

Assessment Report - AY 2012-2013																									
Name of Program: Master of Arts in English - Writing Studies																									
School or Department: English																									
College: Humanities and Social Sciences																									
Kean University																									
Program Level Student Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	Assessment Criteria (Method of Collection, etc)	Results of Assessment (Data Collected)		Action Taken (Closing the Loop)																				
<p>SLO #1: Students will identify key theoretical contributions associated with schools of research within composition studies (KU1, KU2, KU3, KU4).</p>	<p>SLO #1 Direct Measure:</p>	<p>Scored exam in ENG 5002 based on course text</p> <p>Literature review section and discussion in Thesis</p>	<p>10 students completed the ENG 5002 exam during Spring, 2013. Proficiencies were as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Criteria</th> <th>3</th> <th>2</th> <th>1</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Correctly identify, apply, and evaluate theories from at least 3 different schools</td> <td>7</td> <td>3</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Analyze connections between disciplinary theories and real-world context and problems</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correctly identify, evaluate and apply pedagogical/research theories</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Criteria	3	2	1	Total	Correctly identify, apply, and evaluate theories from at least 3 different schools	7	3	0	10	Analyze connections between disciplinary theories and real-world context and problems	6	4	0	10	Correctly identify, evaluate and apply pedagogical/research theories	6	4	0	10	<p>To support students in making connections to disciplinary research we plan to do the following.</p> <p>1. Revise 5020 assignments so that the second project is a literature review (for a research topic of their choice). This assignment will ask students to describe the <i>most important</i> work in writing studies relevant to their topic, and provide them with experiences framing research issues in terms of that research.</p> <p>2. Add an assignment to 5002 where the class collaborates to create a list of "major" researchers in different areas of writing studies, and supports their choice of researchers through discussion of what their research contributes.</p>
			Criteria	3	2	1	Total																		
			Correctly identify, apply, and evaluate theories from at least 3 different schools	7	3	0	10																		
			Analyze connections between disciplinary theories and real-world context and problems	6	4	0	10																		
Correctly identify, evaluate and apply pedagogical/research theories	6	4	0	10																					
<p>7 students completed a thesis during the 2012-2013 AY. Proficiencies for 6 theses were assessed by the Thesis rubric for SLO1 was as follows:</p>																									
<p>Places research question within the content of writing studies scholarship:</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Level of proficiency</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of students</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Level of proficiency	3	2	1	Number of students	1	4	1																
Level of proficiency	3	2	1																						
Number of students	1	4	1																						

			<p><i>Interpretation:</i> These data suggest that ENG 5002 provides students with a strong basis in writing studies theory, and that students are able to name and identify those theories. Data from the thesis evaluations suggests students have some difficulty apply what they have learned (in terms of questions framed in a course) to questions surrounding their thesis work. At least half of the thesis students used scholarly frames from outside the discipline, though most were from an allied discipline (e.g. education or journalism).</p>																																		
	<p>SLO #1 Indirect Measure:</p>	<p>Pre-post Student Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-survey conducted with incoming students registered for ENG 5020 and 5002. • Post-survey circulated to 7 students completing their thesis. 	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="846 659 1085 769"></th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1085 659 1516 769">Number of students who said they recognized theorist</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="846 769 1085 919"></th> <th data-bbox="1085 769 1289 919"><u>Entering student survey</u> (n=4)</th> <th data-bbox="1289 769 1516 919"><u>Graduating Student survey</u> (n=5)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 919 1085 989">Kenneth Bruffee</td> <td data-bbox="1085 919 1289 989">1 (25%)</td> <td data-bbox="1289 919 1516 989">1 (20%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 989 1085 1058">Lisa Delpit</td> <td data-bbox="1085 989 1289 1058">0</td> <td data-bbox="1289 989 1516 1058">1 (20%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 1058 1085 1128">John Dewey</td> <td data-bbox="1085 1058 1289 1128">3 (75%)</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1058 1516 1128">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 1128 1085 1198">Janet Emig</td> <td data-bbox="1085 1128 1289 1198">0</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1128 1516 1198">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 1198 1085 1268">Peter Elbow</td> <td data-bbox="1085 1198 1289 1268">1 (25%)</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1198 1516 1268">5 (100%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 1268 1085 1338">Linda Flower</td> <td data-bbox="1085 1268 1289 1338">0</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1268 1516 1338">4 (80%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 1338 1085 1408">Paolo Friere</td> <td data-bbox="1085 1338 1289 1408">0</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1338 1516 1408">1 (20%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 1408 1085 1477">James Gee</td> <td data-bbox="1085 1408 1289 1477">0</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1408 1516 1477">4 (80%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="846 1477 1085 1547">Henry Giroux</td> <td data-bbox="1085 1477 1289 1547">0</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1477 1516 1547">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number of students who said they recognized theorist			<u>Entering student survey</u> (n=4)	<u>Graduating Student survey</u> (n=5)	Kenneth Bruffee	1 (25%)	1 (20%)	Lisa Delpit	0	1 (20%)	John Dewey	3 (75%)	0	Janet Emig	0	0	Peter Elbow	1 (25%)	5 (100%)	Linda Flower	0	4 (80%)	Paolo Friere	0	1 (20%)	James Gee	0	4 (80%)	Henry Giroux	0	0	<p>Students seemed to have good familiarity with contemporary writing process theorists. At the same time, they did not seem to get adequate background in theorists associated with critical pedagogy, or in theorists important to compositions' historical development.</p> <p>This connects to the results for SLO#1's direct measure, where students were weak in identifying important composition theorists relevant to their thesis.</p> <p>Taken together, these results suggest stronger emphasis on "big name" theorists. The literature review assignment for 5020, and the collaborative activity for 5002 should help strengthen performance in this area.</p>
	Number of students who said they recognized theorist																																				
	<u>Entering student survey</u> (n=4)	<u>Graduating Student survey</u> (n=5)																																			
Kenneth Bruffee	1 (25%)	1 (20%)																																			
Lisa Delpit	0	1 (20%)																																			
John Dewey	3 (75%)	0																																			
Janet Emig	0	0																																			
Peter Elbow	1 (25%)	5 (100%)																																			
Linda Flower	0	4 (80%)																																			
Paolo Friere	0	1 (20%)																																			
James Gee	0	4 (80%)																																			
Henry Giroux	0	0																																			

			<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>bell hooks</td> <td>1 (25%)</td> <td>1 (20%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Donald Murray</td> <td>1 (25%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mike Rose</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cynthia Selfe and Gail Hawisher</td> <td>0</td> <td>4 (80%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ed White</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kathleen Yancey</td> <td>0</td> <td>2 (40%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	bell hooks	1 (25%)	1 (20%)	Donald Murray	1 (25%)	0	Mike Rose	0	0	Cynthia Selfe and Gail Hawisher	0	4 (80%)	Ed White	0	0	Kathleen Yancey	0	2 (40%)	<p>Also, we will be considering both revising the selection of theoretical readings, and identifying different theorists for the pre/post survey, so that 1) theorists on the survey are more closely tied to course assignments and activities; and 2) we cover theorists most important to the discipline.</p>												
bell hooks	1 (25%)	1 (20%)																																
Donald Murray	1 (25%)	0																																
Mike Rose	0	0																																
Cynthia Selfe and Gail Hawisher	0	4 (80%)																																
Ed White	0	0																																
Kathleen Yancey	0	2 (40%)																																
<p>SLO #2:: Students will analyze a range of research paradigms suitable for composition research (KU1, KU2, KU3, KU4).</p>	<p>SLO #2 Direct Measure</p>	<p>Scored exam in ENG 5002 based on course text</p> <p>literature review section and discussion in Thesis</p>	<p>10 students completed the midterm ENG 5002 exam during Spring, 2013 where their knowledge of research paradigms was assessed as follows.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Criteria</th> <th>5</th> <th>4</th> <th>3</th> <th>2</th> <th>1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Correctly identifies paradigmatic features of multiple research articles</td> <td>7</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Analyzes strengths of research strategies within articles</td> <td>8</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Analyzes weaknesses of research strategies within research article</td> <td>8</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Identifies</td> <td>7</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Criteria	5	4	3	2	1	Correctly identifies paradigmatic features of multiple research articles	7	1	2			Analyzes strengths of research strategies within articles	8	2				Analyzes weaknesses of research strategies within research article	8	2				Identifies	7	1	1	1		<p>Teaching strategies under SLO#1 may help with these issues. In addition, we will work on introducing the ideas (if not all the details of the language) in 5020, and on providing more reflecting writing/talk in class where students apply paradigms to their own projects and interests, or other in-class activities.</p>
Criteria	5	4	3	2	1																													
Correctly identifies paradigmatic features of multiple research articles	7	1	2																															
Analyzes strengths of research strategies within articles	8	2																																
Analyzes weaknesses of research strategies within research article	8	2																																
Identifies	7	1	1	1																														

			connections between paradigmatic assumptions and methodological strengths and weaknesses							
			Identifies, reflects on, and analyzes how his/her own assumptions shape his/her assessment of the value and effectiveness of the research	3		4	3			
			Develops a position regarding the usefulness of different paradigmatic approaches	3	5	2				
			Clear focus	9		1				
			Organization	9	1					
			Sentence level concerns	10						
			7 students completed a thesis during the 2012-2013 AY.							

			<p>6 student theses were evaluated in terms conducting research using a suitable paradigm as follows. In this assessment, “suitable paradigm” meant a set of ontological, methodological, epistemological and ethical assumptions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could solve problems in writing studies; • Provided robust data relevant to their research question; • Provides an appropriate theoretical frame to answer the research question <table border="1" data-bbox="848 574 1367 725"> <tr> <td>Level of proficiency</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of students</td> <td>2</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Interpretation:</i> Findings regarding student understanding/ability to apply research paradigms for writing studies suggest that they can identify how research approaches work, and name what they do well and not so well, but that they are less able to apply (or choose) research paradigms that match their own research “beliefs” or the problems they might solve with those approaches. This is in keeping with learning theory (Bloom’s taxonomy) – but, at the same time, we would like to do better.</p> <p>For evaluation of thesis work for SLO#2, students who were ranked at 2 earned that ranking primarily because their methodologies were not well grounded in writing studies (2); did not provide relevant data (2); and/or did not provide a powerful theoretical frame for answering the thesis question (4).</p>	Level of proficiency	3	2	1	Number of students	2	4		
Level of proficiency	3	2	1									
Number of students	2	4										
	<p>SLO #2 Indirect Measure</p>	<p>Pre-post Student Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-survey 	<p>Entering students survey (n=4)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="848 1463 1518 1529"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Not explained</td> <td>Explained</td> </tr> </table>		Not explained	Explained	<p>These findings seem to track with findings from the direct measure, where students can</p>					
	Not explained	Explained										

		<p>conducted with incoming students registered for ENG 5020 and 5002.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post-survey circulated to 7 students completing their thesis. 	<table border="1" data-bbox="846 168 1520 444"> <tr> <td>Positivist</td> <td>4 (100%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>social constructivist</td> <td>4 (100%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Liberatory</td> <td>4 (100%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pragmatic</td> <td>4 (100%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table> <p>Graduating students survey (n=4)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="846 516 1520 862"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Not explained</th> <th>Explained</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Positivist</td> <td>3 (75%)</td> <td>1 (25%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>social constructivist</td> <td>0</td> <td>4 (100%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Liberatory</td> <td>3 (75%)</td> <td>1 (25%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pragmatic</td> <td>1 (25%)</td> <td>3 (75%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Positivist	4 (100%)	0	social constructivist	4 (100%)	0	Liberatory	4 (100%)	0	Pragmatic	4 (100%)	0		Not explained	Explained	Positivist	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	social constructivist	0	4 (100%)	Liberatory	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	Pragmatic	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	<p>identify but not articulate features of the different research paradigms. While there is a shift in what students think they know about research paradigms, only one student could accurately identify defining features of all four paradigms. The disproportionate understanding of social constructionism may reflect teacher's theoretical bias (both instructors see themselves as social constructionists).</p> <p>Another factor may be that the language for the paradigms that was used in course work differs from the language in the survey (eg post-positivist, not postitivist; liberator = transformative). Social constructivist + pragmatic used the same label. We may need to do some generalizing to connect to other labels rather than changing the survey.</p>
Positivist	4 (100%)	0																													
social constructivist	4 (100%)	0																													
Liberatory	4 (100%)	0																													
Pragmatic	4 (100%)	0																													
	Not explained	Explained																													
Positivist	3 (75%)	1 (25%)																													
social constructivist	0	4 (100%)																													
Liberatory	3 (75%)	1 (25%)																													
Pragmatic	1 (25%)	3 (75%)																													
<p>SLO #3: Students will explain the major theories of composing and teaching writing (KU1, KU2, KU3, KU4).</p>	<p>SLO#3 Direct Measure:</p>	<p>Turning Research into Practice (TRIP) rubric for TRIP assignment in ENG 5020</p> <p>Evaluation of six theses focusing on how writer</p>	<p>Results: TRIP Project</p> <p>Number of student papers included in sample: 9</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="846 1377 1520 1554"> <thead> <tr> <th>Criteria</th> <th>5</th> <th>4</th> <th>3</th> <th>2</th> <th>1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Description of contextual problem</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Criteria	5	4	3	2	1	Description of contextual problem	4	5	0	0	0	<p>The faculty will consider intermediate scaffolding activities that help students ground their work in terms of Writing Studies. Possibilities include: more structured presentation of thesis assignment (where research process will be more scaffolded at the beginning),</p>															
Criteria	5	4	3	2	1																										
Description of contextual problem	4	5	0	0	0																										

		frames their project within larger theories of writing, as appropriate to the focus of the project						outside review by other faculty in discipline whose areas of expertise are relevant to study, one more. Discussion of need for more faculty/wider range of expertise.	
			Presentation of theory	2	6	1	0		0
			Application of theory to specific context	4	5	0	0		0
			Justification for application choices (includes link to at least one major theory for composing and/or teaching writing)	2	7	0	0		0
			Development of ideas	2	6	1	0		0
			Organization (overall and of individual paragraphs)	3	5	1	0		0
			Sentence level concerns	5	3	1	0		0

			<p>Thesis results: (with respect to connecting to major theories of writing)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="848 350 1367 500"> <tr> <td>Level of proficiency</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of students</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Interpretation: The TRIP project creates tight parameters for the kind of theories students can draw on. As the data show, they can do well in those situations. In less tightly/teacher-directed assignment, where they make their own choices, they seem to move outside the discipline (i.e. grounding work in journalism or education) without showing connections to Writing Studies.</p>	Level of proficiency	3	2	1	Number of students	1	5		
Level of proficiency	3	2	1									
Number of students	1	5										
	<p>SLO #3 Indirect Measure</p>	<p>Pre-post Student Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-survey conducted with incoming students registered for ENG 5020 and 5002. • Post-survey circulated to 7 students completing their thesis. 	<p>Entering student survey (n=4)</p> <p>All incoming students were unable to discuss and compare major theories for teaching writing. They seem to have little pre-knowledge of composition pedagogy.</p> <p>Graduating student survey (n=3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two of the respondents referred to and correctly defined expressivism - One respondent referred to social constructionist theory - One respondent referred to cognitivist theory <p>One respondent described multiple approaches not mentioned by others (writing as process, collaborative</p>	<p>Only 3 students provided answers, and of those 3, only 1 made a strong showing in terms of identifying widely theorized approaches to teaching writing.</p> <p>We have some work to do here.</p> <p>We need to spend more time on making connections between teaching practices identified in the research articles, and the ways those practices are “named” as</p>								

			writing, inquiry-based writing, using models)	different approaches to teaching. Also, we need a more recent “history” essay to present the schools of teaching, as the “names” for the different approaches are in flux.														
<p>SLO #4: Students will apply, examine and practice the different parts of the writing process (KU1, KU2, KU3, KU4)</p>	<p>Direct Measure SLO#4:</p>	<p>Writing process rubric applied to seven reflective questionnaire assignment in ENG 5020, coupled with instructor observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normally, students would have completed a reflective letter for this assignment. Due to the days lost because of Hurricane Sandy, the assignment was modified to a questionnaire. <p>Evaluation of writing process used to construct thesis, as</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Criterion</th> <th>Number of students proficient</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Articulates connection between audience, purpose, and form requirements for a variety of writing tasks</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Describes/demonstrates use of at least three methods for planning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: I design my classes so that students complete planning activities in class. I counted a student proficient in this category if their reflective questionnaire described at least one activity we did not do in class </td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Demonstrates robust revisions that include at least three of the four main revision strategies</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Use brainstorming techniques in both drafting and revision</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accurately identifies high-order concerns and articulates strategies for revising them</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accurately identifies lower-order concerns and articulates strategies for revising them</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Criterion	Number of students proficient	Articulates connection between audience, purpose, and form requirements for a variety of writing tasks	3	Describes/demonstrates use of at least three methods for planning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: I design my classes so that students complete planning activities in class. I counted a student proficient in this category if their reflective questionnaire described at least one activity we did not do in class 	2	Demonstrates robust revisions that include at least three of the four main revision strategies	4	Use brainstorming techniques in both drafting and revision	3	Accurately identifies high-order concerns and articulates strategies for revising them	5	Accurately identifies lower-order concerns and articulates strategies for revising them	2	<p>At this point, we plan to make no changes to instruction relevant to this SLO.</p>
			Criterion	Number of students proficient														
			Articulates connection between audience, purpose, and form requirements for a variety of writing tasks	3														
			Describes/demonstrates use of at least three methods for planning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: I design my classes so that students complete planning activities in class. I counted a student proficient in this category if their reflective questionnaire described at least one activity we did not do in class 	2														
			Demonstrates robust revisions that include at least three of the four main revision strategies	4														
			Use brainstorming techniques in both drafting and revision	3														
			Accurately identifies high-order concerns and articulates strategies for revising them	5														
			Accurately identifies lower-order concerns and articulates strategies for revising them	2														

		<p>observed by advisor. Six theses were considered</p>	<p>Thesis results: (with respect to writing process)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="846 277 1367 428"> <tr> <td>Level of proficiency</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of students</td> <td>6</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Interpretation:</i> Students seem to have met program expectations for this SLO.</p>					Level of proficiency	3	2	1			Number of students	6	0																	
Level of proficiency	3	2	1																														
Number of students	6	0																															
<p>SLO #4 Indirect Measure:</p>		<p>Pre-post Student Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-survey conducted with incoming students registered for ENG 5020 and 5002. • Post-survey circulated to 7 students completing their thesis. 	<p>Entering student survey (n=4); exiting (n=5) <i>Pre/Post</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="846 683 1530 1559"> <thead> <tr> <th>N=4</th> <th>Strongly Agree</th> <th>Agree</th> <th>Disagree</th> <th>Strongly Disagree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I am confident in my writing ability.</td> <td>1 (25%) 4 (80%)</td> <td>3(75%) 1(20%)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I use different writing processes for different rhetorical demands.</td> <td>1(25%) 1 (20%)</td> <td>3(75%) 3(60%)</td> <td>0 1 (20%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I am comfortable that I can write a 25+ page essay</td> <td>0 4 (80%)</td> <td>1(25%) 1 (20%)</td> <td>2(50%)</td> <td>1(25%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I am</td> <td>0</td> <td>2(50%)</td> <td>2(50%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data track with the direct measure and show that students generally experience important growth in terms of confidence and writing process. We interpret the slight decrease in use of multiple processes as an increase in awareness regarding writing process.</p> <p>No action at this time.</p>					N=4	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I am confident in my writing ability.	1 (25%) 4 (80%)	3(75%) 1(20%)	0	0	I use different writing processes for different rhetorical demands.	1(25%) 1 (20%)	3(75%) 3(60%)	0 1 (20%)	0	I am comfortable that I can write a 25+ page essay	0 4 (80%)	1(25%) 1 (20%)	2(50%)	1(25%)	I am	0	2(50%)	2(50%)	0	
N=4	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree																													
I am confident in my writing ability.	1 (25%) 4 (80%)	3(75%) 1(20%)	0	0																													
I use different writing processes for different rhetorical demands.	1(25%) 1 (20%)	3(75%) 3(60%)	0 1 (20%)	0																													
I am comfortable that I can write a 25+ page essay	0 4 (80%)	1(25%) 1 (20%)	2(50%)	1(25%)																													
I am	0	2(50%)	2(50%)	0																													

			comfortable using digital technologies associated with writing.	3 (60%)	2(40%)							
			I feel well prepared to use writing in my future profession.	1 (25%) 3 (60%)	3(75%) 2(40%)	0	0					
			I have strong writing networks with my colleagues.	0 1 (20%)	3(75%) 0	1(25%) 4 (80%)	0					
<p>SLO #5: Students will develop a writing process suitable for producing an M.A. essay (KU2, KU3, KU4).</p>	<p>Direct Measure SLO#5</p>	<p>Faculty observation of writing process for six students to create their thesis.</p>	<p>Thesis results: (with respect to connecting to major theories of writing)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="848 1089 1367 1239"> <tr> <td>Level of proficiency</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of students</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Interpretation:</i> Their biggest problem is time management. For example, the lower scores on the thesis rubric reflect students who had to ask for extensions due to not being able to meet deadlines. In time-management blocks, it is difficult to tell whether the block is caused by writing issues or life issues.</p>	Level of proficiency	3	2	1	Number of students	3	3		<p>No action taken</p>
Level of proficiency	3	2	1									
Number of students	3	3										

		Entering student survey (n=4); exiting (n=5) <i>Pre/Post</i>						
		N=4	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
SLO #5 Indirect Measure:	Pre-post Student Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-survey conducted with incoming students registered for ENG 5020 and 5002. • Post-survey circulated to 7 students completing their thesis. 	I am confident in my writing ability.	1 (25%) 4 (80%)	3(75%) 1(20%)	0	0	No action taken	
		I use different writing processes for different rhetorical demands.	1(25%) 1 (20%)	3(75%) 3(60%)	0	1 (20%)		
		I am comfortable that I can write a 25+ page essay	0 4 (80%)	1(25%) 1 (20%)	2(50%)	1(25%)		
		I'm confident in my research skills (primary research)	0 4 (80%)	1 (25%) 1 (20%)	2(50%) 0	1 (25%) 0		
		I am comfortable using digital technologies associated with writing.	0 3 (60%)	2(50%) 2(40%)	2(50%)	0		

			I feel well prepared to use writing in my future profession.	1 (25%) 3 (60%)	3(75%) 2(40%)	0	0		
			I have strong writing networks with my colleagues.	0 1 (20%)	3(75%) 0	1(25%) 4 (80%)	0		