

Texas A&M International University

Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)

Date Submitted: February 11, 2008 (2007 Report)

Assessment Period Covered (2006)

Academic Program/AES Unit: Master of Arts in English

Person(s) Preparing Review: Thomas R. Mitchell

Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented

This year we again had a limited number of students to graduate from the program (2 in the spring and 1 in the fall). The Graduate Advisor that we appointed as a result of the program evaluation for the previous year (2005-2006) has developed a tracking study and begun the process of identifying causes for not completing the program and of encouraging students to consider returning to the program.

Institutional Mission

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

Academic Program or Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission

Department of Language & Literature:

In unison with the institutional mission, this Department is dedicated to the promotion of intellectual and personal growth in students, with an emphasis on endowing them with flexibility to adapt to the ever-changing social, professional, economic, cultural, and political environments ushered in by this era of rapid technological change, information proliferation, and global interdependence. To achieve these aims, the Department is committed to the retention of a productive, professionally diverse and highly competent faculty involved in a wide range of academic endeavors.

Identify outcomes and the relationship to Strategic Plan

Outcome 1

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)? Yes

Graduates will synthesize and evaluate their knowledge of literary theory and criticism across genres.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1

Goal 1: Develop, maintain, assess, and improve academic programs, administrative/educational support services and student services to admit, retain, and graduate students who achieve established learning outcomes designed to prepare them

for success in chosen careers.

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 1

1.7 Establish and pursue student learning outcomes appropriate for each program with systematic assessment and use of results for continuous quality improvement.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

A portfolio of papers written for graduate English courses will be collected by the Graduate English advisor from each student completing -- or within 6 hours of completing -- the program. The papers will be evaluated by a team of graduate English faculty using a departmentally developed rubric.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Early Spring Semester 2008

Criteria/Benchmark

At least 80% of the students evaluated will have an average score from "competent" to "excellent" on each of the evaluation criteria on the rubric related to their demonstrated ability to synthesize and evaluate their knowledge of literary theory and literary criticism.

Outcome 2

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)? Yes

Graduates will employ a range of literary tools to identify, analyze, and synthesize literary genres.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2

Goal 1: Develop, maintain, assess, and improve academic programs, administrative/educational support services and student services to admit, retain, and graduate students who achieve established learning outcomes designed to prepare them for success in chosen careers.

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 2

1.7 Establish and pursue student learning outcomes appropriate for each program with systematic assessment and use of results for continuous quality improvement.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

A portfolio of papers written for graduate English courses will be collected by the Graduate English advisor from each student completing -- or within 6 hours of completing -- the program. The papers will be evaluated by a team of graduate English faculty using a departmentally developed rubric.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Early Spring Semester 2008

Criteria/Benchmark

At least 80% of the students evaluated will have an average score from "competent" to "excellent" on each of the evaluation criteria on the rubric related to their demonstrated ability to deploy a range of literary tools to identify, analyze, and synthesize literary genres.

Outcome 3**Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?** No

Eighty percent (80%) of the students who enroll in the program will complete it within four (4) years.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3

Goal 1: Develop, maintain, assess, and improve academic programs, administrative/educational support services and student services to admit, retain, and graduate students who achieve established learning outcomes designed to prepare them for success in chosen careers.

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 3

1.3 Increase student retention and graduation rates.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

The Graduate English advisor will compile a list of students who began the program in the Fall of 2002 or later and identify the progress of each student as of the end of Spring 2006.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Early Spring Semester 2008

Criteria/Benchmark

Eighty percent (80%) of the students who enrolled in the program in the Fall of 2002 will have earned the M.A. in English.

When (term/date) was assessment conducted?**Outcome 1**

Data unavailable (no graduates and no students near graduation)

Outcome 2

Data unavailable (no graduates and no students near graduation)

Outcome 3

January 29, 2008

What were the results attained (raw data)?

Outcome 1: Graduates will synthesize and evaluate their knowledge of literary theory and criticism across genres.

No data.

We had no graduates from the program since the last report, and we have no one scheduled to graduate in 2008, as far as we can determine.

Outcome 2: Graduates will employ a range of literary tools to identify, analyze, and synthesize literary genres.

No data.

We had no graduates from the program since the last report, and we have no one scheduled to graduate in 2008, as far as we can determine.

Outcome 3: Eighty percent (80%) of the students who enroll in the program will complete it within four (4) years.

Four years ago, in the fall semester of 2003, 3 students joined the M.A. in English program. Since then, 2 have graduated (66.6%) and 1 (33.3%) switched to the EDCI program.

During that fall semester of 2003, 13 total students were active in the M.A. in English program. Four years later, 7 (54%) have graduated with the degree, 3 (24%) switched majors to join the EDCI program, 1 (8%) entered a Ph.D. in English program (at Texas A&M), 1 (8%) became inactive, and 1 (8%) remains active.

Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?

Outcome 1

n/a

Outcome 2

n/a

Outcome 3

Dr. Thomas R. Mitchell

When were the results and analysis shared and with whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Submit minutes with data analysis to assessment@tamiu.edu (Please use Minutes Template located on the **Project INTEGRATE web page.)**

A draft of the report was distributed via e-mail attachment to all English faculty members with the request that suggestions be forwarded to Dr. Mitchell for inclusion in the final report. Four indicated that they agreed with the data analysis and the conclusions reached concerning the program. One, however, made the excellent suggestion that in the future program outcome statements specific to the new “rhetoric and composition” track of the M.A. in English program would need to be included. At present no student in the program specializing in that area is near graduation. Thus, next year would be the appropriate time to make these changes.

NOTE: Submit all assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

Use of Results: Indicate whether criteria were met/not met and what changes, if any, have been identified based on the data collected?

Outcome 1

Met: *n/a* Not Met: *n/a*

Outcome 2

Met: *n/a* Not Met : *n/a*

Outcome 3

Met: Not Met: X

Because only 54% (56% in last year's AIER) of the students enrolled in the program four years ago completed the program with a M.A. in English, we failed technically to meet our goal of an 80% graduation rate in the program. However, our stated goal defines program success in an excessively narrow way if one considers that only 1 of the 13 students active in the program 5 years ago dropped out of graduate school. That's a 93% success rate, if success is defined as persisting in the pursue of one's educational goals.

Last year we indicated that the 80% graduation rate was unrealistic, but we kept it as a goal for 2007. For next year, we should lower the number to a more realistic goal of 60% while perhaps restating it in such a way that continuation in graduate school becomes a program goal, whether in the M.A. in English program or in the C&I program,

How have these data-based changes improved your program/unit?

Based on this year's assessment of outcomes – as with last year's, we will strive to improve the program by update the tracking study and contact each semester students who have begun the graduate program in English and fail to enroll in a graduate English course during a fall or spring semester – an early sign that they may fail to complete the program. Responsibility for updating the tracking study and for contacting students will reside with the English graduate advisor. We followed this plan in 2007 and will continue it throughout 2008.

Are resources affected by the changes identified in Section II? Yes No

If so, specify the effect(s) using the chart below:

Funding	Physical	Other
New resources required		Primarily faculty/staff time
		University rule/procedure change only
		Other: Enter text here

Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)

Enter text here

Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:

Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation):

Enter text here

New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below):

Enter text here

Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification):

Enter text here

Are resources requested a priority for the academic program/AES unit?

Yes No

Comments:

Enter text here

If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on the academic program/AES unit?

Enter text here