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Master of Arts in English M.A.
Instructional Degree Program Degree Information

Submitted by: Dr. Helen Blythe, Director of Graduate Studies in English, Department of English; Faculty Assessment Representative.
Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose Linkage:

Institutional Mission Reference:

“The university is committed to excellence in teaching, discovering, preserving and applying knowledge, and is responsive to new opportunities for teaching, learning, research and public service created by a changing environment.”

“The university aspires to develop broadly literate students and leaders, educated in analytical and critical thought and in the appreciation of the arts and sciences.”

“In essence, through educational excellence and a dedication to society’s needs, the university is committed to the cultivation and enrichment of the human mind and spirit.”

Program’s Goals in support of Institutional Mission:

1. “The goals of teaching in the College [of Arts and Sciences] encompass not only imparting to its students the knowledge, the verbal and cognitive skills, and the values and attitudes which comprise the basis of a liberal education, but also instilling in them the ability and desire to think and work independently and creatively . . .”

2. “The purpose of research in the College is to amend and extend the bases of knowledge and creative activity . . .”
Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes for Academic Performance:

All students graduating from the English M.A. program will demonstrate proficiency in the areas listed below by achieving a score of at least 3.5 on the overall scale:

Assessment Scale:  1 = poor   2 = below average   3 = average   4 = excellent

1. Quality of written work.

2. Mastery of relevant and current theoretical concepts.

3. Mastery of interpretive and analytical skills.

4. Mastery of the subject and form.

5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret, and document research.

6. Originality of research or creative project.

7. Quality of oral presentation.

All teaching assistants in the English M.A. program will demonstrate proficiency in the areas listed below by achieving at least a 3.5

8. Best practices in tutoring students having difficulty with writing.

9. Best practices in teaching college composition effectively in the classroom
Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes for Professional Practice:

Students involved in extra-curricular activities and graduating from the English M.A. program will demonstrate proficiency in the areas listed below by achieving a score of at least 3.5 on the overall scale:

Assessment Scale:  1 = poor   2 = below average   3 = average  4 = excellent

Editing Assistants for Picayune or other editorial work

All editing assistants in the English M.A. program will demonstrate proficiency in the areas listed below by achieving at least a 3.5.

1. Mastery of style concerns and the ability to pursue and research editorial questions with accuracy.

2. Ability to work with authors and clarify arguments

Assistants for Conferences, Lecture Series, and other organized events

All conference coordinator and lecture series assistants in the English M.A. program will demonstrate proficiency in the areas listed below by achieving at least a 3.5.

3. Ability to work independently and take initiative.

4. Ability to work effectively with presenters and guest speakers.

5. Organization and effective use of time.

6. Professional conduct.
Intended Educational Outcome 1:

Quality of written work.

First Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


First year paper Evaluation by Director of Graduate Studies

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. See attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5 = 5
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 5 = 5
Student 4: 5 = 5
Student 5: 4 = 4

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

The first-year paper is written by students in their first semester of study. All students met the required outcome of 3.5, so the graduate program is meeting its high standards -- admitting students capable of performing well.

Second Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifying Exam</th>
<th>2 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. See attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 4 = 4
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 4; 5 = 4.5
Student 4: 4 = 4
Student 5: 5 = 5

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score.

Third Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis Proposal</th>
<th>2 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. See attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; 4 = 4.3
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 4; 4; 5 = 4.3
Student 4: 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: 5; 5 = 5

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.
Students met the required score.

Fourth Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>3 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. See attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 2: 4; 4; 5 = 4.3
Student 3: 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5; 4 = 4.5
Student 5: No data available - old evaluation forms used by thesis committee

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score.
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Note: Provide the following information for each outcome from the previous page. Enlarge the space under each category as needed.

**Intended Educational Outcome 2:**

Mastery of relevant and current theoretical concepts.

---

**First Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Paper</th>
<th>Evaluation by Director of Graduate Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5 = 5
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 4 = 4
Student 4: 4 = 4
Student 5: 3 = 3

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Apart from Student 5, all four students met the required OA score of 3.5. Student 5 (with a creative writing concentration) showed great resistance to theory and to participating fully in academic research. Student 5’s resistance was common among creative-writing concentration students in the past, but faculty have done much to quell this attitude and foster instead an understanding of the need to conduct research and understand theory at the graduate level.
Second Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


Qualifying Exam

2 (or more) evaluations by faculty

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5; N/A = 5
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5 = 5
Student 5: 4 = 4

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

All students met the required score, even Student 5, who showed resistance to theory in the first semester of study, so this improvement suggests that the program is persuading students of the need for sustained research in graduate studies.

Third Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


Thesis Proposal

2 (or more) evaluations by faculty

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; N/A; 3 = 3.5
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: N/A; 5 = 5
C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

All students met the required score of 3.5, so the MA Program is meeting its goals in fostering students’ research. On several occasions, faculty members wrote N/A for Outcome 2 – mastery of theories -- because the student is writing a creative-writing thesis. However, since each thesis includes a critical scholarly introduction, faculty should evaluate this outcome when reviewing the thesis proposal.

---

Fourth Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>3 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5; N/A; 5 = 5
Student 2: 4; 4; 5 = 4.3
Student 3: 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5; 4 = 4
Student 5: N/A; N/A; N/A. Outdated evaluation forms used.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Apart from Student 5, for whom the incorrect evaluation forms were submitted, all students met the required score. There are several out-dated versions of Outcomes Assessment forms that faculty are still using, which makes it difficult and sometimes impossible to provide a comprehensive overall summary of student performance. In this instance, the forms pre-dated the institution the Critical Introduction to the Creative Writing Thesis. It is recommended that faculty remove all outdated material from their computer files and emails.
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Intended Educational Outcome 3:
Mastery of interpretive and analytical skills.

First Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Paper</th>
<th>Evaluation by Director of Graduate Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5 = 5
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 5 = 5
Student 4: 4 = 4
Student 5: 4 = 4

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score and so the MA program is meeting its goals.

Second Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifying Exam</th>
<th>2 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5; 5 = 5  
Student 2: 4 = 4  
Student 3: 4; 5 = 4.5  
Student 4: 5 = 5  
Student 5: 5 = 5

All five students met the required score of 3.5, which shows that the MA Program is meeting its goals.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

---

Third Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis Proposal</th>
<th>3 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; 3 = 4  
Student 2: 4 = 4  
Student 3: 5; 5 = 5  
Student 4: 5; 5 = 5  
Student 5: 4; 5 = 4.5

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.
All students met the required score so the MA Program is meeting its goals.

---

**Fourth Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>3 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.*

*Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:*

Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 4; N/A = 4
Student 2: 4; 4; 5 = 4.3
Student 3: 4; 5 = 4.5
Student 4: No data available- old evaluation forms and creative writing thesis.
Student 5: no data available – old evaluation forms used for a creative-writing thesis

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students are meeting the required score of 3.5 for this outcome. However, faculty members need to use the updated Outcomes Assessment forms since several students were unable to be evaluated because the old thesis evaluation forms for creative-writing poetry only listed creative criteria that do not apply, and which no one uses for any kind of evaluation of the student or the program.

---

**Fifth Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Defense of Thesis</th>
<th>3 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.*

*Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:*

Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 4; 5 = 4.3
Student 2: 4; 5; 4 = 4.3
Student 3: No data available - Old evaluation forms used
Student 4: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: No faculty member of the thesis committee submitted the forms.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score of 3.5, so the program is meeting its goals. However, since faculty members used old out-dated evaluation forms or submitted none at all, it is difficult to gain an accurate overall sense of student performance in the program in this outcome.
Intended Educational Outcome 4:
Mastery of the subject and form.

First Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


First Year Paper
Evaluation by Director of Graduate Studies

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4 = 4
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 4 = 4
Student 4: 4 = 4
Student 5: 3 = 3

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Apart from Student 5, all four students met the desire score of 3.5, suggesting that the MA program is meeting its goals. Student 5 showed resistance to academic research, having entered the program with a creative-writing emphasis. It is recommended that students are enlightened early in their first semester as to the nature of the MA English Program at NMHU. In short, students need frequent reminding that they have entered an MA English Program and not an
MFA Program. They are told this repeatedly during the admissions process, but perhaps in 601 Research Methods they need further reminding, as they do in the orientation meetings in the first weeks of the academic year.

Second Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifying Exam</th>
<th>2 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (or more) evaluations by faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1:5; 5 = 5
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5 = 5
Student 5: 5 = 5

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score.

Third Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis Proposal</th>
<th>2 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (or more) evaluations by faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; 4
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5; N/A (old forms used); 5 = 5
Student 5: 4; 4 = 4

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required scores.

---

Fourth Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>3 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; 5 = 4.6
Student 2: 4; 4; 5 = 4.3
Student 3: 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: 5; 4; 5; 4; 4 = 4.5

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required scores, although a couple of committees used Outcomes Assessment forms that were outdated and difficult to apply.

---

Fifth Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Defense of Thesis</th>
<th>3 evaluations (or more) by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent
B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; 5 = 4.6  
Student 2: 4; 5; 4 = 4.3  
Student 3: N/A; N/A; N/A. No data available. Old evaluation forms used.  
Student 4: 4; 5; 5 = 4.6  
Student 5: No Outcomes Assessment forms submitted by the thesis committee.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

For the most part, students met the required scores except for Student 5, whose forms were not submitted, and Student 3, whose evaluation forms were outdated and impossible to apply.
### Intended Educational Outcome 5:

Ability to conduct, synthesize, and document research

#### First Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Paper</th>
<th>Evaluation by Director of Graduate Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.*

*Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:*

Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

- Student 1: 5 = 5
- Student 2: 4= 4
- Student 3: 5= 5
- Student 4: 4= 4
- Student 5: 4= 4

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score.

#### Second Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome

Qualifying Exam

2 (or more) evaluations by faculty

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; N/A = 4
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 5; 5= 5
Student 4: 5 = 5
Student 5: 4 = 4

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score.

---

Third Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


Thesis Proposal

2 (or more) evaluations by faculty

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; N/A = 4.5
Student 2: 4 = 4
Student 3: 5; 5; N/A = 5
Student 4: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: 4; 5 = 4.5

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.
Fourth Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>3 (or more) evaluations by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

*Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:*
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; 5
Student 2: 4; 5; 5
Student 3: 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: No data available. Old out-dated evaluation forms used that do not apply.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score, with the exception of Student 5, for whom outdated evaluation forms were submitted. However, the forms submitted were very positive in their assessment of the student’s thesis.
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Intended Educational Outcome 6:
Originality of research or creative project.

First Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


Thesis Proposal 2 (or more) evaluations by faculty

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; 5 = 4.6
Student 2: 5 = 5
Student 3: 4; 5; 5
Student 4: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: 5; 5 = 5

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score.

Second Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>3 evaluations (or more) by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; N/A = 4.5
Student 2: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 3: 5; 5 = 5
Student 4: 5; 5 = 5

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score.

---

Third Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Defense of Thesis</th>
<th>3 evaluations (or more) by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5; 4; N/A; = 4.5
Student 2: 4; 5 = 4.5
Student 3: No data available. Old evaluation forms used.
Student 4: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: No data available. Thesis committee did not submit evaluation forms.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.
Students met the required scores except in those instances when no Outcomes Assessment forms were submitted or when out-dated forms were submitted that could not be applied. It is recommended that faculty members update their files and destroy old forms and that they cooperate more with the Outcomes Assessment process.
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Intended Educational Outcome 7:

Quality of oral presentation.

First Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


Thesis Proposal

3 evaluations (or more) by faculty

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 5; 4
Student 2: 5 = 5
Student 3: 5; 4; 5
Student 4: 5; 5; 5 = 5
Student 5: 4; 4 = 4

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

All students met the required score. This result is particularly gratifying since an effort was made by faculty to prepare students better by including more oral presentations in graduate courses and encouraging students to present papers at conferences.
Second Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Defense of Thesis</th>
<th>3 evaluations (or more) by faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.

Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 4; 4; 4 = 4
Student 2: 4; 5; = 4.5
Student 3: 5; 5; 5; 5; 4; 5; 4; 5 = 4.7
Student 4: 4; 5; 4 = 4.3
Student 5: No forms were submitted by faculty.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

All students met the required score with the exception of Student 5, for whom no data are available since the thesis committee did not complete and submit the evaluation forms. It is recommended that faculty cooperate more fully in the Outcomes Assessment process so that a more comprehensive view of the program performance can be undertaken.
# Assessment Report for Master of Arts in English

**M.A.**  
(Instructional Degree Program)  
2009-2010  
(Period Covered)  
May 2010  
(Date Submitted)

**Note:** Provide the following information for each outcome from the previous page. Enlarge the space under each category as needed.

## Intended Educational Outcome 8:

Best practice in tutoring students having difficulty with writing.

## Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome


   Evaluation of tutoring form by the Director of the Writing Center

   *Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.*

   *Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:  
   Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent*

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

   Student 1: 2; 4; 4; 5; 3; 3 = 3.5  
   Student 2: None provided.  
   Student 3: None provided.  
   Student 4: None provided.  
   Student 5: None provided.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

In response to the expansion of the program, in 2008 the Graduate Committee decided that the Director of the Writing Center and the Director of Composition should include their evaluations of tutoring and teaching performance in their respective reports. However, when writing the seven-year Academic Program Review of the MA English Program, the Director of Graduate Studies realized that the results of such evaluations should be included in the overall assessment...
of the MA English Program. As a result, this year, few evaluations were available for inclusion in this assessment report, but it is hoped that next year, evaluations will be submitted by the Director of the Writing Center, and that along with the numerical evaluations of classroom instruction, the Director of Composition will also include narrative descriptions of students classroom performance. Since faculty will be required to participate in the classroom observations and evaluations of graduate students, it is important that up-to-date forms be made available to all faculty.
Intended Educational Outcome 9:
Best practice in teaching college composition effectively in the classroom

First Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome

Qualitative written reviews of teaching, based on observation by faculty teaching mentor.

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. See attached forms.

Goal: Favorable reviews of teaching and grading

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.
No narrative evaluations were included.

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Second Means of Assessment for the Above Outcome

Numerical evaluation of classroom teaching, based on observation by faculty teaching mentor.

Criteria for evaluating each of the above items are stated on the evaluation forms. Please see attached forms.
Goal: Each portfolio will achieve a score of at least 3.5 on the following scale:
Assessment scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent

B. RESULTS: Summarize results from data collected.

Student 1: 5; 4; 5; 4; 4; N/A; 4 = 4.3
The student performed well in the classroom, but needed to improve class planning and goals, and attend more mentoring and training meetings.

Student 2: 4; 4; 3; N/A; N/A; 4; 4 = 3.8
The student performed very effectively in the classroom, but need to improve class planning and goals.

Student 3: No data submitted.

Student 4: 5; 4; 5; 5; 5; 5 = 4.8
Student performed very well in the classroom. Successful problem-solving approach.

Student 5: 5; 4; 5; 5; 5; 5 = 4.5
Student performed very well in the classroom. Excellent progress

C. USE OF RESULTS: Describe how results are used for program decision-making and improvement, with evidence of how decisions are implemented.

Students met the required score. The overall impression of student performance in the classroom is that the MA program is meeting its goals of training effective instructors of composition. Students could benefit from extra assistance with class planning and achieving goals.

NOTE: No evaluation forms were submitted this year for the outcomes assessment of Professional Practice.
The mission of the Master of Arts in English is to provide advanced instruction in three emphasis areas: (1) literature, (2) language, rhetoric, and composition, and (3) creative writing. Students will develop a strong foundation in advanced research methods, history and development of the English language, and current theories and subject matter for their emphasis area. Teaching assistants will receive special training in tutoring and in teaching composition in the classroom. This M.A. program has been designed to serve the needs of regional secondary school teachers, prospective community college teachers, students who plan to enter Ph. D. programs, and students who seek stronger credentials in English for careers in journalism, publication, and professional writing.

**Intended Outcomes of Academic Work**

*Students who complete the M.A. in English from New Mexico Highlands University will demonstrate the following:*

1. Quality of written work.
2. Mastery of relevant and current theoretical concepts.
3. Mastery of interpretive and analytical skills.
4. Mastery of the subject and form.
5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret, and document research.
6. Originality of the creative or research project
7. Quality of oral presentation.

**Intended Outcomes of Tutoring and Teaching**

*Teaching Assistants who complete the M.A. in English from New Mexico Highlands University will demonstrate the following:*
8. Best practice tutoring students who are having difficulty with writing.

9. Best practice in teaching college composition effectively in the classroom

Intended Outcomes of Professional Practice

**All students who receive editing assistantships will demonstrate the following:**

1. Mastery of house style and the ability to pursue and research editorial questions with accuracy

2. Ability to work with authors to revise and clarify arguments

**All students who serve as assistant conference/lecture series coordinators will demonstrate the following:**

3. Ability to work independently and take initiative

4. Ability to work with presenters and guest speakers

5. Organization

6. Professionalism
Assessment of Student Work

The Director of Graduate Studies will establish a portfolio for each student, which will contain the following assessment materials:

1. **First-Year Course Work.** A final paper from one course in the student(s) first year will be evaluated by the Director of Graduate Studies, using the Course Paper Evaluation form. **Outcomes Assessed:** 1-6.

2. **First-Year Evaluation.** Faculty will evaluate the student’s performance using the First-Year Evaluation form. The Director of Graduate Studies will collate the data and write a letter to the student detailing the results, and, if necessary, offering recommendations for improvement.

3. **Qualifying Examination.** Two members of the student(s) thesis committee will grade this examination and fill out the Qualifying Examination Evaluation form. Copies of the examination will be kept in the student’s portfolio. **Outcomes Assessed:** 1-5.

4. **Thesis Proposal.** The proposal will be evaluated by at least two members of the graduate faculty, using the Proposal Evaluation form. **Outcomes Assessed:** 1-6.

5. **Thesis.** At least two members of the thesis committee will evaluate the thesis, using the Thesis Evaluation form. **Outcomes Assessed:** 1-6.


Assessment of Tutors and Teaching Assistants

1. **Review of Tutors.** Each semester the Director of the Writing Center will monitor the tutoring of the graduate students working in the Writing Center and evaluate their work, using the Tutoring Evaluation form. **Outcome Assessed:** 8.

2. **Review of Teaching.** Each semester the Director of Composition will observe classes taught by teaching assistants and provide written commentaries for them. The Director of Composition will also give a copy of these written evaluations and a numerical evaluation, using the Teaching Assistant Classroom Observation form to the Director of Graduate Studies. **Outcome Assessed:** 9.

Assessment of Editorial Assistant and Assistance Conference/Lecture Series Coordinator
1. **Editorial Assistant and Assistant Conference Coordinator.** Depending on funding and program needs, graduate students may have the opportunity to hold a summer TA line fulfilling the duties of an Editorial Assistant or Assistant Conference Coordinator.

   **Editorial Assistant Outcomes Assessed:** Professional Practice (PP) 1-6
   **Assistant Conference Coordinator Outcomes Assessed:** PP 1-5

---

**Overall Assessment of Program**

*The following assessment activities are designed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the program for the purpose of improving it:*

1. **Exit Survey.** Students who have successfully defended their theses will be asked to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the program, using the Exit Survey form.

2. **Alumni Survey.** Periodically the Director of Graduate Studies will conduct a survey of alumni, using the Alumni Survey form, to determine how well the program has prepared students for doctoral or professional work.

3. **Annual Assessment Report.** At the end of each academic year the Director of Graduate Studies will provide the Chair with an Outcomes Assessment Report and a Director of Graduate Studies Report. This information will be used to institute changes that will improve the program.
First-Year Paper Evaluation

Faculty Evaluator _______________________
Student: ___________________________ Semester: ____________

Please rate the course paper using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale: 1 = poor 2 = below average 3 = average 4 = good 5 = excellent

1. Quality of written work

2. Mastery of relevant and current theoretical concepts

3. Interpretive and analytical skills

4. Mastery of subject and form

5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret, and document research

6. Originality of the paper

7. What are the strengths of the paper?

8. What are the weaknesses of the paper?

9. Additional comments:
# First-Year Graduate Student Evaluation

**Faculty Evaluator:** ____________________________

**Student:** ____________________________

**Year:** __________

**Required Course:** ______

**Elective Course:** ______

**Practicum:** ______

**Writing Center Tutoring:** ______

**Workshop Facilitation:** ______

**Classroom Teaching:** ______

**Thesis & Reading List Preparation:** ______

Please rate the course paper using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>1 = poor</th>
<th>2 = below average</th>
<th>3 = average</th>
<th>4 = good</th>
<th>5 = excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of written work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery of relevant and current theoretical concepts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpretive and analytical skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mastery of the subject and form</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret, and document research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Originality of projects</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality of oral presentations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. First-semester Writing Center tutoring (score from OAE)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Apprenticeship classroom performance (score from OAE)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Professional practice (score from OAE)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Student’s strengths:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Suggestions for improvement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualifying Examination Evaluation

Faculty Evaluator: ______________________

Student: ______________________________  Semester: ________________

Please rate the course paper using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale: 1 = poor  2 = below average  3 = average  4 = good  5 = excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Quality of written work</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery of theoretical concepts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpretive and analytical skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mastery of subject and forms</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret, and document research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What are the strengths of the examination?

7. What are the weaknesses of the examination?

8. Additional comments:
# Thesis Proposal Evaluation

**Faculty Evaluator:**

**Student:** __________________________  **Semester:** __________

Please rate the course paper using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

**Scale:**

1 = poor  
2 = below average  
3 = average  
4 = good  
5 = excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Quality of written work</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery of relevant and current theoretical concepts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpretive and analytical skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mastery of the subject and form</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret, and document research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Originality of the project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality of the oral presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What are the strengths of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What are the weaknesses of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Additional comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M.A. Thesis Evaluation: Literature or Language, Rhetoric, and Composition

Faculty Evaluator: ________________________________

Student: ________________________________ Semester: ________________

Please rate the course paper using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale: 1 = poor  2 = below average  3 = average  4 = good  5 = excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of written work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery of current and relevant theoretical concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpretive and analytical skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mastery of subject and form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret, and document research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Originality of the thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What are the strengths of the thesis?

8. What are the weaknesses of the thesis?

9. Additional comments:
M.A. Thesis Evaluation: Creative Writing - Poetry

Faculty Evaluator: __________________________

Student: ____________________________ Semester: __________

Please rate the course paper using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale: 1 = poor 2 = below average 3 = average 4 = good 5 = excellent

1. Overall quality of written work 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

2. Mastery of relevant and current theoretical concepts 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

3. Interpretive and analytical skills 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. Overall mastery of subject and form 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret and document research 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. Level of originality and innovation 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. Effectiveness of the oral presentation 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

8. Ability to explore important content in the poems 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

9. Use of figurative language (metaphor, symbol, image, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

10. Ability with formal techniques (line breaks and length, formatting stanza form, spacing, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

11. Ability to create music, rhythm, and momentum in poems 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

12. What are the strengths of the thesis?

13. What are the weaknesses of the thesis?

14. Additional comments:
M.A. Thesis Evaluation: Creative Writing - Fiction

Faculty Evaluator: ____________________________

Student: ____________________________

Semester: ____________________________

Please rate the course paper using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale: 1 = poor  2 = below average  3 = average  4 = good  5 = excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Overall quality of written work</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery of relevant and current theoretical concepts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpretive and analytical skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall mastery of subject and form</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret and document research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Originality and innovation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ability to develop characters</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ability to develop plot</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Narrative voice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What are the strengths of the project?

11. What are the weaknesses of the project?

12. Additional comments:
Oral Thesis Defense

Faculty Evaluator: __________________________

Student: __________________________ Semester: ____________

Please rate the oral thesis defense using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale: 1 = poor  2 = below average  3 = average  4 = good  5 = excellent

Initial Presentation and Questioning Period

1. Quality of written work  
2. Mastery of relevant theoretical concepts  
3. Interpretive and analytical skills  
4. Mastery of subject and form  
5. Ability to conduct, synthesize, interpret, document, & present research  
6. Originality of thesis ideas and presentation  
7. Quality of oral presentation and responses to questions

8. What are the strengths of the oral defense?

9. What are the weaknesses of the oral defense?

10. Additional comments
M.A. Outcomes Assessment  
Evaluation of Graduate Assistant as Writing Center Tutor

Scale: 1=poor  2=below average  3=average  4=good  5=excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutor Name</th>
<th>Evaluation Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ratings Provided by Writing Center Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Active participation in tutor training sessions</th>
<th>Understanding of strategies / principles / rules of effective writing (content, expression, organization, mechanics)</th>
<th>Ability to convey strategies / principles / rules of effective writing in tutoring sessions</th>
<th>Ability to engage students in tutoring sessions</th>
<th>Workshop performance</th>
<th>Professionalism (during and between tutoring sessions)</th>
<th>Positive and helpful attitude towards Writing Center and other tutors and staff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Observation Evaluative Criteria

Instructor ___________________    Semester ___________    Date ________
Observer ___________________

The observed class is rated using the scale below and the attached rubric.

Scale: 1 = poor    2 = weak    3 = competent    4 = strong    5 = superior

On written plan:

1. Class plan links to assignment/course objectives   1 2 3 4 5 N/A
2. Plan states day and course objectives as student actions   1 2 3 4 5  N/A

On observed class:

3. Class activities meet objectives in plan   1 2 3 4 5 N/A
4. Sequencing and scaffolding of activities   1 2 3 4 5 N/A
5. Students understand class session in course context   1 2 3 4 5 N/A
6. Instructor creates engaging classroom atmosphere   1 2 3 4 5 N/A
7. If applicable: flexibility and adaptability   1 2 3 4 5 N/A
8. Attendance
9. Number of students who spoke
10. What were the strengths of the class session?

11. What are some suggestions for improvement?

12. Additional comments:
Student: ___________________________    Semester: _______________________

Please rate the editorial assistant using the criteria below, bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale: 1 = poor   2 = below average   3 = average   4 = good   5 = excellent

1. Ability to copyedit thoroughly

2. Ability to help authors revise and clarify arguments

3. Ability to pursue and research editorial questions

4. Familiarity with subject matter

5. Familiarity with MLA and Chicago style

6. Professionalism (dependability, attitude)

Comments:
M.A. Outcomes Assessment

Conference/Lecture Series Coordinator Evaluation

Student: ___________________________  Semester: ___________________________

Please rate the editorial assistant using the criteria below, bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale:  1 = poor  2 = below average  3 = average  4 = good  5 = excellent

1. Ability to work independently
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A

2. Ability to work with speakers and presenters
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A

3. Ability to keep organized record
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
NMHU M.A. English Exit Survey

Year: ______________________

Please rate the English M.A. program using the criteria below and bearing in mind that overly generous scoring will inhibit improvement of the program.

Scale: 1 = poor  2 = below average  3 = average  4 = good  5 = excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of academic advising during the program</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accessibility and helpfulness of faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mentoring by the thesis director</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Variety of courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The way the program is set up (including required courses, course</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progression, proposal, examinations, thesis, and defense)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clarity of requirements and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall experience in the graduate program</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Assistants</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Preparation for and assistance with tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Preparation for and assistance with teaching in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the strengths of the program?
What are the weaknesses of the program?

Additional Comments:
Please help us to evaluate the effectiveness of the NMHU Master’s Program in English by answering the following questions.

Scale: 1 = poor  2 = below average  3 = average  4 = good  5 = excellent

1. How would you rate your overall experience in our program?  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A

2. How would you rate the academic quality of the M.A. program in English?  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A

3. How would you rate the reputation of the M.A. program in English?  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A

4. Rate how well the M.A. program in English prepared you for
   a. your current position (name position) ____________________  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   b. graduate or professional school  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A

5. Please rate
   a. breadth of knowledge of the discipline provided by our program  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   b. depth of knowledge in your emphasis area  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A

6. To what extent has the education from the English graduate program been
   a. professionally rewarding  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   b. personally rewarding  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   c. financially rewarding  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A

7. Overall, how would you rate the English M.A. program in the following areas:
   a. quality of courses  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   b. variety of courses  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   c. accessibility & helpfulness of faculty  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   d. quality of instruction by faculty  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   e. quality of academic advising  
      1  2  3  4  5  N/A

8. What do you think the English Master’s program does well?
9. How do you think the English Master’s program could be improved?

10. Would you recommend the NMHU English M.A. program to others?

11. Please provide the following information so we can determine how different groups evaluate the English Master’s program?

Did you attend another school after you graduated? Yes __________ No __________

What is your current occupation?