Institutional Effectiveness
2024-2025

Program: English MA
College and Department: College of Arts & Sciences, English
Contact: Linda Null
Mission:

The Master of Arts degree program in the Department of English prepares graduates for success in any further graduate and professional education that might require superior analytical and communication skills, as well as for careers outside the academic world wherever superior analytical and communication skills and knowledge of literary and cultural traditions are essential. Our English MA also provides superb grounding for seeking a PhD in English by increasing students' knowledge of literary history and improving their skills in writing, literary analysis, and research. Graduates can also become effective high-school or college-level teachers by improving their knowledge of writing pedagogy and theory.

Attach Curriculum Map (Educational Programs Only):
Other 6000-level courses included in the curriculum build on the skills students developed in ENGL 6000. The chart below provides a curriculum map to show the progression of core courses in relation to learning outcomes for the graduate program.

Key: I = Introductory   R = Reinforced   M = Mastery

Leaning Outcomes	Required Courses		
	ENGL 6000 Introduction to Graduate Studies	ENGL 6--- American Literature	ENGL 6--- British Literature
Interpret texts (from both American and British literature) from a variety of approaches and perspectives	I	R,M	R,M
Analyze and synthesize disciplinary, scholarly conversations and participate in them	I	R, M	R,M
Analyze the writing conventions and write in a discipline-specific genre	I	R,M	R,M
Analyze communication strategies and implement them in their discipline	I	R,M	R,M

SLO1: Interpret Texts

Define Outcome:

Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of approaches and perspectives with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" or above on the thesis/nonthesis rubric.

80% of students will score "At Expectations" or above on the final project in ENGL 6000.

Assessment Methods:

Thesis Evaluation (assessed through the thesis and non-thesis rubric)

Course project for ENGL 6000 (assessed through 6000 final project rubric)

Exit interview

Attached Files: See Appendices 1, 2, and 3

Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" or above on the thesis/nonthesis rubric.

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" or above on the final project ENGL 6000 rubric.

Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:

1.E Stackable Credentials

Results and Analysis:

ENGL 6000 Final project. See the attachment below. The most recent results (Fall 2024--ENGL 6000 is offered only in the fall), are slightly higher than in 2023. We met the goal of 80% of the students will score At Expectations (3) or higher.

Number of students	Year	SLO 1 AV.	SLO 2 AV.	SLO 3 AV.	Overall AV.
5	2023	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.7
5	2024	3.59	4.53	3.73*	3.95

*One student submitted a creative project. For SLO 3, this student was evaluated for only one category in SLO 3, the first category labeled "Writing."

Thesis/Nonthesis project. See attachment below. For 2024-25, we reached our goal of 80% of students scoring At Expectations or higher.

Year	Number of Students	Average Score	Goal
2023-4	4	3.5	All students met the goal of scoring 80% or above.
2024-5	5	4.4	All students met the goal of scoring 80% or above.

Scores on SLO 1 2023-24
Student 1: 5.0 Significantly above expectations
Student 2: 3.0 At expectations
Student 3: 3.0 At expectations
Student 4: 3.0 At expectations

Scores on SLO 1 2024-25
Student 1: 4.0 Above expectations
Student 2: 4.0 Above expectations
Student 3: 5.0 Significantly above expectations
Student 4: 4.0 Above expectations
Student 5: 5.0 Significantly above expectations

For a definition of "At Expectations," see the attached documents.
Exit interviews are reviewed for indicators that students feel confident navigating different writing styles and rhetorical goals aligned with their concentration.

Attached Files: See Appendix 3

Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:
In all three SLO's for the ENGL 6000 final projects, the student average landed in the "At Expectations" category. One student in the Creative Writing concentration submitted a creative project and was evaluated in only one of the three subcategories of SLO 3 of the project. Perhaps the department should develop a new SLO that focuses on creative projects.

The program continues to perform well on SLO 1. Scores on the thesis/nonthesis rubric confirm development of interpretive skills.

Exit interviews indicate that students demonstrated a mature understanding of genre as both a set of formal expectations and a rhetorical strategy. Many described transitioning from seeing writing as "correct" to seeing it as audience driven and context specific. Literature students reflected on learning the conventions of critical essays and proposals; PTC students referenced shifting between genres like memos, white papers, and user manuals. Creative writing students commented on understanding literary form as a craft, something that could be intentionally broken once mastered.

Exit interviews also indicated that student wanted more autonomy in choosing interpretive frameworks aligned with their goals, especially when preparing capstone projects. Students recognized the importance of learning to analyze texts through frameworks grounded in identity, history, and power structures and appreciated opportunities to extend interpretation to nontraditional texts such as digital and social media.

Improving outcomes: include more opportunities for critical reflection on interpretive choices. Incorporate more interdisciplinary and global readings. Encourage faculty to treat interpretation as a transferable skill.

SLO2: Analyze and Synthesize

Define Outcome:
Students will be able to analyze and synthesize disciplinary, scholarly conversations and participate in them with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis rubric.

Assessment Methods:
- Thesis Evaluation (assessed through thesis and non-thesis rubric)
- Course project for ENGL 6000 (assessed through 6000 final project rubric)
- Exit Interview

Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):
80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis rubric

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the ENGL 6000 project

Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:
1.E Stackable Credentials

Results and Analysis:
"At Expectations" is indicated by a level 3 on the rubric for evaluating a thesis/nonthesis project and for the ENGL 6000 project. It indicates in engaging with disciplinary research and theory. This includes the ability to summarize and integrate key scholarly sources, use theoretical frameworks appropriately, and develop arguments that enter into conversation with other scholars. A score of 5 represents exceptional synthesis, where theory and secondary research are critically engaged with originality and depth.

Number of Students	Year	SLO 1 AV.	SLO 2 AV.	SLO 3 AV.	Overall AV.
5	2023	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.7
5	2024	3.59	4.53	3.73*	3.95

*One student submitted a creative project. For SLO 3, this student was evaluated for only one category in SLO 3, the first category labeled "Writing."

For the thesis and nonthesis rubric, a score of 3 or higher in Theory and Research Integration categories is required. On the ENGL 6000 final project rubric, a score of 3 or higher in Engagement with Scholarship and Argument is the benchmark.

Year	Number of Students	Average Score	Goal
2023-4	4	3.5	All students met the goal of scoring 80% or above.
2024-5	5	3.73	All students met the goal of scoring 80% or above.

Exit interviews are reviewed for qualitative indicators that a student can connect ideas across texts, engage with research productively, and situate their work within scholarly frameworks.

In exit interviews, students consistently identified SLO2 as an area of growth. Many described learning not just how to use "sources" but to enter into academic conversations--moving from reporting to synthesizing. They discussed the impact of ENGL 6000 assignments, annotated bibliographies, and theory-heavy seminar courses in developing this skill.

Attached Files: See Appendices 1 and 3

Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:
In exit interviews, students in 2023-24 expressed anxiety around theoretical writing and asked for more guidance early in the program. There was an effort to reinforce research literacy and synthesis skills in ENGL 6000 and to introduce genre-specific research instruction and to use scaffolded assignments like annotated bibliographies, source mapping, and synthesis matrices.

SLO3: Writing Conventions and Genres

Define Outcome:
Students will be able to analyze the writing conventions of and write in discipline-specific genres with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis rubric.

Assessment Methods:
- Thesis evaluation (assessed through thesis and non-thesis rubric)
- Exit interview

Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):
80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the thesis/nonthesis option

Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:
1.E Stackable Credentials

Results and Analysis:
"At Expectations" is defined as a score of 3, indicating that student demonstrate the ability to write effectively in genres appropriate to their concentration (literature, creative writing, or professional/technical communication). They understand the conventions, tone, and structure required in academic, professional, or creative contexts. A score of 5 indicates that a student writes with advanced rhetorical awareness, clarity, and genre mastery.

     Results of the Thesis and Nonthesis project 2023-24

     Student 1: 5.0 Significantly above expectations

     Student 2: 5.0 Significantly above expectations

     Student 3: 5.0 Significantly above expectations

     Student 4: 5.0 Significantly above expectations

     100% scored significantly above expectations

     Results of the Thesis and Nonthesis project 2024-25

     The rubric for 2024-25 included both genre and audience

     Student 1: Genre 4.0, Audience 5.0

Student 2: Genre 5.0, Audience 5.0

Student 3: Genre 3.0, Audience 3.0

Student 4: Genre 5.0, Audience 5.0

Student 5: Genre 5.0, Audience 5.0

All students scored above the 80% threshold for SLO 3.

In the Exit interview, this cohort offered especially rich reflection on genre as a rhetorical and ethical practice. Students frequently described genre as not just a form but a decision about how to connect with a reader. They referenced assignments that required them to tailor their communication for different professional or creative contexts. Several students praised ENGL 6000 for introducing expectations early, and others highlighted PC 6060 as key to seeing how visual design and information structure interact with genre.

Observational themes:

Strong emphasis on rhetorical flexibility

Development of professional communication genres

Creative writers emphasized learning genre constraints and how to break them with intention

Awareness that genre proficiency is a professional skill

Attached Files: See Appendix 2

Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:
Revised the core curriculum to include concentration-specific writing courses that integrate genre into every stage of the program.

Updated ENGL 6000 to introduce genre awareness, multimodal analysis, and rhetorical context from the first semester.

A 50% increase in student enrollment, supported by hybrid delivery, allowed for more frequent offerings of genre-diverse electives, flexibility to tailor coursework to individual genre interests, and more sections of creative, professional, and applied writing courses.

<h1 style="text-align:center">SLO4: Communication Strategies</h1>

Define Outcome:

Students will be able to analyze communication strategies and implement them in their disciplines with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the defense/presentation rubric.

Assessment Methods:

- Thesis/Nonthesis rubric (3 or above in each of the four categories)
- Defense and Presentation Rubric (3 or above for clarity, structure, and rhetorical appropriateness)
- ENGL 6000
- Exit interview
- PC 6060 (3+ level performance in multimodal, audience-specific communication)

Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):

80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the defense/presentation rubric

Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:

1.E Stackable Credentials

Results and Analysis:

A score of 3 ("At Expectations") means the student can clearly and effectively communicate their ideas in both written and oral contexts They demonstrate awareness of audience, purpose, tone, and delivery, and present their work in ways that are organized, clear, and rhetorically effective. A score of 5 represents sophisticated, impactful communication tailored to a specific context and audience, whether in writing or live presentation.

      Results of Defense and Presentation Rubric 2023-24

      Student 1: 5.0 (significantly above expectations)

      Student 2: 4.0 (above expectations)

      Student 3: 4.0 (above expectations)

      Student 4: 3.0 (at expectations)

      100% scored at or above expectations and therefore met the goal we set.

      Results of Defense and Presentation Rubric 2024-25

Student 1: Defense 4; Presentation 3

Student 2: Defense 4; Presentation 5

Student 3: Defense 5; Presentation 5

Student 4: Defense 5; Presentation 5

Student 5: Defense 5; Presentation 3

Once again 100% scored at or above expectations and therefore met the goal we set.

Themes noted in the presentations included strong rhetorical decision-making, use of multimodal and visual communication, and ethical awareness of tone and bias.

Exit exams 2023-24 cohort: Students reported significant growth in both written and oral communication. Many pointed to their work as teaching assistants, WEST presenters, or thesis writers as experiences that pushed them to adapt tone, simplify complexity, and speak with confidence. Students described as moving from a one-size fits all writing approach to one that is strategic and context-aware.

Exit exams 2024-25 cohort: Students demonstrated exceptional awareness of communication as a strategic, multimodal process. They frequently referred to specific courses that taught them to think beyond written text--to consider audience expectations, design principles, and the ethics of tone. Several noted that communication skills will continue to serve them in professional and public-facing contexts.

ENGL 6000 Final Presentation (2023) Instructor notes describe most presentations as clear and well-paced, with students generally showing good awareness of rhetorical purpose. Visual presentation varied. Some used professional slide design while others relied on text-heavy formats. Most students practiced delivery in advance and received positive peer feedback.

PC 6060 (Fall 2024) This course introduced structured rhetorical reflection and professional presentation practice: Students (a) conducted professional interviews with real-world communicators, (b) developed multimodal deliveries like slide decks and web-based reports, (c) wrote reflections connecting visual design to rhetorical strategy.

Instructor feedback confirmed that students showed mature rhetorical decision-making, with strong attention to audience needs and delivery format.

These results indicate students' increased awareness of how genre and platform shape rhetorical effectiveness, increased use of design thinking and multimodal presentation, and comfort speaking and writing in both academic and non-academic settings.

Attached Files: See Appendix 2

Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:

Plans:

- Apply the Defense and Presentation Rubric consistently to all thesis/portfolio defenses.
- Offer more low-stakes presentation assignments in core classes to build early confidence.
- Include visual rhetoric and design in technical and academic communication instruction
- Provide explicit feedback on delivery, layout, and rhetorical strategy.
- PC 6060 Digital Design is now a core course.
- ENGL 6005 and ENGL 6740 emphasize public writing, editorial processes, and audience-centered design.
- ENGL 6000 was revised to include structured presentation assignments with peer and faculty feedback.
- A 50% increase in enrollment, supported by hybrid delivery, has allowed for more presentation-based courses and electives, expanded opportunities for student showcases, conference-style delivery, and digital storytelling, integration of communication tools (e.g. Canva, PowerPoint, Adobe Express) into project work.

SLO5: Intercultural Factors

Define Outcome:
Students will be able to articulate how intercultural factors shape the creation of texts, with 80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the Critical Reflection rubric.

Assessment Methods:
Critical Reflection rubric

Criteria for Success (Thresholds for Assessment Methods):
80% of students scoring "At Expectations" on the Critical Reflection rubric

Link to 'Tech Tomorrow' Strategic Plan:
1.C Diversity

Results and Analysis:
"At expectations" is defined as the student's ability to articulate how intercultural factors such as historical context, cultural values, identity, and worldview shape the creation of texts. A score of 3 reflets competence in recognizing and discussing these influences in general terms or via specific examples. A 5 represents sophisticated, critical engagement with intercultural dynamics, including an understanding of how context shapes both authorship and readership.

We intended to assess this SLO with a Critical Reflection Rubric, but data are not yet available from that source. Instead, we have responses to question 8 of the exit interview.

"How do authors' positionality, historical context, and cultural values influence the creation of the texts studied in the classes you took throughout the program? You can speak in general terms or focus on a specific example." Because this question focuses on intercultural factors, it serves as a strong substitute measure for this outcome.

Criteria for success: 80% of students should provide a response to question 8 that demonstrates awareness of how intercultural factors such as authors' cultural background, historical moment, or social values influence the creation and interpretation of texts.

Several students commented on the cultural complexity of authorship, often while reflecting on how the program helped them recognize historical gaps, social positioning, and diverse voices in the literature they studied. Students in both the literature and creative writing concentrations

mentioned changes in how they read and represent characters, cultural settings, or voices; some students connected this shift to specific classroom conversations.

Use of Results to Improve Outcomes:
These reflections suggest that while the program fostered intercultural insight, the absence of a formal assessment tool limited the depth and consistency of the data collected.

The students in the 2023-24 cohort demonstrated emerging awareness of authorial and cultural context but did so inconsistently whereas the students in the 2024-25 cohort consistently connected authors' cultural values, historical context and social identities to rhetorical and thematic decisions within texts. Their reflections often included references to power, representation, ethical reading practices, and cultural humility.

We should develop and use a critical reflection rubric to assess this SLO but continue to use question 8 on the exit interview. Further, we should support faculty in explicitly naming intercultural frameworks already at work in assignments and discussions. We plan to integrate discipline-specific reflective writing assignments into literature, etc, and creative writing courses that as students to consider how intercultural factors influence both texts and readers.

Summative Evaluation:

The department should focus on the development of a rubric to assess SLO 5 and also in relation to SLO 5, we should integrate reflective writing assignments, especially in the literature and creative writing concentrations. So that students in all three concentrations have opportunities to understand how intercultural factors shape texts and their interpretation, we should encourage engagement with issues of audience, localization, and disability in all concentrations.

Assessment Plan Changes:

Apply a Critical Reflection Rubric to assess capstone reflections or written responses beginning 2025-26.

Integrate reflective writing assignments into literature and creative writing courses that ask students to consider how intercultural factors influence both texts and readers.

Encourage concentration-specific approaches to intercultural engagement (e.g. analyzing audience and localization in PTC, cultural voice in Creative Writing.

List of Appendices:

Appendix 1: Thesis and Nonthesis Rubric 1
Appendix 2: Thesis and Nonthesis Rubric 2
Appendix 3: ENGL 6000 Final Project Rubric

Appendix 1: Thesis and Nonthesis Rubric 1

	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)	N/A	Rating
1. Students will demonstrate a broad and integrated knowledge of history, theory, and/or pedagogy.					
History	The project is thoroughly grounded in the traditions of the text, genre, or issue. The student has clearly engaged with the ongoing scholarly/artistic conversations surrounding the text or issue.	The project shows an awareness of the scholarly/artistic conversations surrounding the text, genre, or issue. Cites major critics or secondary sources.	The project lacks awareness of the scholarly/artistic or professional conversations surrounding the text, genre, or issue. Few to no secondary sources cited.		
Theory	The project has a clear theoretical/craft framework, and demonstrates mastery of the relevant critical theories. Not only cites theorists (if applicable), but engages with their ideas and arguments.	The project engages with appropriate craft/critical theory. Cites major figures and concepts in the field or fields (if applicable).	The project lacks a clear theoretical/craft framework. It may fail to integrate or have awareness of theory/craft or rush through it in a cursory manner. Lacks awareness of major figures and concepts in the field or fields.		

Pedagogy and/or Industry Application (if applicable)	The writer demonstrates they are well-prepared to consider how their work would apply or be relevant in a classroom or professional setting. They show a mastery of their content/practice that indicates a larger awareness of the requirements and conventions of their chosen field.	The writer demonstrates awareness of the conventions of their respective profession/craft, and that they would be prepared to either teach or apply their work to that profession. They have clearly thought beyond just the specifics of their project and considered its application for teaching or industry.	The writer does not consider the implications of the project beyond itself, demonstrating a lack of awareness/preparation for a career in teaching or industry. Regardless of the content of the project, the writer seems unprepared to apply this work to a chosen field.		
Integration (if applicable)	The writer demonstrates mastery by integrating secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing in a fluid and professional manner.	The writer integrates secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing.	The writer engages with secondary sources or their ideas and concepts, but in a disjointed way, without establishing why they are necessary for the writer's own project.		
2. Students will be prepared for success in Ph.D. programs in English.					
3. Students will be prepared for success in other areas of advanced graduate education.					
Content	The author demonstrates advanced analytical skills, original and exciting ideas, rigorous thought, creativity/innovation, and a clear sense of	The author demonstrates good analysis, ideas that move beyond just summarizing, independent thought, some creativity/innovation, and gestures towards the larger significance of the project.	The author lacks sufficient analysis, engages in too much summary/rehashing others' ideas, and fails to realize the project or establish why it matters.		

	payoff/importance for the work.				
Organization	The project is clearly an integrated whole, with connections made across chapters/components/answers. Not only is each individual piece well organized, but these pieces clearly fit together into a larger project with an integrated vision.	Individual chapters/components/answers are well-organized and cohesive, with clear structure, logic, and progression, but there are inconsistencies or incongruities in the project viewed as a whole.	Individual chapters/components/answers lack organization. There may be good content, but the project overall lacks a clear structure, logic, or progression.		
Audience	The project is written/designed with a strong understanding of audience. The tone is that of an advanced academic or confident artistic practitioner communicating with an educated audience, difficult concepts are explained at an appropriate level, and the writing anticipates and addresses potential audience questions or concerns.	The project is written/designed with a decent understanding of audience. The tone is suitable for a developing academic or artist communicating to more advanced academics. Difficult concepts are explained (though perhaps overexplained), and the writing recognizes potential audience questions or problems but may not entirely resolve them.	The project is written/designed without a good awareness of audience or problems in reception. The tone is not suitable for graduate-level writing, concepts are either overexplained or underexplained, and the writing fails to anticipate potential audience questions or difficulties.		

Genre Conventions	The project demonstrates a strong understanding of the conventions of the genre(s) involved. It not only follows all appropriate formatting and style conventions, but also indicates knowledge of the broader socio-cultural context and dynamics behind formatting and style choices, including audience expectations and purposes of the project.	The project follows all formatting and style conventions.	The project has numerous errors in terms of formatting and style conventions.		
4. Students will be prepared for teaching careers in high schools and community colleges.					
5. Students will be prepared for careers outside academe that require advanced analytical and communication skills.					
Analysis	The project demonstrates strong analysis of the texts/objects of study, or of the workings of the creative genre and subject matter. The work is intellectually stimulating and demonstrates advanced independent thought, rather than simply reproducing the thoughts/work of others.	The project demonstrates acceptable analysis of the texts/objects of study, or of the workings of the creative genre and subject matter. The work demonstrates an ability to read and think critically/creatively.	The project does not show strong analytic skills. It primarily involves summary/reproducing the work of others, mimicking the style/ideas of others, or simply relying on others' thought instead of producing something original.		

Defense	The author displays confidence and poise in answering questions. The author presents as a peer and an authority in the field, not as a subordinate. The author facilitates an engaging dialogue about the topic or artistic endeavor, instead of just responding to questions.	The author answers questions and responds to comments with clarity and insight. The author is comfortable dealing with critique and supporting their own ideas in a dialogue.	The author struggles to answer questions or challenges. The author seems uncomfortable if pushed off script, hesitates to provide answers, and engages in the conversation as a subordinate, not as an authority.	
Presentation (if applicable)	The author has designed a professional presentation, considering the genre conventions of their chosen field. The author presents with confidence and poise, displaying authority over their subject matter and engaging the audience both during their presentation and during the Q&A.	The author has designed a presentation that has no errors and conveys the content adequately. The author has developed and practiced a clear presentation, with few fumblings or hesitations. The author responds to audience questions with acceptable answers.	The author has not put adequate design or rehearsal into the presentation. The presentation is disjointed and confusing, particularly to audience members unfamiliar with the work. The author struggles to respond to questions from the audience.	

Overview

Thesis and Non-Thesis Rubric
Defense and Presentation Rubric

Sheet 1: *Thesis and Non-Thesis Rubric*

	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)	N/A	Rating
1.Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of approaches and perspectives					
Content	The author demonstrates advanced analytical skills, original and exciting ideas, rigorous thought, and a clear sense of payoff/importance for the work.	The author demonstrates good analysis, ideas that move beyond just summarizing, independent thought, and gestures towards the larger significance of the project.	The author lacks sufficient analysis, engages in too much summary/rehashing others' ideas, and fails to establish why the project matters.		
Theory	The project has a clear theoretical framework, and demonstrates mastery of the relevant critical theories. Not only cites theorists, but also engages with variety of approaches and perspectives.	The project engages with appropriate critical theory. Cites major figures and concepts in the field or fields.	The project lacks a clear theoretical framework. It either does not integrate theory or rushes through it in a cursory manner. Lacks awareness of major figures and concepts in the field or fields.		
Interpretation	The project demonstrates strong interpretation of the texts/objects of study, or of the workings of the creative genre and subject matter. The work is intellectually stimulating and demonstrates advanced independent thought, rather than simply reproducing the thoughts/work of others.	The project demonstrates acceptable analysis of the texts/objects of study, or of the workings of the creative genre and subject matter. The work demonstrates an ability to read and think critically.	The project does not show strong analytic skills. It primarily involves summary/reproducing the work of others, mimicing the style/ideas of others, or simply relying on others' thought instead of producing something original.		
2.Students will be able to analyze and synthesize disciplinary, scholarly conversations and participate in them					
History	The project is thoroughly grounded in the traditions of the text, genre, or issue. The student has clearly engaged with the ongoing scholarly conversation surrounding the text or issue.	The project shows an awareness of the scholarly conversation surrounding the text, genre, or issue. Cites major critics or secondary sources.	The project lacks awareness of the scholarly or professional conversation surrounding the text, genre, or issue. Few to no secondary sources cited.		

Theory	The project has a clear theoretical framework, and demonstrates mastery of the relevant critical theories. Not only cites theorists, but also engages with variety of approaches and perspectives.	The project engages with appropriate critical theory. Cites major figures and concepts in the field or fields.	The project lacks a clear theoretical framework. It either does not integrate theory or rushes through it in a cursory manner. Lacks awareness of major figures and concepts in the field or fields.
Integration	The writer demonstrates mastery by integrating secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing in a fluid and professional manner.	The writer integrates secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing.	The writer engages with secondary sources or their ideas and concepts, but in a disjointed way, without establishing why they are necessary for the writer's own project.

3. Students will be able to analyze the writing conventions of and write in discipline-specific genres

Organization	The project is clearly an integrated whole, with connections made across chapters/components/answers. Not only is each individual piece well organized, but these pieces clearly fit together into a larger project.	Individual chapters/components/answers are well-organized and cohesive. Each piece reads/looks holistic, with a clear structure, logic, and progression.	Individual chapters/components/answers lack organization. There may be good content, but it lacks a clear structure, logic, or progression.
Audience	The project is written/designed with a strong understanding of audience. The tone is that of an advanced academic communicating with peers, difficult concepts are explained at an appropriate level, and the writing anticipates and addresses potential audience questions or concerns.	The project is written/designed with a decent understanding of audience. The tone is suitable for a developing academic communicating to more advanced academics, difficult concepts are explained (though perhaps overexplained), and the writing recognizes potential audience questions.	The project is written/designed without a good awareness of audience. The tone is not suitable for graduate-level writing, concepts are either overexplained or underexplained, and the writing fails to anticipate potential audience questions.
Genre Conventions	The project demonstrates a strong understanding of the conventions of the genre(s) involved. It not only follows all appropriate formatting and style conventions, but also indicates knowledge of the broader socio-	The project follows all formatting and style conventions.	The project has numerous errors in terms of formatting and style conventions.

cultural context and dynamics behind
formatting and style choices, including
audience expectations and purposes of
the project.

Sheet 2: *Defense and Presentation Rubric*

Defense/Presentation Rubric

Students will be able to analyze communication strategies and implement them in their disciplines

	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)	N/A	Rating
Defense	The author displays confidence and poise in answering questions. The author presents as a peer and an authority in the field, not as a subordinate. The author facilitates an engaging dialogue about the topic, instead of just responding to questions.	The author answers questions and responds to comments with clarity and insight. The author is comfortable dealing with critique and supporting their own ideas in a dialogue.	The author struggles to answer questions or challenges. The author seems uncomfortable if pushed off script, hesitates to provide answers, and engages in the conversation as a subordinate, not as an authority.		
Presentation (if applicable)	The author has designed a professional presentation, considering the genre conventions of their chosen field. The author presents with confidence and poise, displaying authority over their subject matter and engaging the audience both during their presentation and during the Q&A.	The author has designed a presentation that has no errors and conveys the content adequately. The author has developed and practiced a clear presentation, with few fumblings or hesitations. The author responds to audience questions with acceptable answers.	The author has not put adequate design or rehearsal into the presentation. The presentation is disjointed and confusing, particularly to audience members unfamiliar with the work. The author struggles to respond to questions from the audience.		

Appendix 3: ENGL 6000 Final Project Rubric

	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)	N/A
1. Students will be able to conduct graduate-level research in English studies. (Tied to Program SLO 2 and 3)				
Scholarly Conversation	The project is well-grounded in an ongoing scholarly conversation. This may include previous scholarship about the primary text(s) and/or existing scholarship about a critical/theoretical discourse. The writer has clearly researched the background of the text/issue being considered.	The project shows an awareness of the scholarly conversation surrounding the text or issue. Cites major critics or secondary sources.	The project lacks awareness of the scholarly conversation surrounding the text, genre, or issue. Few to no secondary sources cited.	
Sources	The project engages with a variety of appropriate sources, from academic works and peer-reviewed journals (or other sources, if relevant). The project engages relevant sources at length and with thorough consideration.	The project engages with the required amount of sources, from academic works and peer-reviewed journals (or other sources, if relevant.) The project engages relevant sources at a minimally-acceptable length.	The project does not engage with the required amount of sources, or the sources are not appropriately rigorous or scholarly. The project does not engage its secondary sources at an acceptable length.	

Integration	The writer demonstrates mastery by integrating secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing in a fluid and professional manner.	The writer integrates secondary sources or their ideas and concepts into their own writing.	The writer engages with secondary sources or their ideas and concepts, but in a disjointed way, without establishing why they are necessary for the writer's own project.	
2. Students will be able to interpret texts from a variety of critical approaches. (Tied to Program SLO 1, 4, and 5)				
Theory/Critical Approach	The project is strongly grounded in one or more existing critical approaches, traditions, or theoretical frameworks. It is well-versed in key ideas, vocabulary, and arguments from said approach(es).	The project engages with one or more existing critical approaches, traditions, or theoretical frameworks. It shows awareness of key terms or issues in said approach(es).	The project seems to lack a critical or theoretical focus. While it may contain scholarship and analysis, there is no unifying methodology/framework.	
Interpretation	The writer shows strong interpretive skills, practicing close reading / analysis of the subject matter at an advanced level for a first-semester M.A. student.	The writer demonstrates an ability to close read / analyze the subject matter at a level acceptable for a first-semester M.A. student. The writer makes clear claims, and does not simply rely on summary or repeating others' insights.	The writer does not close read / analyze the subject matter at a level acceptable for a first-semester M.A. student. The writer relies heavily on summary or repeating others' insights.	

Application	The writer clearly connects their critical approach to their primary analysis. The project shows how the primary analysis contributes to a larger theoretical or critical conversation.	The writer makes efforts to connect their critical approach to their primary analysis. There are linkages between the close reading / analysis and the theoretical or critical conversation.	The writer fails to connect their critical approach to their primary analysis. The project may contain both, but it is unclear how the close reading / analysis is grounded in or contributes to a larger theoretical or critical conversation.	

3. Students will be able to use the conventions of scholarly writing in English studies, including MLA-style documentation. (Tied to SLO 2, 3, 4, and 5)

Writing	The project is well-written, with a clear logic and progression, a clearly articulated argument, and strong control over the prose at both the global (overall essay) and local (individual sentences) levels.	The project is adequately written, with efforts at logic and progression, an effort to create an overall argument, and with adequate control over the prose at both the global and local levels.	The project loses focus sustaining its logic and progression, or the argument gets confused or lost. Connections or transitions between paragraphs are unclear. There are an unacceptable amount of problems at either the global or local levels (or both).	
Conventions	The project follows all conventions for English academic writing, both in terms of style and of grammar. This includes incorporating sources, formatting issues, and rhetorical conventions common to writing in this field.	The project has a few places where it does not follow all conventions for English academic writing, both in terms of style and grammar. This includes incorporating sources, formatting issues, and rhetorical conventions common to writing in this field.	The project has numerous places where it does not follow all conventions for English academic writing, both in terms of style and grammar. This includes incorporating sources, formatting issues, and rhetorical conventions common to writing in this field.	

Documentation	The project has no errors in citation and documentation, as specified by the instructor (most commonly MLA style).	The project has few errors in citation and documentation, as specified by the instructor (most commonly MLA style).	The project has many errors in citation and documentation, as specified by the instructor (most commonly MLA style).	