

**NECHE Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators  
Undergraduate Programs  
(Masters in English, AY 22-23)**

Degree Granting Program Name	(1) List ONLY the program learning objective(s) assessed during the current reporting period	(2) For each learning objective listed in column (1), other than GPA, what data/ evidence was used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated objectives? (e.g., capstone assignment, portfolio review, licensure examination)	(3) What were the results/outcomes/findings/conclusion(s) of the assessment? Explain results/findings/conclusions for each program learning objective listed in column (1)	(4) Who interprets the evidence? Describe the process (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee).	(5) What changes/improvements have been made as a result of using the data/evidence (3)? Link discussion in this column with a learning objective (1) and the results of assessing that objective (3)	(6) Date of most recent program review
English	PLO 1: Articulate one's own critical and theoretical orientations within historical and contemporary scholarship	In summer of 2022, the coordinator met with OIA and designed a rubric for this PLO. In the subsequent fall semester, the <i>Critical Self-portrait</i> assignment from ENGL 901 (a required course in the program) was collected, scored and the data examined.	No report has yet been made, as the program's 5-year review is due in April 2024, and the findings will be reviewed there	The chair of the department assessment committee gathers scoring forms and produces basic statistical plots for initial interpretation by the committee. Plots are also forwarded to the department chair and discussed at a departmental meeting. Since goals are typically assessed for both the fall and spring semesters, the assessment committee generally makes a short presentation of findings at the May departmental meeting.	None, as the results are forthcoming.	2019

	<p>PLO 5: Demonstrate advanced communication skills, including the ability to write lucid prose for specific rhetorical situations</p>	<p>Artifact assessment. Faculty scored artifacts at the end of the semester, following a norming session. Scores were submitted through an online form with the anonymized artifacts attached.</p>	<p>Our initial conclusions are that students are graduating with a general competency in departmental goals and learning objectives, though this conclusion is based on a relatively small sample size.</p>	<p>The chair of the department assessment committee gathers scoring forms and produces basic statistical plots for initial interpretation by the committee. Plots are also forwarded to the department chair and discussed at a departmental meeting. Since goals are typically assessed for both the fall and spring semesters, the assessment committee generally makes a short presentation of findings at the May departmental meeting.</p>	<p>We are refraining on making changes to goals/learning objectives until we have completed a full round of assessment (6 goals), though we anticipate a robust discussion at that time. We have improved the assessment process for AY23-24 by asking faculty scorers to also submit a short survey indicating any learning objectives that they found particularly difficult to assess or anything that they were seeing in artifacts that would seem to be relevant to the goal under assessment, but which did not have a stated learning objective.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--	--