

WSU Five-Year Graduate Program Review  
Self-Study

Cover Page

Department/Program: Master of Arts in English

Semester Submitted: Fall 2019

Self-Study Team Chair: David Hartwig

Self-Study Team Members:

Hal Crimmel, Sally Shigley, Christy Call, Jason Barrett-Fox, Ryan Ridge, Emily January Petersen, and Kate Johnson.

Contact Information:

Dr. David Hartwig

Graduate Director and Assistant Professor of English

Phone: 801-626-7461

Email: davidhartwig@weber.edu

Information Regarding Current Review Team Members:

External Reviewers:

Tyson Hausdoerffer, Director of Graduate Program in Creative Writing, Western Colorado University

970-943-2298, thausdoerffer@western.edu

Internal Reviewers:

Valerie Herzog, Prof. and Chair of Athletic Training and Director of Graduate Studies, Weber State University

801-626-7656, valerieherzog@weber.edu

Electra Fielding, Assoc. Prof. of Spanish, Weber State University

801-626-6452, electrafielding@weber.edu

#### A. Brief Introductory Statement

The Master of Arts in English (MENG) Program offered its first classes in Fall 2006. Over the past decade, MENG has awarded over 200 Master's degrees. Over the past several years, MENG has sought to better equip our students for the increasingly specialized job market, offering unique tracks in Literature, Creative Writing, TESOL, and English Education (including secondary licensure).

Dr. David Hartwig was appointed to a three-year term as Program Director beginning in July 2019.

#### B. Mission Statement

##### a. Description of Program Mission

The Master of Arts in English program (MENG) provides excellent educational experiences for its students through extensive personal contact among faculty, staff and students in an environment that encourages freedom of expression while valuing diversity. We take pride in a student-centered environment for learning and believe close associations between faculty and students contribute to student success.

The MENG program is designed to provide advanced preparation in writing, critical thinking skills, and English language and literature. The purpose of the advanced study of language and literature is to heighten humanistic values and the awareness of them, in order to serve a local community of scholars.

##### b. Brief discussion of the alignment of the program mission with the mission, core themes, and strategic plans of Weber State University

(see [http://weber.edu/universityplanning/Mission\\_and\\_core\\_themes.html](http://weber.edu/universityplanning/Mission_and_core_themes.html))

The MENG program is aligned with the mission and core themes of Weber State University. The core theme of Access is achieved by the MENG program through scheduling, funding opportunities for students, and course offerings allowing students to progress effectively. In terms of scheduling, nearly all MENG classes are offered from 5:30-8:10pm, Monday through Thursday, and at the same times/days during two 7-week blocks during the summer. We offer classes at the Ogden campus, the Davis campus, the Farmington campus, and in hybrid/online formats, with plans to offer more online courses in the future. This allows MENG students to continue working and balancing their commitments while they pursue their graduate studies. MENG is the most affordable graduate program in English in the state of Utah, and we offer numerous funding opportunities for our students, including scholarships, a Graduate Research Assistant (GRA) position, and Teaching Assistant

(TA) positions. The GRA and TA positions pay students, provide tuition waivers reducing the cost of their graduate degree, and provide valuable professionalizing opportunities for our students. Finally, MENG has carefully scheduled courses to ensure students can progress toward their degrees in a timely fashion. Students who do not have an undergraduate degree in English have the opportunity to take a leveling-class at the 5000-level to help both the program and the students determine if they are a good fit with the program. Through course scheduling and advising, MENG has maintained a median time-to-graduation of 2.03 years over the past decade.

The MENG program achieves the core theme of Learning through faculty/student contact, graduate research, conference participation, and professionalizing experiences. MENG courses are capped at 15 students, allowing for extensive contact between faculty and students both inside and beyond the classroom. MENG students are required to complete a research project and submit it for publication in 6010: Introduction to Graduate Studies. Students are encouraged to further pursue publication beyond this course. MENG students have published in *CEA: A Journal of the College English Association*, *Albeit*, *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture, and Society*, *The Journal of Dracula Studies*, *Utah English Journal*, *The English Literature Journal*, *The Buffalo Almanac*, *The New Orleans Review*, *These Fragile Lilacs Poetry Journal*, *Black Fox Literary Magazine*, *Peculiar: A Queer Literary Journal*, *Zone*, *Mud Season Review*, and *ReviewingShakespeare.com*. Students have also presented at conferences regionally, nationally, and internationally. To highlight just a few, a student recently presented at the Uniport Conference on Language and Literature in the Democratic Republic of Congo, students have regularly presented at the Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association (RMMLA) annual conference and the Wooden O Symposium at the Utah Shakespeare Festival, and a student recently had a paper accepted for the College Composition and Communication Conference (CCCC). MENG assists student conference travel through our competitive applications for Travel Reimbursement funding, and encourages students to apply for grants available through the Office of Undergraduate Research. As previously mentioned, MENG provides students with professionalizing experiences through both our TA program and GRA program, which provide vital experience in teaching and research to further prepare students for their careers. Students apply for the TA program and are interviewed by the MENG director and the Composition program director. Prior to beginning in the classroom, TAs attend an intensive training workshop with the Composition director and assistant director. In their first semester as TAs, the students teach one section of either first- or second-year composition, and are required to take MENG 6822: Teaching College Writing and MENG 6823: Teaching Practicum. These two classes help TAs understand the challenges of teaching composition, and utilize evidence-based practices for addressing these challenges. In their second semester, TAs then take Composition Theory to round out their understanding of the discipline.

The core theme of Community is achieved through MENG's contribution to area schools. Many MENG students are teachers in area K-12 schools, seeking greater expertise and specialization in the fields they are teaching. MENG also offers an Education track which includes secondary licensure for students interested in teaching, and a TESOL track for students interested in serving English Language Learner populations. MENG contributes to the richness of regional culture by training the writers and artists whose work will contribute to area cultures, especially in our Wasatch Range Writing Project. WRWP provides area teachers and writers with an intensive, 3-week writing workshop, facilitated by a WSU faculty member. WRWP is often taken for professional development hours by area teachers, as well as by MENG students who receive credit for it. The program is free, and also features local/regional writers, most recently Utah's poet laureate, Paisley Rekdal. MENG also engages the community in research projects being pursued by our students and faculty. As part of MENG's commitment to the English Department more broadly, MENG students serve as moderators for the National Undergraduate Literature Conference (NULC), hosted annually at WSU. This provides a connection between the undergraduates and the graduate program, and introduces our graduate program to the many participants who come from across the state, region, and country. Finally, MENG students pursue a variety of career pathways after graduation, contributing to the economic development of the area. Students have gone on to teaching careers in the public K-12 schools in Weber County and beyond and at the college and community college levels, doctoral programs in Utah, across the country, and even internationally, and diverse careers such as business and entrepreneurship, law, and others.

### C. Program and Curriculum

#### a. Program Description

- i. Include all admission, retention, and degree requirements. Include GPA, standardized test scores, English language proficiency requirements, etc.

### **Admission Requirements**

Admission to the MENG program requires a bachelor's degree in English. Students with less English preparation may petition for conditional admission which may require that they take additional classes at the 5000-level for full matriculation.

Applicants must complete an online application. Criteria for acceptance into the program include:

Undergraduate degree in English with a minimum GPA of 3.25 in the major (preferred)

Submission of writing sample (4-8 pages)

Transcripts from all institutions of higher education attended  
Three letters of recommendation from educational or professional references  
Interview with the program director or option coordinator

### **Additional Requirements for International Students**

All international students and any applicants educated outside the United States must demonstrate proficiency in English. Those whose native language is not English must submit an official score from the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) of 550 (paper-based) or 213 (computer-based). Other appropriate tests may be used as an alternative to the TOEFL, such as IELTS and the WSU LEAP Special Examination. The score may not be more than two years old.

### **Transfer Credits**

Transfer credit must be approved by the program director and cannot exceed 11 credit hours. Transfer classes must be at appropriate levels and fulfill the objectives of the Master of Arts in English degree at WSU. No courses for which credit was used to fulfill requirements of another degree may be used toward the Master of Arts in English degree.

### **Obsolete Credits**

Credit earned more than ten (10) years earlier than the proposed date of graduation will not be accepted for the MA degree unless approved by the program director.

### **Graduation Requirements**

Credit hour requirements are determined within the option. A minimum of 24 credit hours at the 6000-level and a minimum of 33 total credit hours are required in the program. Students must complete all requirements in one of the options.

Grades of B- or better in all courses counting toward the degree.

Students with a BS degree must show foreign language competency either by completing six hours of a foreign language class with a grade of C (or better) or by passing a prescribed foreign language reading test.

Students not completing a thesis will be required to submit a portfolio of their work to the program for assessment purposes.

## **Time for Degree Completion**

MENG students must receive approval from the program director to register for more than nine (9) credit hours in a semester.

MENG students have a maximum of six calendar years to complete their degree requirements, starting from the first semester during which the student has registered for and begun taking classes. Students who exceed this time limit may submit a letter of appeal to the program director to request an extension.

Students who fail to enroll in program classes for three consecutive semesters (not including summers) must apply for readmission to the program.

In order to ensure timely progress through the program, students are encouraged to consult with an advisor at least once a year.

## **Course Requirements for Master of Arts in English**

*All MENG students will be required to complete the Core Requirements as part of their degree. In addition to the Core, a student needs to complete one of the options.*

### ***CORE REQUIREMENTS***

#### **Core Research Methods**

---

MENG 6010 - Introduction to Graduate Studies **Credits: (3)**

**Required in first or second semester.**

#### **Core Literature**

---

One course from the following:

MENG 6030 - Studies in Literary Theory and Criticism **Credits: (3) \***

MENG 6610 - Advanced Studies in Genre **Credits: (2-3) \***

MENG 6710 - Variable Topics **Credits: (2-3) \***

#### **Core Seminars**

---

One course from the following:

MENG 6510 - Seminar in Eminent Writers: **Credits: (2-3) \***

MENG 6520 - Seminar in Shakespeare **Credits: (3)**

**Note:**

---

\*May be repeated for elective credit with different content.

### **Electives**

---

Elective courses may be taken to fulfill the minimum 33 credit hours required to graduate. All program courses not taken as a required course may be taken as electives.

No more than three hours of directed readings credit (MENG 6830) may apply toward the Master of Arts in English degree unless approved by the program director.

The following two courses may be taken only by students who are teaching writing for WSU for the first time: MENG 6821 and MENG 6823.

### **LITERATURE OPTION**

---

*All MENG students will be required to complete the Core Requirements as part of their degree.*

#### **Seminars in Literature**

---

*Three courses from at least two of the following repeatable seminars (9 credit hours):*

MENG 6240 - Seminar in American Literature **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6250 - Seminar in British Literature **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6260 - Seminar in World Literature **Credits: (3)**

#### **Electives**

---

Elective courses may be taken to fulfill the minimum 33 credit hours required to graduate.

## CREATIVE WRITING OPTION

---

All MENG students will be required to complete the Core Requirements as part of their degree.

### **Creative Writing Option Requirement: Seminars in Literature**

---

*Three courses from at least two of the following repeatable seminars (9 credit hours):*

MENG 6240 - Seminar in American Literature **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6250 - Seminar in British Literature **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6260 - Seminar in World Literature **Credits: (3)**

### **Forms and Crafts**

---

MENG 6730 - Creative Writing Forms and Crafts **Credits: (3)**

### **Creative Writing Workshops**

---

Must complete at least two workshops (6 Credits)

MENG 6740 - Creative Nonfiction Writing **Credits: (3) \***

MENG 6750 - Fiction Writing **Credits: (3) \***

MENG 6760 - Poetry Writing **Credits: (3) \***

\* Repeated with different titles.

### **Thesis**

---

MENG 6950 - Creative Writing Thesis: Fiction, Nonfiction, Poetry **Credits: (1-6)**

Must take a minimum of 3 credits

## SECONDARY LICENSURE OPTION

---

*All MENG students will be required to complete the Core Requirements as part of their degree.*



## Literature

---

*One of the following courses (may be used to also fulfill the Core Literature).*

MENG 6030 - Studies in Literary Theory and Criticism **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6610 - Advanced Studies in Genre **Credits: (2-3)**

MENG 6710 - Variable Topics **Credits: (2-3)**

## Seminars

---

*One of the following courses (may be used to also fulfill the Core Seminars).*

MENG 6510 - Seminar in Eminent Writers: **Credits: (2-3)**

MENG 6520 - Seminar in Shakespeare **Credits: (3) \***

\*Strongly recommended

## Linguistics

---

*One of the following courses.*

MENG 6310 - Language and Linguistics for Teachers **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6410 - Strategies and Methodology of Teaching ESL/Bilingual **Credits: (3)**

## Writing

---

*One of the following courses (3 credit hour minimum).*

MENG 6110 - Writing for Teachers **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6230 - Wasatch Range Writing Project Summer Institute **Credits: (1-6)**

## Seminars in Literature

---

*One course in two of the three following seminars (6 credit hours).*

MENG 6240 - Seminar in American Literature **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6250 - Seminar in British Literature **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6260 - Seminar in World Literature **Credits: (3)**

## Electives

---

Elective courses may be taken to fulfill the minimum 33 credit hours required to graduate if the secondary licensure is not pursued.

### **Secondary Licensure Teaching**

---

*MED 6050 must be taken prior to MENG 6120/MENG 6861; MENG 6120 and MENG 6861 must be taken concurrently. It is strongly recommended that MENG 6110 or MENG 6230 be taken prior to MENG 6120/MENG 6861.*

MENG 6120 - Teaching Traditional and Contemporary Young Adult Literature **Credits: (4)**

MENG 6861 - Practicum in Secondary English Education **Credits: (2)**

#### **Note:**

---

Students seeking to fulfill the secondary licensure requirements through the Utah State Office of Education must also apply and be accepted into the Master of Education (MEd) Secondary Licensure Track. For all requirements related to pursuing a secondary licensure, please refer to the Master of Education Secondary Licensure Track in this catalog and contact the MEd Program offices. A minimum of 16 credit hours will be required from MEd for licensure with additional credit in student teaching also required. Credit taken in the MEd Program will meet elective requirements for the 33 credit hour minimum in MENG.

### **TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES OPTION (TESOL)**

---

*All MENG students will be required to complete the Core Requirements as part of their degree.*

#### **TESOL Foundations**

---

*All of the following:*

MED 6250 - Second Language Acquisition: Theories and Implementation **Credits: (3)**

MED 6270 - Literacy Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6005 - Intercultural Classroom Discourse **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6280 - TESOL Practicum **Credits: (1)**

MENG 6410 - Strategies and Methodology of Teaching ESL/Bilingual **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6420 - English Phonology and Syntax for ESL/Bilingual Teachers **Credits: (3)**

MENG 6450 - ESL/Bilingual Assessment: Theory, Methods, and Practices **Credits: (3)**

#### **Electives**

Elective courses may be taken to fulfill the minimum 33 credit hours required to graduate.

ii. List the program level learning outcomes

LO 1: Gather, analyze, and communication information and insights creatively and critically.

LO 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.

LO 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and /or analysis of data.

LO 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles, or theoretical perspectives.

LO 5: Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.

LO 6: Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.

iii. Include a list of course titles and numbers (combine ii and iii in a curriculum-grid like chart, see example – Curriculum map on next page)

	Department/Program Learning Outcomes					
	LO1: gather, analyze, and communicate	LO2: reading, thinking, and expression	LO3: theoretical perspectives	LO4: significant texts	LO5: current scholarship and practices	LO6: conventions and protocols
Core Courses in Department/Program						
5000-level courses	X	X	X	X	X	X
6005: Intercultural Classroom Discourse	X	X	X	X	X	X
6010: Introduction to Graduate Studies	X	X	X	X	X	X
6030: Theory/Criticism	X	X	X	X	X	X

6110: Writing for Teachers	X	X	X	X		X
6120: Teaching Young Adult Literature	X	X			X	X
6210: Teaching Literature in Secondary Schools	X	X	X	X		X
6230: Wasatch Range Writing Project		X		X		X
6231: Wasatch Range Writing Project (advanced)		X		X		X
6240: Seminar in American Literature	X	X	X	X	X	X
6250: Seminar in British Literature	X	X	X	X	X	X
6260: Seminar in World Literature	X	X	X	X	X	X
6280: TESOL Practicum	X	X	X			
6310: Language and Linguistics for Teachers	Not offered					
6320: World Languages	Not offered					
6330: Literary and Rhetorical Styles	X	X	X	X	X	X
6400: Multicultural Perspectives on Literature for Young	Not offered					
6410: Strategies and Methods of Teaching ESL	X	X		X		X
6420: English Phonology and Syntax for Teachers	X	X		X		X
6450: ESL/Bilingual Assessment	X	X		X		X
6510: Seminar in Eminent Writers	X	X	X	X	X	X
6520: Seminar in Shakespeare	X	X		X	X	X
6610: Advanced Studies in Genre	X	X	X	X	X	X
6710: Variable Topics	X	X	X	X	X	X
6730: Creative Writing Forms and Craft	X	X		X		X
6740: Creative Nonfiction Writing	X	X		X		X
6750: Fiction Writing	X	X		X		X
6760: Poetry Writing	X	X		X		X
6821: Teaching Developmental Reading/Writing	Not offered					
6822: Teaching College Writing	X	X			X	
6823: Teaching Practicum	X	X				
6830: Directed Readings	X	X	X	X	X	X
6861: Practicum in Secondary English Education	X	X		X		X

6920: Short Courses, Workshops, etc.	Not offered				
--------------------------------------	-------------	--	--	--	--

Because the MENG program does not have a fixed progression of courses, we do not apply Introduction, Application, or Mastery of concepts.

- iv. Web address for WSU catalog page AND any program webpages which provide a description of the program’s curriculum, degree requirements, and course descriptions.

Catalog page: [https://catalog.weber.edu/preview\\_program.php?catoid=17&poid=8203&returnto=5670](https://catalog.weber.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=17&poid=8203&returnto=5670)

Program webpages:

Literature: <https://www.weber.edu/MAEnglish/literatureoption.html>

Creative Writing: <https://weber.edu/MAEnglish/creativewritingoption.html>

Education/Secondary Licensure: <https://www.weber.edu/MAEnglish/secondarylicensureoption.html>

TESOL: <https://www.weber.edu/MAEnglish/tesoloption.html>

Course descriptions:

[https://catalog.weber.edu/content.php?filter%5B27%5D=MENG&filter%5B29%5D=&filter%5Bcourse\\_type%5D=-1&filter%5Bkeyword%5D=&filter%5B32%5D=1&filter%5Bcpge%5D=1&cur\\_cat\\_oid=17&expand=&navoid=5686&search\\_database=Filter&filter%5Bexact\\_match%5D=1#acalog\\_template\\_course\\_filter](https://catalog.weber.edu/content.php?filter%5B27%5D=MENG&filter%5B29%5D=&filter%5Bcourse_type%5D=-1&filter%5Bkeyword%5D=&filter%5B32%5D=1&filter%5Bcpge%5D=1&cur_cat_oid=17&expand=&navoid=5686&search_database=Filter&filter%5Bexact_match%5D=1#acalog_template_course_filter)

- b. Evidence of ongoing demand for the program

Please provide data on the last five academic years on admissions, enrollments, and degrees awarded:

*In order to provide consistent data that conforms to the format for reporting to the Utah Board of Regents, some data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Contact that office at extension 8586 for assistance.*

i.

Academic Year	New applications	Admitted Applicants	Selectivity (%)	Applicants Enrolled	Yield (%)	Matriculated Students [IR]	Matriculated International Students [IR]	Number of Graduates (Sum, Fall, Spr) [IR]
2018-19	24	21	88%	18	86%	36	0	13
2017-18	25	21	84%	15	71%	45	1	20
2016-17	34	26	76%	16	62%	47	1	16
2015-16	33	32	97%	24	75%	41	1	18
2014-15	22	18	82%	11	61%	52	1	24

**NOTE:** the IR data above is collected in a manner that may not match departmental data on enrollment.

ii. Enrollment History:

Academic Year	Number of Majors
2018-19	35
2017-18	44
2016-17	48
2015-16	42
2014-15	53

Academic Year	Faculty/Student ratios across program curr.	Average class size*
2018-19	Unavailable	7.06
2017-18	5.43	10.25
2016-17	5.21	9.11
2015-16	4.53	8.13
2014-15	6.23	9.15

\*Please note that average class size was calculated using only 6000-level courses, and does not include directed readings, thesis projects, or dual-designation courses.

iii. Average time to degree completion (months): 24

(Note: If the program has different timeline options, please explain this in your narrative and organize your data based on the different options/tracks.)

- iv. Enrollment projections – briefly describe enrollment patterns and factors influencing demand for the degree. (Note: programs are not expected to project an exact number of expected students, but rather a qualitative assessment of potential opportunities and/or threats to enrollment as well as any strategies for maximizing opportunities and managing threats.).

Over the past several years, we have seen a decline in program enrollment. In part, this can be attributed to administrative turn-over within the program and a decline in program marketing. We see no systemic threats to enrollment. Since Spring 2018, we have been utilizing social media marketing, and have seen a rise in applications and admissions in that short time. Our current (Fall 2019) majors count is back up to 39 (from our 2018-19 low of 35), we are planning to admit 7 new students for Spring 2020 (applied in Fall 2019, with Fall being traditionally our lowest application period), and we are projecting that enrollment will continue to rise, with the goal of sustained enrollment of 50 or more students.

We have begun to reconsider the curriculum options and explore additional avenues. MENG is in the process of developing two graduate certificates: Teaching of Writing and TESOL. These certificates would be stackable (they could be accomplished as part of a student’s graduate degree) or independent of a degree. We predict this will attract additional students to the program and give those students a valuable qualification.

c. Student profile

i. Please provide information on the entering class for each of the past 5 years:

Entering Class	Ave. GRE	Ave. GMAT	Ave. GPA (undergrad)	Ave. Age (years)	Ave. Relevant Work Experience (months) (optional)
2018-19	N/A	N/A	3.59	32.4	N/A
2017-18	N/A	N/A	3.61	33.5	N/A
2016-17	N/A	N/A	3.56	Unavailable	N/A
2015-16	N/A	N/A	3.54	Unavailable	N/A
2014-15	N/A	N/A	3.52	Unavailable	N/A

- ii. *Success rate of your students' post-graduation regarding employment and/or further graduate education. Add narrative if desired.*

The MENG program has not tracked its graduates' career placement. However, we have crafted a strategy for alumni outreach, and will be working with the University's Alumni and Development Offices to implement this plan in keeping with University policies and procedures beginning Spring 2020.

Graduating Class	# of Graduates (A)	# of Graduates Employed in Field (B)	# of Graduates in Add'l Graduate Program (C)	# of Graduates with unknown status	Placement Rate (B+C)/A
2018-19	13	These data are unavailable.		13	N/A
2017-18	20			20	N/A
2016-17	16			16	N/A
2015-16	18			18	N/A
2014-15	24			24	N/A

- iii. *List the most common career fields represented among your students (optional):*

K-12 Teacher

Higher Education (various fields/positions)

- iv. *Does your program provide career placement services: Describe:*

Because MENG's staff consist of the director and the administrative specialist, the program does not provide comprehensive career placement services. However, the director and individual faculty within the MENG program regularly advise students regarding their career options as well as options for further study at the doctoral level.

- v. *List any recent awards, honors or recognition received by your students (optional).*

2014-15: Kathryn Black and David (DB) Troester received Lindquist Scholarships worth \$8,000 each.

2014-15: Manuel Saine received conference travel funds from Office of Undergraduate Research.



2014-15: Michelle Gifford received conference travel funds from Office of Undergraduate Research.

2015-16: Tagen Baker was one of ten finalists for the National Geographic Fulbright Fellowship.

2015-16: Whitney Laycock received Honorable Mention in the Shout Out for the Humanities Writing Contest.

2016-17: Whitney Laycock and Erin Seaward received Lindquist Scholarships worth \$8,000 each.

Summary Information (as needed)

## D. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

### Measureable Learning Outcomes

At the end of their study at WSU, students in this graduate program will

1. Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.
2. Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.
3. Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and /or analysis of data.
4. Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles, or theoretical perspectives.
5. Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.
6. Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.

### Assessment of Graduating Students

Please provide a brief narrative describing the assessment processes for graduating students.

Prior to graduation, students are required to submit the final paper from their 6010: Intro to Graduate Studies class. This assignment should meet all six of the program learning outcomes, and is assessed by MENG faculty anonymously on annual basis. Additionally, students are required to collect three artifacts from throughout their degree program which represent their best work and submit these. The MENG steering committee then assesses these works based upon the learning outcomes for that course.

Summary Information (as needed)

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Program (replicate as needed or place in appendix)

<b>Evidence of Learning: Portfolio 2014-15</b>					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate an ability to gather, analyze, and communicate information effectively.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 10/11 "strong" 91%	Measure 1: Expectations for master level work have been clearly communicated to faculty and students.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 2: Demonstrate in your texts that you have cultivated skills in careful reading, critical thinking, logical argument from evidence presented, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 8/11 "strong" 73%	Measure 1: Threshold met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Apply various theoretical perspectives and literary terminology to interpretations of literary texts to showcase an understanding of theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 8/11 "strong" 73%	Measure 1: Discussion of the place of theory in the program. Should this be included in LO?	Measure 1: Research peer institutions and Utah institutions to determine how much theory is being taught in similar programs.

**Evidence of Learning: Portfolio 2014-15**

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 8/15 Strong 53%	Measure 1: The committee felt that this measure was unclear and did not constitute an expectation for every paper students write. Therefore there were papers without a critical focus that were judged on this outcome	Measure 1: The steering committee will reevaluate this learning outcome and clarify the expectation and broaden it to fit all papers submitted.
Learning Outcome 5 : Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key primary texts in one specific literary genre, period, culture or style.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 8/11 Strong 73%	Measure 1: Threshold met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 6 : Demonstrate an ability to employ academic conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 9/12 Strong 75%	Measure 1: Threshold met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.

<b>Evidence of Learning: 5000-level classes 2015-16</b>					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate an ability to gather, analyze, and communicate information effectively.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 9/15 Strong 60% 2/15 Adequate 13% 4/15 Not Adequate 27%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: This was the first time 5000-level courses were assessed, and only a small number artifacts collected. The program continues to monitor and assess these courses.
Learning Outcome 2: Demonstrate in your texts that you have cultivated skills in careful reading, critical thinking, logical argument from evidence presented, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 7/15 Strong 46% 4/15 Adequate 27% 4/15 Not Adequate 27%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: This was the first time 5000-level courses were assessed, and only a small number artifacts collected. The program continues to monitor and assess these courses.
Learning Outcome 3: Apply various theoretical perspectives and literary terminology to interpretations of literary texts to showcase an understanding of theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 7/15 Strong 47% 3/15 Adequate 20% 5/15 Not Adequate 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: This was the first time 5000-level courses were assessed, and only a small number artifacts collected. The program continues to monitor and assess these courses.

<b>Evidence of Learning: 5000-level classes 2015-16</b>					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 6/15 Strong 40% 3/15 Adequate 20% 6/15 Not Adequate 40%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: This was the first time 5000-level courses were assessed, and only a small number artifacts collected. The program continues to monitor and assess these courses.
Learning Outcome 5 : Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key primary texts in one specific literary genre, period, culture or style.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 9/15 Strong 60% 0/15 Adequate 0% 6/15 Not Adequate 40%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: This was the first time 5000-level courses were assessed, and only a small number artifacts collected. The program continues to monitor and assess these courses.
Learning Outcome 6 : Demonstrate an ability to employ academic conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 9/15 Strong 60% 1/15 Adequate 7% 5/15 Not Adequate 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: This was the first time 5000-level courses were assessed, and only a small number artifacts collected. The program continues to monitor and assess these courses.

**Evidence of Learning: 6010 Intro to Graduate Studies 2015-16**

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate an ability to gather, analyze, and communicate information effectively.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 11/14 Strong 79% 3/14 Adequate 21%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 2: Demonstrate in your texts that you have cultivated skills in careful reading, critical thinking, logical argument from evidence presented, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 8/14 Strong 57% 5/14 Adequate 36% 1/14 Inadequate 7%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: This was the first time this LO was not met. The program will continue to monitor and assess this LO.
Learning Outcome 3: Apply various theoretical perspectives and literary terminology to interpretations of literary texts to showcase an understanding of theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 7/14 Strong 50% 7/14 Adequate 50%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Faculty assessors had mixed responses to this LO and the program embarked on further norming for assessment.
Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 7/14 Strong 50% 7/14 Adequate 50%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Faculty assessors had mixed responses to this LO and the program embarked on further norming for assessment.

<b>Evidence of Learning: 6010 Intro to Graduate Studies 2015-16</b>					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 5 : Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key primary texts in one specific literary genre, period, culture or style.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 11/14 Strong 79% 3/14 Adequate 21%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 6 : Demonstrate an ability to employ academic conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 12/14 Strong 86% 2/14 Adequate 14%	Measure 1:Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.

<b>Evidence of Learning: Portfolio 2015-16</b>					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate an ability to gather, analyze, and communicate information effectively.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 13/15 Strong 87% 2/15 Adequate 13%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.



**Evidence of Learning: Portfolio 2015-16**

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 2: Demonstrate in your texts that you have cultivated skills in careful reading, critical thinking, logical argument from evidence presented, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 11/15 Strong 73% 3/15 Adequate 20% 1/15 Inadequate 7%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Apply various theoretical perspectives and literary terminology to interpretations of literary texts to showcase an understanding of theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 8/15 Strong 54% 2/15 Adequate 13% 5/15 Not Adequate 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Faculty assessors had mixed responses to this LO and program embarked on further norming for assessment. Additionally, results were shared with faculty to put additional emphasis on this LO.
Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate knowledge of and interaction with foundational and current scholarly criticism.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 10/15 Strong 67% 4/15 Adequate 27% 1/15 Not Adequate 6%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Faculty assessors had mixed responses to this LO and the program embarked on further norming for assessment. Additionally, results were shared with faculty to put additional emphasis on this LO.

<b>Evidence of Learning: Portfolio 2015-16</b>					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 5 : Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key primary texts in one specific literary genre, period, culture or style.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 12/15 Strong 80% 1/15 Adequate 7% 2/15 Not Adequate 13%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 6 : Demonstrate an ability to employ academic conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 70% of students will score "strong"	Measure 1: 12/15 Strong 80% 3/15 Adequate 20%	Measure 1:Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.

Please note that the program revised the learning outcomes for clarity for 2016-17. These revisions were not substantive, but minor in nature in order to clarify the wording of several of the learning outcomes. Additionally, the assessors adopted a new rubric and threshold for the year, requiring 80% of the artifacts to be assessed as "acceptable" rather than the previous threshold of 70% "strong."

<b>Evidence of Learning: 6010 Intro to Grad Studies 2016-17</b>					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct Measures				
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 12/12 Acceptable 100%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.

Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 12/12 Acceptable 100%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 8/12 Acceptable 67% 3/12 Not acceptable 25% 1/12 Not applicable 8%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty and assessors engaged in further norming.
Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 12/12 Acceptable 100%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 12/12 Acceptable 100%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 11/12 Acceptable 92% 1/12 Not acceptable 8%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.

**Evidence of Learning: Portfolio 2016-17**

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct Measures				
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 11/12 Acceptable 92% 1/12 Not acceptable 8%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 10/12 Acceptable 83% 2/12 Not acceptable 17%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 5/12 Acceptable 42% 7/12 Not acceptable 58%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty and assessors engaged in further norming.
Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 8/12 Acceptable 67% 4/12 Not acceptable 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty and assessors engaged in further norming.

Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 8/12 Acceptable 67% 4/12 Not acceptable 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty and assessors engaged in further norming.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 10/12 Acceptable 83% 2/12 Not acceptable 17%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.

**Evidence of Learning: 5000-Level Courses 2016-17**

Measurable Learning Outcome Students will...	Method of Measurement Direct Measures	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 10/13 Acceptable 77% 3/13 Not acceptable 23%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty, who were encouraged to spend more time on the Los and mentoring students.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 10/13 Acceptable 77% 3/13 Not acceptable 23%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty, who were encouraged to spend more time on the Los and mentoring students.

Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 6/13 Acceptable 46% 7/13 Not acceptable 54%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty, who were encouraged to spend more time on the Los and mentoring students.
Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 9/13 Acceptable 77% 4/13 Not acceptable 23%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty, who were encouraged to spend more time on the Los and mentoring students.
Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 6/13 Acceptable 46% 6/13 Not acceptable 46% 1/13 Not applicable 8%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty, who were encouraged to spend more time on the Los and mentoring students.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 6/13 Acceptable 46% 7/13 Not acceptable 54%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results were shared with faculty, who were encouraged to spend more time on the Los and mentoring students.

Please note that the program was exempt from annual assessment for the next two years. Therefore, the following data were compiled for this review by the current steering committee. In order to better reflect the summative nature of these assessments, the committee adopted the language of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Approaches Expectations, and Does Not Demonstrate in order to better assess student learning. The committee adopted the same threshold as the previous, expecting 80% of the artifacts to be rated as “Meets Expectations” or better.

**Evidence of Learning: 6010 Intro to Grad Studies 2017-18**

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct Measures				
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 10/11 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (91%) 1/11 Approaches Expectations (9%)	Measure 1: Threshold Met	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 9/11 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (82%) 2/11 Approaches Expectations (18%)	Measure 1: Threshold Met	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 8/11 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (73%) 1/11 Approaches Expectations (9%) 2/11 Does not demonstrate (18%)	Measure 1: Threshold not met	Measure 1: Results will be shared with faculty, and assessors will undergo further norming. This Learning Outcome has been problematic and warrants further attention in the design of the course. But, it's important to note that with one paper's improvement and threshold would be met.

Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 8/11 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (73%) 3/11 Approaches Expectations (27%)	Measure 1: Threshold not met	Measure 1: Results will be shared with faculty. This Learning Outcome has not been a consistent problem, and will be reassessed in further years. If any one of the three papers below the threshold were slightly better, this threshold would be met.
Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 8/11 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (73%) 2/11 Approaches Expectations (18%) 1/11 Does not demonstrate (9%)	Measure 1: Threshold not met	Measure 1: Results will be shared with faculty. This LO has not been a consistent problem, and will be reassessed in further years. If one of the two papers that approached expectations were improved, this threshold would be met.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 8/11 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (73%) 2/11 Approaches Expectations (18%) 1/11 Does not demonstrate (9%)	Measure 1: Threshold not met	Measure 1: Results will be share. This LO will continue to be assessed. If one of the two papers that approached expectations improved, this threshold would be met.



**Evidence of Learning: Portfolio 2017-18**

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct Measures				
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 19/25 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (76%) 6/25 Approaches Expectations (24%)	Measure 1: Threshold not met.	Measure 1: Results will be shared with faculty and assessors. We will reassess this LO in future years, and reconsider the collection process as some of the artifacts may be assignments not intended to fulfill this LO. If one of the six artifacts that approached the expectations were improved, then this LO would be met.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 19/25 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (76%) 5/25 Approaches Expectations (20%) 1/25 Does not demonstrate (4%)	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results will be shared with faculty and assessors. We will reassess this LO in future years, and reconsider the collection process as some of the artifacts may be assignments not intended to fulfill this LO. If one of the six artifacts that approached the expectations were improved, then this LO would be met.

Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 10/19 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (53%) 5/19 Approaches Expectations (26%) 4/19 Does not demonstrate (21%)	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: This LO has been consistently problematic for the program. We will revisit the ways in which theory is addressed in various courses, and consider reframing the theory outcome for classes outside the literature track.
Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 14/19 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (74%) 3/19 Approaches Expectations (16%) 2/19 Does not demonstrate (10%)	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results will be shared with the faculty and assessors. This LO is not a consistent problem for the program, and if one of the three papers that approached expectations were improved, this LO would be met.
Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 14/22 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (64%) 4/22 Approaches Expectations (18%) 4/22 Does not demonstrate (18%)	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Results will be shared with the faculty and assessors. This LO is not a consistent problem for the program, but this result is significantly below our threshold. We will reassess in future years to determine if improvements are made.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 19/23 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (83%) 4/23 Approaches Expectations (17%)	Measure 1: Threshold met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.

**Evidence of Learning: 6010 Intro to Grad Studies 2018-19**

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct Measures				
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 4/5 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (80%) 1/5 Approaches Expectations (20%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 5/5 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (100%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 3/5 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (60%) 2/5 Approaches Expectations (40%)	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Small sample size notwithstanding, this LO continues to be a problem. In SP2020, the steering committee will reassess the current 6010 class, and make significant changes to this LO to better reflect the various tracks of the program and the place of theory therein.

Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 5/5 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (100%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 3/5 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (60%) 2/5 Approaches Expectations (40%)	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: Small sample size notwithstanding, this LO has been a consistent problem over the last few years. The steering committee will reassess in SP2020, but it is likely that we will ask faculty to demonstrate recent scholarship in syllabi to ensure students are exposed to current material.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 5/5 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (100%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.

**Evidence of Learning: Portfolio 2018-19**

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Students will...	Direct Measures				
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 16/16 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (100%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action is needed. This result mediates the near-miss result of 17-18 and demonstrates that, over the course of 2 years, the LO is being met.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 15/16 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (94%) 1/16 Approaches Expectations (6%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action is needed. This result mediates the near-miss result of 17-18 and demonstrates that, over the course of 2 years, the LO is being met.
Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 13/14 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (93%) 1/14 Does not demonstrate (7%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: While the threshold was met this year, the consistently problematic nature of this LO still warrants further assessment.
Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 14/15 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (93%) 1/15 Approaches Expectations (7%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.

Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Meets/Exceeds Expectations	Measure 1: 11/14 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (79%) 2/14 Approaches Expectations (14%) 1/14 Does not demonstrate (7%)	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: The artifacts very nearly met this outcome, but it remains a consistent problem for the program. The steering committee will further assess in SP2020 and recommend program-wide changes, including an emphasis on current scholarship in syllabi.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Portfolio	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 13/16 Meets/Exceeds Expectations (81%) 3/16 Approaches Expectations (19%)	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.

\*At least one measure per objective must be a direct measure. Indirect measures may be used to supplement evidence provided via the direct measures.

Summary Information (as needed)

The current steering committee served as assessors for the artifacts from 2017-18 and 2018-19. The committee underwent a very productive norming session in Fall 2019, and the results above demonstrate a more consistent assessment process than previous years. The committee will undertake further norming before assessing artifacts collected during the 2019-20 academic year, and will pay special attention to LOs 3 and 5, which are the most consistently problematic for the program. We plan to revise the LOs across the program to better reflect the variation in the program's tracks, as the results may be skewed by, for example, artifacts from Creative Writing being assessed for LO 3, which is not necessarily vital to the particular piece of creative writing. Additionally, we will reconsider the Portfolio collection process, as many of the artifacts were from courses that met only some of the LOs (hence the variation in numbers over the last two years), and the artifacts may represent assignments which met only a selection of LOs. We intend to further discuss the place of theory in our courses, especially 6010: Intro to Grad Studies, and encourage faculty to demonstrate current

scholarship in their syllabi. In short, we see that the program has two consistent problems, and recognize the need to reconsider both the way we approach these LOs in the assessment process, and the way our curriculum can better serve students in these areas.

Evidence of Learning: High Impact or Service Learning (if applicable)

**Not Applicable**

Summary Information (as needed)

E. Academic Advising

Advising Strategy and Process

Upon entering the program, students are encouraged to meet with Kate Johnson, administrative specialist, to help them schedule classes. The goal is to ensure they are taking the necessary foundational courses and planning for the program track they wish to pursue. Students are then encouraged to meet with the program director, David Hartwig, when they are within a year of graduating to ensure they are completing the requisite courses, have established a thesis committee (if they are pursuing a thesis), and to discuss career pathways.

Additionally, the English Department academic advisor, Dr. John Schwiebert, provides advice and feedback to graduate students, and is often a first point-of-contact for undergraduates interested in continuing their studies with an MA. The Lindquist College of Arts and Humanities also has a team of three advisors who often discuss pursuing graduate work with students.

Effectiveness of Advising

This advising plan is new to the current program administration. Previous directors allowed students to make contact as needed with the program for advisory meetings. Our goal is to maintain an average time-to-graduation rate of two years and to increase student persistence rates within the program.

Past Changes and Future Recommendations

This new advising strategy is itself a change to better formalize the process of student advising. In the past, it was noted that CatTracks, the online advising system utilized by Weber State, is not student-friendly. Both the director and the

administrative specialist are familiar with the system and can thus improve student understanding of their progress toward the degree.

F. Faculty and Teaching

- a. Describe the minimum qualifications required of graduate faculty (e.g., degree, professional experience):  
All English department faculty who hold an terminal degree (Ph.D. or M.F.A.) are eligible to teach in the MENG program. Occasionally, faculty from other departments (LEAP, Foreign Language, Education, or History) will teach in the MENG program, and they must hold a terminal degree.

- b. Faculty Demographic Information – list all faculty who teach in the program:

Name	Home Dept	Title/Qual	Type (tenure, tenure track, contract or adjunct)	Gender	Ethnicity
Dr. Jason Barrett-Fox	English	Assist. Prof.	TT	M	C
Dr. Russell Burrows	English	Prof.	T	M	C
Dr. Christy Call	English	Assist. Prof.	TT	F	C
Dr. Tim Conrad	English	Assoc. Prof.	T	M	C
Dr. Courtney Craggett	English	Assist. Prof.	TT	F	C
Dr. Hal Crimmel	English	Prof.	T	M	C
Dr. Rebekah Cumpsty	English	Assist. Prof.	TT	F	C
Dr. Becky Jo Gesteland	English	Prof.	T	F	C
Dr. Siân Griffiths	English	Assoc. Prof.	T	F	C
Dr. David Hartwig	English	Assist. Prof.	TT	M	C
Dr. Mark LeTourneau	English	Prof.	T	M	C
Dr. Susan McKay	English	Assoc. Prof.	T	F	C
Dr. Karen Moloney	English	Prof.	T	F	C
Dr. Julia Panko	English	Assist. Prof.	TT	F	C
Dr. Emily January Petersen	English	Assist. Prof.	TT	F	C
Ryan Ridge	English	Assist. Prof./MFA	TT	M	C
Dr. Scott Rogers	English	Prof.	T	M	C
Dr. John Schwiebert	English	Prof.	T	M	C



Dr. Debi Sheridan	LEAP	Instructor	Adj	F	C
Dr. Sally Shigley	English	Prof.	T	F	C
Abraham Smith	English	Assist. Prof./MFA	TT	M	C
Laura Stott	English	Instructor/MFA	Contract	F	C
Dr. Mali Subbiah	English	Prof.	T	M	A
Dr. Eric Swedin	History	Prof.	T	M	C
Dr. Mikel Vause	English	Prof.	T	M	C
Dr. Michael Wutz	English	Prof.	T	M	C
Dr. Jim Young	English	Prof.	T	M	C

i. Percentage of graduate courses and/or credits taught:

	# of courses or credits taught in-load	# of courses or credits taught in overload	Percentage of courses or credits taught in overload
2018-19	25	11	31%
2017-18	36	11	23%
2016-17	39	13	25%
2015-16	49	15	23%
2014-15	55	17	24%

Because the MENG program does not allow overload during the regular semesters, the above reflects the number of classes we offer in summer term, which is considered overload.

ii. *Describe the faculty compensation model for thesis advising, directed study, supervision of student consulting projects / internships, etc.*

The MENG steering committee passed an update to our compensation model in Fall 2019 which will go into effect in Spring 2020. The updated compensation is as follows:

For standard courses taught in-load: \$1,250 additional compensation

For standard courses taught as overload in summer: standard overload compensation plus \$1,250

For dual-designation courses (always taught in-load): \$400 additional compensation  
For directed readings and practicums: \$400 for 1-2 students, \$750 for 3-4 students  
Thesis committee chair: \$750  
Thesis committee reader: \$400

c. Programmatic/Departmental Teaching Standards

Faculty Qualifications

All MENG faculty must have a terminal degree.

Evidence of Effective Instruction

i. Regular Faculty

In the semester prior to teaching, faculty are required to submit syllabi for their courses for review by the MENG Steering Committee. This review is to ensure that each course is meeting the academic standards of the MENG program.

Student evaluations are completed for each course using the University's ChiTester program. These are reviewed by the director and individual meetings are scheduled with faculty if there are any instructional issues that need to be addressed.

The program faculty members are held to the Lindquist College of Arts and Humanities teaching standards and policies and procedures for tenure and promotion (per PPM 8-11). The department chair reviews faculty members in their second year. Peer review committees evaluate faculty according to policy, and department and college ranking tenure and evaluation committees review faculty also according to policy. Additionally, all faculty are required to submit an annual report to the Dean.

ii. Adjunct Faculty

The MENG program has not utilized adjunct faculty for some time, but the same system of previewing and approving syllabi and reviewing course evaluations applies.

### Mentoring Activities

Faculty members within the program are mentored by the department chair, the program director, and other faculty with the department.

### Diversity of Faculty

Faculty who have taught for the MENG program in the past 5 years include 15 men and 12 women, mostly Caucasian. The college, department, and program aspire to have greater diversity of faculty but have not been particularly successful in this regard.

### Ongoing Review and Professional Development

Program faculty are reviewed according to Weber State's PPM schedules. The typical schedule after hire as a tenure track assistant professor is:

2<sup>nd</sup> year: department chair review

3<sup>rd</sup> year: formal rank and tenure evaluation committee review

5<sup>th</sup> year: peer review of teaching by committee

6<sup>th</sup> year: formal rank and tenure evaluation committee review

If granted tenure...

11<sup>th</sup> year: post-tenure review and eligible promotion to full professor

Every 5 years: post-tenure review

## G. Support Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library

### Adequacy of Staff

The program currently has one full-time administrative specialist.

#### i. Ongoing Staff Development

The program staff have access to ongoing professional development training through the University's Training Tracker system.

### Adequacy of Administrative Support

At the previous 5-year review, it was noted that the administrative specialist position should be increased to full-time. This has been completed. There has been some administrative turn-over in the last 12 months at both the director and administrative specialist position, but the current administrative specialist position has proven more than adequate for the size and complexity of the MENG program.

#### Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment

The program's offices are in Elizabeth Hall, a modern, four-story building equipped with all necessary resources. Currently there are no classroom shortages and the facilities and equipment are adequate.

#### Adequacy of Library Resources

The Stewart Library provides print, electronic, and audio-visual materials in adequate titles. The Library's hours of operation have proven adequate for student and faculty needs. The Library is also part of an extensive Interlibrary Loan system, providing additional materials for no cost to the patron in adequate time. Additionally, each College is assigned a librarian with an annual budget to provide additional resources. While the Library's print holdings cannot compare with those of a research-focused institution, the extensive electronic databases, Interlibrary Loan system, and our proximity to the University of Utah's library proves adequate for our needs.

### H. Relationships with External Communities

#### Description of Role in External Communities

The MENG program is represented by the program director at the University Graduate Council, which sets university-wide policies for graduate programs and oversees Board of Regents program reviews. The program director consults regularly with the English department chair and the dean of the College of Arts and Humanities.

Through the Wasatch Range Writing Project, the MENG program provides outreach to local teachers seeking professional development hours.

Additionally, MENG faculty are members of numerous professional associations and organizations locally, in the state of Utah, and across the country, including holding leadership positions with these organizations.

#### Summary of External Advisory Committee Minutes

The MENG program does not have an external advisory committee. The MENG Steering Committee is an internal

committee comprised of the program director, the department chair, and a rotating selection of faculty members. The Steering Committee serves as reviewers for admissions decisions, syllabi, and to set internal program policies.

I. Results of Previous Program Reviews

Problem Identified	Action Taken	Progress
Issue 1 Previous reviewers recommended reinstating the GRE for applicants and increasing the selectivity of the program.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: N/A	The program felt that reinstating the GRE was a hurdle for applicants and not in keeping with Weber State's core value of Access. The program's admissions standards are in keeping with University policy.
	Year 1 Action Taken: none	
	Year 2 Action Taken: none	
	Year 3 Action Taken: none	
	Year 4 Action taken: none	
Issue 2 Dual-designation courses.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: N/A	In order to ensure that dual-designation courses are meeting the academic standards of the program, the courses were reviewed at the 5000-level and review of dual-designation syllabi was implemented. The program has attempted to reduce the number of dual-designation courses offered as much as possible, and we hope that growth in enrollment will further alleviate the need for dual-designation courses.
	Year 1 Action Taken: review of dual-designation courses implemented	
	Year 2 Action Taken: dual-designation syllabi reviewed	
	Year 3 Action Taken: above actions continued	
	Year 4 Action taken: above actions continued	
Issue 3 Faculty load and remuneration.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: N/A	Faculty load is not likely to change and would require action by the university and the state legislature. The program has assessed its remuneration model and increased pay for all faculty teaching or facilitating student projects in the program. Additionally, the English department as a whole has actively worked to increase time for
	Year 1 Action Taken: none	
	Year 2 Action Taken: none	
	Year 3 Action Taken: none	
	Year 4 Action Taken: remuneration increased	

		faculty publishing in various ways: there is a plan to create a research award, the chair encourages faculty to apply for Eccles Fellowships, providing a 1-course reduction in load, team teaching opportunities in the General Education curriculum, a custom-designed online pedagogy workshop to assist faculty with crafting online courses, the ability to take load during the Summer terms, and foreign exchange opportunities.
Issue 4 Learning outcomes.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: N/A	As part of the syllabus review process, faculty are required to connect required assignment to the program learning outcomes to better demonstrate the depth of coverage. Additionally, last year the program has begun to review the learning outcomes and is in the process of crafting new learning outcomes that are more specific to the different tracks within the program.
	Year 1 Action Taken: assessment continued	
	Year 2 Action Taken: assessment continued	
	Year 3 Action Taken: syllabi required to implement learning outcomes	
	Year 4 Action Taken: review of learning outcomes	
Issue 5 Support staff	Previous 5 Year Review: N/A	The administrative specialist position has been increased to full time and provided with increased compensation. The current administrative specialist is doing excellent work for the program.
	Year 1 Action Taken: position audit	
	Year 2 Action Taken: position audit	
	Year 3 Action Taken: new administrative specialist hired	
	Year 4 Action Taken: new administrative specialist hired	

Issue 6 Library resources	Previous 5 Year Review: N/A	The subject-area librarian for the College has been excellent in securing resources needed by the program. We do not have any concerns with the adequacy of the Library.
	Year 1 Action Taken: none	
	Year 2 Action Taken: none	
	Year 3 Action Taken: none	
	Year 4 Action Taken: none	

Summary Information (as needed)



J. Action Plan for Ongoing Assessment Based on Current Self Study Findings

Action Plan for Evidence of Learning Related Findings

Problem Identified	Action to Be Taken
<p>Issue 1 Student Learning Assessment: We have persistently failed to meet the threshold for Learning Outcomes 3 and 5, as evidenced by student artifacts.</p>	Current 5 Year Program Review: further and more detailed norming among assessors
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: revise program curriculum to convert “tracks” and revise learning outcomes in support of those tracks, thus making learning outcomes more specific to literature, creative writing, and education.
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: implement new learning outcomes and assess.
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: assess artifacts with new learning outcomes
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: continue the above
<p>Issue 2 Artifact Collection: While the courses may meet all (or nearly all) of the program Learning Outcomes, each assignment may not. Student self-selection makes it nearly impossible to tie each artifact to the specific Learning Outcomes.</p>	Current 5 Year Program Review: create new “folders” in Canvas to simplify the collection mechanism for artifacts. Continue to assess.
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: create LO rubrics meeting the new LOs as detailed above. Collect student artifacts directly from course in Canvas and assess with new LO rubrics.
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: continue the above.
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: continue the above.
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: continue the above.
<p>Issue 3 Tracks/Concentrations/Certificates: The current “tracks” in the MENG program are internal routing mechanisms intended to provide coherence to student degrees. They do not appear on diplomas nor transcripts. To better serve our students, we plan to create three distinct “concentrations” in literature,</p>	Current 5 Year Program Review: identify the problems, determine faculty specializations and feasibility of new concentrations. Propose new certificate in Writing and Rhetoric and the requisite new course.
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Put new concentrations and TESOL certificate through curriculum approval processes, including revising curriculum and creating area-specific learning outcomes.
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Assess new concentrations.
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: continue the above.

creative writing, and education, and two certificates (Writing and Rhetoric, and TESOL).	Year 4 Action to Be taken: continue the above.
--	--

Summary Information (as needed)

Action Plan for Staff, Administration, or Budgetary Findings

Problem Identified	Action to Be Taken
Issue 1 No issues.	Current 5 Year Program Review:
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken:
Issue 2 No issues.	Current 5 Year Program Review:
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken:

Summary Information (as needed)

K. Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

Artifact	Learning Outcome Measured	When/How Collected?	Where Stored?
6010 Intro to Grad Studies final paper	All	End of semester	Electronic copies are stored on Canvas
Portfolio	Varying	Prior to graduation	Electronic copies are stored on Canvas

Summary Information (as needed)

The Portfolio assessment is a requirement for all students not completing a thesis. Students self-select three of their best pieces of work and upload these to Canvas. Because the artifacts represent different courses, the Learning Outcomes vary depending upon the artifacts students choose, but we receive a sufficient number of artifacts to assess all the Learning Outcomes. In the future, we plan to revise this collection procedure, hoping to better align artifacts with Learning Outcomes. This will be especially necessary as we revise the Learning Outcomes to more effectively reflect the different disciplines represented by our four tracks.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Student and Faculty Statistical Summary

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Student Credit Hours Total	720	683	592	629	462
Student FTE Total	36	34.15	29.6	31.45	23.1
Students in the Program	53	42	48	44	35
Program Graduates	24	18	16	20	13
Student Demographic Profile					
Female	38	35	41	37	26
Male	15	7	7	7	9
Faculty FTE Total	5.78	7.54	5.68	5.79	n/a
Adjunct FTE	0.85	0.62	0.63	0.66	n/a
Contract FTE	4.93	6.92	5.05	5.13	n/a
Student/Faculty Ratio	6.23	4.53	5.21	5.43	n/a

Program Name:		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Expectation of time to graduation?	# of years	2	2	2	2	2
Number and percent of majors meeting expectation for graduating	Department	63%	58%	65%	21%	N/A
Number and percent of majors graduating w/in 1 year of expectation	Department	69%	77%	65%	21%	N/A
Number and percent of majors graduating w/in 2 years of expectation	Department	75%	77%	65%	21%	N/A
Number and percent of majors who don't complete by 6 years	Department	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average overall hours of graduates	University	39.8	36.5	40.0	40.0	39.0
	Department	33.5	34.5	33.0	34.0	35.0
Average 'years to degree' for master's degree recipients	University	1.99	1.95	1.66	1.93	1.93
	Department	2.14	2.14	1.80	2.13	2.93
Other Analyses		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Percent of courses with adequate completion	Department	95%	98%	98%	96%	99%
(adequate completion = 80%+, A and B grades)	University	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: Data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Appendix B: Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Rank	Tenure Status	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
Laura Stott	F	C	Instructor	Contract	MFA	15	Poetry
Debi Sheridan	F	C	Instructor	Contract	PhD	25	ESL

Summary Information (as needed)

Appendix C: Staff Profile

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Job Title	Years of Employment	Areas of Expertise
Kate Johnson	F	C	Administrative Specialist III	<1	Interpersonal communication, data management, advising, marketing

Summary Information (as needed)

While Kate Johnson has been with the MENG program for less than 1 year, she previously spent 2 years as Administrative Specialist II.

Appendix D: Financial Analysis Summary

Program Name					
Funding	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19
Appropriated Fund	294,878	321,029	317,368	275,024	250,680
Other:					
Special Legislative Appropriation					
Grants or Contracts					
Special Fees/Differential Tuition	20	1,709	463	0	66
<b>Total</b>	<b>294,898</b>	<b>322,738</b>	<b>317,831</b>	<b>275,024</b>	<b>250,746</b>

*Note:* Data provided by Provost's Office

Summary Information (as needed)



Appendix E: External Community Involvement Names and Organizations

Name	Organization
Ogden Schools Foundation	
Public Schools	Davis, Weber, and Ogden school districts.