Saint Louis University
Program Assessment Plan

Program (Major, Minor, Core): Master of Arts
Department: English
College/School: Arts & Sciences
Person(s) Responsible for Implementing the Plan: Associate Chair, Graduate Director and Other Assigned Faculty
Date Submitted: November 11, 2015

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?	*Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?*	*How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.*	*How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?*

A. demonstrate a foundational knowledge of literary/rhetorical histories, aesthetics, cultures, and emerging areas of inquiry, including an awareness of cultural diversity within literary traditions	Direct Assessment: This knowledge is learned throughout the student's program of study and will be directly assessed through a review of the M.A. oral examination that each candidate takes at the conclusion of his/her degree program. Indirect Assessment: Each student's knowledge base will be indirectly assessed through annual faculty reporting on the wide historical array of course work the student takes during master's study, especially that in 6000-level seminars, as well as through relevant data from graduate course evaluations.	Direct Assessment: During the M.A. oral examination which culminates the degree, each student will demonstrate his/her relative competence by discussing a wide range of faculty-approved core texts (historical, national, critical, and theoretical, with a grounding in diversity issues). Students will examine assigned primary texts within their critical and theoretical contexts in response to questions from an examining committee of three faculty, who will complete a departmental rating form expressly prepared for the purpose of assessing each student's level of demonstrated knowledge. Indirect Assessment: Faculty reports on each student's overall academic performance, especially in seminar courses, will be shared with the student's faculty mentor, who in turn will include information about the student's acquisition of knowledge in the annual student report filed with the department's director of graduate studies. Aggregated data from course evaluations bearing on Learning Objective A will also be considered.	Feedback on Direct Assessment: The director of graduate studies will collect and aggregate the ratings of student performance on the M.A. oral examinations with respect to Learning Objective A, looking for patterns of overall success as well as specific areas of relative strength or weakness. In turn, the director will report the aggregated results of student performance to the faculty at the department's annual August retreat so that recommendations for changes to our program may be considered. This report will include recommendations about changing the core list of texts, which will be revised every three years. Feedback on Indirect Assessment: Annual reports from faculty mentors will form the basis both for reviewing each student's progress toward successful degree completion and for meeting Learning Objective A. The director and faculty mentor will meet individually with any student who is lagging and larger patterns of poor performance, if identified, will be shared with a departmental faculty committee for possible recommendations that could produce revisions to our program. Such recommendations would be considered at one of the department's monthly faculty meetings.

| B. demonstrate knowledge of research expectations, and of theoretical approaches, requisite for advanced study in English, including appropriate research resources and tools | Direct Assessments: This knowledge is learned throughout the student's program of study and will be directly assessed (1) through review of a portfolio which each M.A. candidate will present at the conclusion of course work but prior to taking the M.A. oral examination that includes a current *curriculum vitae*, what the candidate regards as the strongest research paper s/he has produced during course work, and the annotated bibliographies the student produced as a requirement in ENGL 5000 and ENGL 5110, and (2) through a review of the student's performance with respect to Learning Objective B on the M.A. oral examination which each student takes at the conclusion of his/her degree program.

Indirect Assessment: Each student's knowledge base with respect to Learning Objective B will be indirectly assessed through annual faculty reporting on the wide historical array of course work the student takes during master's study, especially that in ENGL 5000 (Methods of Research), ENGL 5110 (Literary Theory), and 6000-level seminars, as well as through relevant data from graduate course evaluations. | Direct Assessments: (1) A departmental faculty committee will review each student's portfolio for evidence of research and theoretical competence and assess individuals using a departmental rating form expressly prepared for this purpose; in addition, (2) information regarding each student's research and theoretical competence will be gleaned from the M.A. oral evaluation form referenced under Objective A above.

Indirect Assessment: Faculty reports on each student's overall academic performance, especially in ENGL 5000, ENGL 5110, and seminar courses, will be shared with the student's faculty mentor, who in turn will include information about the student's acquisition of research and theoretical knowledge in the annual student report filed with the department's director of graduate studies. Aggregated data from course evaluations bearing on Learning Objective B will also be considered. | Feedback on Direct Assessment: The director of graduate studies will collect and aggregate the faculty ratings of students' portfolios as well as the research and theory sections of their M.A. oral examinations, looking for patterns of overall success as well as specific areas of relative strength or weakness. In turn, the director will report the aggregated results of student performance to the faculty at the department's annual August retreat so that recommendations for changes to our program may be considered.

Feedback on Indirect Assessment: Annual reports from faculty mentors will form the basis both for reviewing each student's progress toward successful degree completion and for meeting Learning Objective B. The director and faculty mentor will meet individually with any student who is lagging. Larger patterns of poor performance, if identified, will be shared with a departmental faculty committee for possible recommendations that could lead to revisions to our program. Such recommendations would be considered at one of the department's monthly faculty meetings. |

C. demonstrate an ability to engage productively with relevant critical debates through written and spoken arguments	Direct Assessments: This ability is fostered throughout students' programs of study and will be directly assessed (1) through a review of a portfolio which each M.A. candidate will present at the conclusion of course work but prior to taking the M.A. oral examination that includes a current *curriculum vitae*, what the candidate regards as the strongest research paper s/he has produced during course work, and the annotated bibliographies the student produced as a requirement in ENGL 5000 and ENGL 5110, and (2) through a review of the student's performance with respect to Learning Objective C on the M.A. oral examination which each student takes at the conclusion of his/her degree program. Indirect Assessment: Each student's ability with respect to Learning Objective C will be indirectly assessed through annual faculty reporting on the student's course work, especially that in 6000-level seminars, as well as through relevant data from graduate course evaluations.	Direct Assessments: (1) A departmental faculty committee will review each student's portfolio for evidence of the student's ability to engage productively with relevant critical debates and then assess individuals using a departmental rating form expressly prepared for this purpose; in addition, (2) information regarding each student's competence in this area will gleaned from the M.A. oral evaluation form referenced under Objective A above. Indirect Assessment: Faculty reports on each student's oral and written performance in seminar courses will be shared with the student's faculty mentor, who in turn will include information about the student's ability to engage productively in relevant critical debates in the annual student report filed with the department's director of graduate studies. Aggregated data from course evaluations bearing on Learning Objective C will also be considered.	Feedback on Direct Assessment: The director of graduate studies will collect and aggregate the results of the portfolio reviews and the relevant sections of the M.A. oral examination forms, looking for patterns of overall success as well as specific areas of relative strength or weakness. In turn, the director will report the aggregated results of student performance to the faculty at the department's annual August retreat so that recommendations for changes to our program may be considered. Feedback on Indirect Assessment: Annual reports from faculty mentors will form the basis both for reviewing each student's progress toward successful degree completion and for meeting Learning Objective C. The director and faculty mentor will meet individually with any student who is lagging and larger patterns of poor performance, if identified, will be shared with a departmental faculty committee for possible recommendations that could produce revisions to our program. Such recommendations would be considered at one of the department's monthly faculty meetings.

1. **It is <u>not recommended</u> to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.**

   Because the reading list for the department's M.A. oral examination is revised on a routine basis, we will begin with Learning Objective A. A semester-by-semester breakdown follows:
   Fall 2015: Submit the overall assessment plan and develop the requisite departmental rating form.
   Spring 2016: Assess Learning Objective A as described above.

   In AY2016-17, we will use the Spring 2016 assessments to revise the M.A. reading list and consider any other changes to our program that pertain to Learning Objective A during the Fall 2016 semester, and we will carry out the assessments of Learning Objective B in the Spring 2017 semester.

   The same pattern will be followed in AY2017-18. We will consider changes to Learning Objective B in Fall 2017 and undertake Learning Objective C assessments in Spring 2018.

   Our current plan is to keep repeating this three-year cycle thereafter, pending revisions.

2. **Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?**

   No new students entered the English M.A. program in Madrid in Fall 2015, and recruitment is in abeyance. The interim program director of the English program in Madrid has, however, reviewed the protocols detailed in this document, and the program there will participate in them should the program again begin accepting students.

3. **The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:**

   a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)

   Acceptance of this document will be proposed at the department's December 2015 faculty meeting, and our current plan is to consider revisions to the abovelisted assessment protocols every six years.

   b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.

   Two graduate students are on the committee that drafted this assessment protocol, and they will take the draft assessment plan to English Graduate Organization in November 2015. Proposed revisions coming out of this meeting will be considered before the document comes before the faculty in December.

   c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?

   Association of Departments of English. "Report of the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment." New York: Modern Language Association, April 2014. Web. https://www.ade.org/reports/adHocAssessment.pdf

   Heiland, Donna, and Laura J. Rosenthal, eds. *Literary Study, Measurement, and the Sublime: Disciplinary Assessment*. New York: Teagle, 2011. Print.

   Shavelson, Richard J. *Measuring College Learning Responsibly*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2010. Print.

   Walvoord, Barbara E. *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey, 2010. Print.

   d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel

   The protocols outlined in this plan build upon existing departmental practices (e.g., annual reporting on students and M.A. oral examinations) and structures (notably, an appointed director of graduate studies, a monthly department meeting structure, and faculty service as assigned student mentors). Once this plan is put in place, there will be some extra work required of individual faculty, especially the director of graduate studies, but we have designed the protocols to be efficient as well as what we believe will be effective, rendering the increase in workload tolerable.