For example, the articulation and evaluation of scholarly work are still areas with which they struggle.	Overall, we were happy with the findings in the assessment of SLO 2. However, we were concerned with students' ability to articulate and evaluate scholarly work. A meeting with faculty teaching in the MA program suggests that further emphasizing this skill in graduate classes is essential for student success. While students may have these basic skills from their undergraduate courses, they still need faculty to carefully walk them through close readings and analyses.
2013 – 2014	SLO 3: Student work applies and demonstrates, appropriate to the student's area of concentration, comprehensive knowledge in scholarly research and methods, theoretical application, critical analysis, academic writing, and/or creative writing.	Members of the English Department Assessment Committee and program faculty used a rubric to evaluate 20 student theses/projects. An assessment rubric was used that focused on: purpose, content, quality of references, use of references, and MLA format.	We found that, on average, our students' M.A. theses/projects rate as "good" (between 2.0 - 3.0) in each category measured. This suggests that, overall, the culminating activity is a successful learning experience for our students and that they demonstrate comprehensive knowledge in scholarly research	We were happy with the findings in the assessment of SLO 3. An analysis of student work reveal success in this area and no further action was determined to be necessary.

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
		Each area was scored according to a simple 4-point system where 0 = not applicable/non-existent; 1 = Acceptable; 2 = Good; 3 = Exemplary.	and methods appropriate to their areas of concentration.	
2014 - 2015	SLO 4: By means of rigorous training and practice, interested students should be able to independently design and teach college-level courses in writing and literature.	Members of the English Department Assessment Committee and program faculty reviewer graduate student TA syllabi produced in ENGL 634: "Teaching Composition." In addition, Student Evaluations of graduate student TAs who taught in AY 2014-2015 were also evaluated.	Findings indicated that the syllabi students produced were excellent, showing that they had the skills to design college-level writing and literature courses. The SETs of actual teaching practices, however, were mixed. While most TAs received SET scores above 4.0, several TAs had scores lower than this, suggesting a struggle in the classroom.	While ENGL 634 seems to do an excellent job helping students to develop teaching materials, our graduate students sometimes still struggle in actual teaching environments. Thus, we are increasing the amount of hours devoted to our TA mentorship program; we are also requiring all TAs to visit their peers' classes to help them learn how to evaluate teaching practices and to encourage peer conversations about teaching.
2015 - 2016	NA: No specific SLOs were evaluated. Instead, faculty from the Graduate Committee worked with members of the Department Assessment Committee to review program SLOs, assessment rubrics, and other tools to evaluate student learning objectives.	NA: No specific SLOs were evaluated. Instead, faculty from the Graduate Committee worked with members of the Department Assessment Committee to review program SLOs, assessment rubrics, and other tools to evaluate student learning objectives.	NA: No specific SLOs were evaluated. Instead, faculty from the Graduate Committee worked with members of the Department Assessment Committee to review program SLOs, assessment rubrics, and other tools to evaluate student learning objectives.	NA: No specific SLOs were evaluated. Instead, faculty from the Graduate Committee worked with members of the Department Assessment Committee to review program SLOs, assessment rubrics, and other tools to evaluate student learning objectives.
2016 - 2017	SLO 1: Student work demonstrates comprehensive knowledge in his or her area of concentration: Literature; Language and Literacy;	Members of the English Department Assessment Committee and program faculty used a rubric to evaluate 25 student theses/projects. An assessment rubric was used	We found that, on average, our students' M.A. theses/projects rate as "good" (between 2.5 - 3.0) in each category measured. This suggests that, overall, the culminating activity is a successful learning experience	Overall, we were happy with the findings in the assessment of SLO 1. However, we were concerned by the lower scores in "Content," "Quality of References," and "Use of References." While the reasons for these relatively lower scores varied, in general the subcommittee recommends increased

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
	Creative Writing; and/or Pedagogy.	that focused on eight different areas of measurement: purpose, content, organization, feel, tone, quality of references, use of references, and MLA format. Each area was scored according to a simple 4-point system where 0 = not applicable/non-existent; 1 = Acceptable; 2 = Good; 3 = Exemplary.	for our students and that they demonstrate comprehensive knowledge in their areas of study. However, there were definitely areas where we saw higher achievement than in others. For example, theses/projects scored highest in the categories of "Tone," "Feel," and "MLA Format," and theses/projects scored lowest in "Content," "Quality of References," and "Use of References," suggesting that the research, analysis, and articulation of scholarly work may still be areas with which they struggle.	attention to the application of theoretical and/or methodological sources throughout the thesis/project. This is something that should be incorporated into graduate-level classes, as well as individual mentoring sessions with program faculty.