

Program Level Assessment Report for 2012-2013

PROGRAM NAME, DEGREE NAME (e.g. Organizational Leadership, B.S.): English, M.A.

COLLEGE in which PROGRAM is housed: College of Liberal Arts

REPORT PREPARED by: Alpana Sharma, Director of Graduate Studies

A. ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

What actions did you take in 2012-2013, based on previous assessment findings, to improve student learning in your program? (Refer back to plans indicated in "Response to Assessment Findings" in 2011-2012 Assessment Report.)

- In 2012, we redesigned our MA portfolio based on existing deficiencies (in particular, an inadequate first-time pass rate for portfolios across the three concentrations—70% instead of the preferred 75%). Instead of requiring an independent paper of students, we now require them to revise a paper from a 7000-level course, working closely with the professor who taught the course for which the paper was originally written. The Graduate Committee prepared a set of questions that the student needs to address as part of the advisory process leading up to the revision; created an advising form; and instituted grading rubrics for the evaluation of the introductory essay, the revised paper, and the portfolio presentation of the paper. In Spring 2013, we implemented this new model. Sixteen graduating students revised their essays to a publication-worthy standard, submitted them as part of a portfolio for evaluation, and then presented a conference-style version of the revised essay before members of the English faculty and their peers during finals week on a day designated as "Scholarship Day."

B. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSED AND EXAMINED

Which Program Level Student Learning Outcomes did you assess and examine during 2012-2013? List the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes using the format of "Graduates will be able to _____."

(Please note that due to specialized accreditation requirements, accredited programs may be required to assess and report on all program level student learning outcomes every year; accredited programs should report in a manner that will align with their accreditation. Programs not carrying specialized accreditation may assess all of their learning outcomes every year but may choose to report on 2-3 per year, looking at several years of data.)

- The learning outcomes targeted for assessment were as follows:
Graduates will be able to
 1. communicate effectively;
 3. evaluate arguments and evidence critically.

C. METHODS FOR COLLECTING DATA

Which students were included in the assessment? (For example, all seniors completing Course X in Spring 2013, all graduating seniors, etc.)

- Students included in this assessment were the sixteen students who were graduating in Spring 2013.

D. ASSESSMENT MEASURES

- What key assessments/assignments/student work did you examine to directly assess the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes listed above?
 - The student work that was assessed was
 1. Their M.A. portfolio which included an introductory essay and their revised 7000-level essay, and
 2. Their conference-style version of the revised essay which they presented on “Scholarship Day.”
 - We directly assessed the targeted learning outcomes through the following methods:
 - Committees of three readers per portfolio (one of who served as the student’s advisor) read and graded the portfolio according to a weighted grading rubric.
 - Three faculty members graded each student on her/his portfolio presentation, also using a weighted grading rubric. (See attached for copies of the two rubrics.)
- What, if any, indirect assessments (e.g. exit survey, alumni survey, focus groups, etc.) did you use to indirectly assess the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes listed above?
 - No indirect assessments were used.

E. SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

What did you find from your assessments? What did your data reveal about how well students are achieving the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes that you listed above?

- Using the two grading rubrics as a guide, we found that students were more likely to succeed if they were provided with a more structured mentoring experience while being required to do higher-level research and original work. Providing rubrics with criteria ranging from effective argument and research to effective communication of ideas encouraged students to see themselves as members of a professional academic community. All sixteen students passed; five received certificates of excellence based on their scores of 90+%.

F. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

How were results shared? With whom were they discussed?

- Students received their graded rubrics for the revised portfolio essay and met with their advisors in order to prepare for their portfolio presentations. They also received their portfolio presentation rubrics directly after their presentations and had the opportunity to discuss their scores with their advisors. Members of the English department’s Fall 2013 department meeting uniformly deemed the new M.A. portfolio a success, at which time it was brought to the department’s attention that criteria similar to the ones used to grade the revised portfolio paper should be incorporated by all graduate faculty in their 7000-level seminar classes. These criteria were unanimously approved for adoption as common language by all graduate faculty in their 7000-level courses by the graduate committee in their earlier Fall 2013 meeting. (See attached for common language pertaining to research writing at the 7000-level.)

G. ACTIONS PLANNED TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

Based on what you learned from your assessment of the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes, what actions do the faculty in your program plan to take to improve student learning in your program/area? Describe the steps faculty have taken/will take to use information from the assessments for improvement of student performance and the program. List additional faculty meetings or discussions and planned or actual changes to curriculum, teaching methods, approaches, or services that are in response to the assessment findings.

- As mentioned under F above, in the Fall 2013 department meeting graduate faculty were advised as to the common language to be used for students’ research writing at the 7000-level. This common set of expectations should produce a wider, more consistent range of courses from

which students may choose papers to revise, as the only shortcoming emerging from our new M.A. portfolio model in Spring 2013 was that under semesters students do not have as many courses to choose from as they did under quarters; hence, if all graduate faculty members implemented common standards, students may be better prepared at the outset of their coursework to produce potentially revisable papers regardless of their concentration. The portfolio process of 2013-14 will be examined in relation to that of 2012-13, in particular, the quality of the revised portfolio essay, to judge whether the quality of writing is comparable across the three concentrations.

H. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (recommended)

Please attach minutes of program faculty meeting where discussion of results and action planning occurred and any other relevant documents.

- See attached:
 - Minutes of the Fall 2013 English department meeting
 - Minutes of the Fall 2013 Graduate committee meeting
 - Minutes of Graduate Committee meetings 2012-13 (short form)
 - Minutes of the Graduate Faculty meeting 2-11-2013
 - Grading rubrics for the new M.A. portfolio and presentation
 - Common language agreed upon for adoption by all members of the graduate faculty in 7000-level courses

Minutes Report
Department of English Language and Literatures
Fall Semester Meeting
Thursday, December 12, 2013
12:20 pm
401 Millett

In Attendance:

Sarah McGinley, Karen Hayes, Lilia Moyer, Jeannette Horwitz, Mailinh Nguyen, Rich Bullock, Kelli Zaytoun, John Haught, Shengrong Cai, Chris Hall, Hope Jennings, Andrea Harris, Michelle Metzner, Cynthia Marshall, Kristie McKiernan, Scott Geisel, Jane Blakelock, Charis Elliot, Stephanie Dickey, Nancy Mack, Byron Jason Crews, Chuck Holmes, Annette Oxindine, Jim Guthrie, Alpana Sharma, Lars Soderlund, Drew Strombeck, Lynnette Jones, Crystal Lake, Carol Loranger, Dennis Loranger, Lars Soderland, Carol Mejia LaPerle, Barry Milligan, Bobby Rubin, Sally DeThomas, Deborah Crusan, Erin Flanagan, Robin Rahim, Tom Fenton, Chris Sitko, Matt Duncan, Irena Joseph, Catherine Crowley, Chris DeWeese, Daryl Hausman, Kathleen Kollman, David Seitz, Lynnette Jones, Karen Berry

Agenda

1. **Approval of Minutes of August 22, 2013**, department meeting:
 - Amendment: Catherine Crowley requested that August 22, 2013 minutes include new LEAP faculty member, Robin Raheem
 - Dr. Richard Bullock moved to approve the August 22, 2013 minutes; Dr. David Seitz seconded

2. **Questions for Committees:** (discussion of online committee reports)
 - **Graduate Committee Research Assessment Criteria:** Dr. Alpana Sharma's Graduate Committee Report is to be reposted to digested committee reports; she reviewed clear assessment criteria for research writing in an M.A. portfolio model. The research assessment rubric would serve as a list of guidelines for students; serve as a compliment to 6000-level research writing; and criteria would be incorporated into 7000-level course syllabuses
 - Senior lecturer Stephanie Dickey complimented the criteria for succinct language
 - Dr. Annette Oxindine advocated that the criteria would also be useful in seminars
 - Dr. Carol Loranger emphasized boiler-plate language be incorporated into English course syllabuses: "students must earn a grade of "C" or better to gain entry into the English graduate program

3. **Old Business: Amendments to Bylaws:**

- Faculty Governance Committee approved PTR amendments
- The Lecturer Review Committee has been abolished as contrary to the CBA. Accordingly, it will cease to exist.
- Lecturer I status and Lecturer II status no longer exist
- Language regarding Instructor and Senior Lecturer Review Committee violates CBA, and the language (item v.) has been struck from the bylaws
- Therefore, the Advisory Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the programs and procedures of the department and for preparing materials for college and university committees; this may include consultation with applicants in revision of promotional documents
- 2 recently approved (Fall 2013) Senior Lecturer promotion documents successfully followed the guidelines in the new NTE collective bargaining agreement; consequently, these applications will serve as models for prospective applicants

4. **New Business: ENG 3430: Survey of Women and Literature**

- The department voted to approve *ENG 3430: Survey of Women and Literature* (course outline posted online for departmental review).
- Program of Study Change: *The Literature Programs Committee is proposing a new survey of women's literature course to serve as a third survey option for undergraduate students. Currently, students in all concentrations are required to take one British (3210, 3220, 3230) and one American (3310, 3320) literature survey. Literature students must take a third survey from the two categories. The new survey course will be 3430. Under the new program requirements, students will take any two from the three categories without duplicating any one range (32, 33, 34). Literature majors will be required to take one course from each of the three categories.*
- Dr. Davis Seitz moved to approve; Dr. Andrew Strombeck seconded and moved to discuss
- Dr. Kelly Zaytoun and Dr. Annette Oxindine contributed supporting rationale for the course. Arguments in favor of the survey course emphasized the value of students' exposure to women writers that they would not otherwise encounter via strictly British and American offerings; enhancement of students' cultural capital; enriched breadth and depth of literary and social experience; the survey course would provide historical and cultural context and emphasize an overview of historical periods
- Observing weaknesses in ILA students, Dr. James Guthrie dissented, emphasizing inconsistencies between the 3430 survey course, professional obligations and graduate expectations; Dr.

Guthrie respectfully expressed the concern that this specialization is a potential disservice to WSU grads

- Dr. Strombeck moved that the proposed course outline return to the Literature Programs Committee for further discussion, revision and development of course rationale
- Dr. Zaytoun moved to approve the course; Dr. Seitz seconded
- Dr. Carol Loranger put the *ENG 3430: Survey of Women and Literature* course to a departmental vote; the department approved the survey course by a majority vote
- Dr. Guthrie voted “Nay”
- Dr. Loranger directed the Literature Programs Committee to table the proposed survey course and discuss rationale at the forthcoming spring departmental meeting

5. Chair’s Report :

- **Language Proficiency Scores** have been approved by Faculty Senate
- **College Readiness:** A Professional Development event will soon be offered for Writing Programs faculty; Dr. Richard Bullock has invited Peter Adams to visit WSU and speak on the topic of improving student success
- **Specialized ENG 2100:** Enrollment records indicate that special “Science/Med.” sections of 2100 are not attracting students; consequently, these specialized sections may need to be converted to conventional 2100 composition courses. Dr. Loranger will keep the department updated on the status of these specialized courses
- **ENG 1100 Enrollment:** As a consequence of semester conversion, ENG 1100 enrollments are not presently as high as expected
- **CBA: Contractual Obligations:** Dr. Loranger directed all faculty members to read and honor contractual obligations in the new CBA:
 - **7.4.2:** *Bargaining Unit Faculty Members have an obligation to meet all of their scheduled classes throughout the scheduled time, unless an alternative learning experience has been assigned*
 - **7.4.6:** *Bargaining Unit Faculty Members are expected to use the final examination period for its intended purpose and to schedule exams and other culminating class experiences during the time period designated by the Registrar*
 - **7.5.2.:** *Regular office hours shall occur at reasonably convenient times for students and advisees; they shall be scheduled on at least two days per week; they shall be posted, distributed and included in all course syllabi; and they shall occur in the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member’s faculty office or other facility equally convenient for students*

- **7.5.2.3:** *E-mail, voice mail and other types of electronic communication may supplement regular office hours but may not be used to replace opportunities for face-to-face meetings.*

- **Finals Week:** During Finals Week, Faculty members are encouraged to provide students an “end of the semester event,” which offers closure and fosters community in the classroom and beyond: activities may include large-group conference; individual consultation; free-wheeling discussion; celebration, etc.
- **ESL Retraining:** English composition teachers are encouraged to consider taking a series of TESOL courses, earning a TESOL Enhancement Certificate, which enables faculty members to teach ESL composition courses. ESL numbers have tripled and there is a demand for qualified ESL teachers
- **New Scholarship:** Professional/Technical Writing (approx. \$1000.00)
- **OSA (Ohio Student Association)** is sponsoring a student-internship program to develop student activists (specifically, students who are Junior status). AAUP would like to sponsor one or two students and to provide a modest stipend in addition to making a contribution to the OSA to cover the cost of attending the four weekend workshops required as part of the internships (this contribution is, by the way, not mandatory). AAUP intern/independent study—students who have a progressive perspective, who are good at connecting with groups of people, who are articulate, and who have some ability to organize efforts. Martin Kich is the contact at WSU Lake Campus: martin.kich@wright.edu
- **New English Department Publication: Journal: *Best Integrated Writing*;** Senior Lecturer, Scott Geisel, Editor: This new publication may include essays, posters, poems, multi-media projects integrating writing in the Core; Geisel solicited submissions, encouraging faculty to nominate students who have generated extraordinary work, which will serve as working models for all WSU writing students, and which will further enhance our dynamic award-winning curriculum

6. Announcements from Floor:

- **College Readiness:** Dr. Nancy Mack is inviting 1st year college students from Logan County to visit WSU for orientation and recruitment. Dr. Mack is requesting that faculty members nominate model writing students to form a panel, which will both assist in recruitment of Logan Country students and honor WSU students; the event is scheduled for January 24, 2014; “Snow Date”: the following Friday

- **Presidents Day Recruiting Event: “Pathways to Success”:**
Senior Lecturer Cynthia Marshall will lead this initiative on Monday, February 17, 8:30 am-12-30 pm; Marshall communicated the need for faculty “ambassadors” who will escort High School students into “English Immersion” and invite guest students to consider an undergraduate major in English
- **Final Remarks:**
 - Holiday party 2 pm
 - Fall semester grades due: Wednesday, December 18
 - Spring semester begins: January 13
 - FARs due: FIRM deadline: January 15, 2014 for TET and NTE faculty to submit faculty activity reports, workload requests, proposed scholarship plans (if needed), report on last year’s scholarship plan if required. The FAR may be considered the report on scholarship; if faculty do not meet this deadline, the assumption is that they are requesting a standard workload
 - As soon as possible after January 15 and before January 31, copies of all TET FARs, workload requests and proposed scholarship plans should be scanned and sent to Bill Rickert
 - February 28 is the FIRM deadline for workload assignments to be sent to Bill Rickert. This is also the deadline for faculty performance summaries to be sent to COLA.
 - Deadline for candidate to initiate 2014-15 promotion and tenure process via written request to Department Chair with copy to Department PTR Committee: March 24

7. Adjournment : Dr. Barry Milligan moved to adjourn; department members seconded in chorus

Respectfully submitted by Lecturer, Byron J. Crews

December 12, 2013

Graduate Studies Committee
Minutes of meetings 2012-13

Meeting 28 Sept. 2012

Present: Alpana Sharma (presiding), Barry Milligan, Chris Hall, Carol Mejia-La Perle, Crystal Lake, Andrew Strombeck, David Seitz, Rich Bullock

1. Committee discussed and approved the final version of advising form and the advising guidelines for the new MA portfolio.
2. Committee discussed TESOL's proposed option to the MA portfolio revised seminar paper, the Action Research Case Study Option. One member brought up the problem of needing permission for research using human subjects, which required further investigation by director of TESOL, Chris Hall.

Meeting 26 Oct. 2012

Present: Alpana Sharma (presiding), Barry Milligan, Chris Hall, Carol Mejia-La Perle, Crystal Lake, Andrew Strombeck, David Seitz, Rich Bullock

1. Committee discussed having the Research Methods and Materials courses serve as co-requisites for seminar courses in fall of the first year and decided that we would allow for them to count as co-requisites, given the need for students in the first semester of their second year to have some degree of choice of seminar papers to revise.
2. The rubric and scoring system for the introductory essay and the MA revised paper was discussed. It was decided to float drafts of the grading rubric and have the committee vote on a final version via email.
3. Committee discussed Melissa Carrion's petition to have the paper she was currently writing for Lars Söderlund's class approved for her MA revised seminar paper portfolio.
4. Committee decided to have the MA portfolio due on Wed. of the 9th week instead of 10th.

Meeting 6 March 2013

Present: Alpana Sharma (presiding), Barry Milligan, Carol Loranger, Chris Hall, Carol Mejia-La Perle, Crystal Lake, Andrew Strombeck, David Seitz, Rich Bullock, Annika Vorhes (Graduate student representative)

1. After some discussion, the committee voted unanimously to nominate Dani Eller for Outstanding Graduate Student of the Year Award.
2. After further discussion, the committee decided to nominate the following students for Excellence Awards: Darryl Evans (TESOL); Caleb Hildenbrandt (Literature); and Charles Von Nordheim (Composition/Rhetoric).
3. The committee began their review of 35 TA applications; 13 positions were available. After much discussion, weighing the need to balance awards among first- and second-year applicants, the committee made their decision. Splitting their decisions between two meetings (see below), the committee selected

the following among first-year applicants: Lauren Weidenhammer and Tania Dominguez; among second-year applicants: Lucy Flowers, Sarah Kachovec, Angela Pedrotti, and Jarrett Shedd.

Meeting 8 March 2013

Present: Alpana Sharma (presiding), Barry Milligan, Carol Loranger, Chris Hall, Crystal Lake, Andrew Strombeck, David Seitz, Rich Bullock, Annika Vorhes (Graduate student representative)

1. The committee continued their deliberations and made further determinations. Among the remaining first-year TA applicants, the following were selected: Jamal Russell, Erin Glinski, Kylie Kaiser, Alison McNichol, Madison NicholasBell, Tiffany Mitchell, and Penny Sobocinski.
2. It was decided that more discussion needed to be given to a procedure whereby the needs of the Composition program would be balanced by the graduate program's need to hire the best qualified TAs.

Graduate Committee Meeting 9/13/2013

Present: David Seitz, Alpana Sharma, Chris Hall, Barry Milligan, Carol Loranger, Drew Strombeck and a graduate student

Alpana opened the meeting by asking us to evaluate the portfolio process from last spring. Drew said that the portfolio day was great, and that the portfolio papers themselves were more focused and successful than in previous years. Annette also reported being energized by the panels. Carol raised the idea of giving 3050 and 3060 students extra credit for attending. Alpana pointed out that grading the presentation portion was problematic, because it felt like the grading had already been “locked in” at that point. David reported that he and Lars had discussed running a workshop on panel presentations. Carol pointed out that Stac (?) has a rehearsal room for presentations. David also observed that a crop of graduate students were attending 4Cs this year. He also felt that researching journals was an effective task for students.

The committee next took up the issue of writing in the TESOL program. Chris reported that historically, TESOL faculty have emphasized classroom preparedness, building concrete materials. Students in these courses continually revise curriculum and lesson plans, seeking to develop a realistic classroom. While this approach has acknowledged benefits, Chris noted that a lack of outside research has led to a somewhat insular program, where students have to take the faculty’s word regarding their own approaches: TESOL faculty become the final authority on TESOL issues and practices, because students tend to remain unexposed to other viewpoints. Chris noted that some students reach the end of their TESOL MA without doing a seminar.

Drew raised the issue of whether we should have standards or guidelines for what counts as a graduate seminar. David objected that seminar papers don’t always apply to comp rhet’s focus on genres. This led to much discussion about genre and comp rhet. Carol raised the idea that the presence or lack of seminar papers might impact accreditation. Annette asked whether such TESOL research would actually help in a job letter, in terms of helping graduates articulate their teaching strategies. Carol concluded this segment by noting that curriculum belongs to faculty, but not simply to individual programs.

Chris next initiated a discussion of a proposed BA/MA in TESOL. He framed this in terms of recruitment: students don’t know what to do with a TESOL undergrad degree. Barry noted that the 4 + 1 program runs into potential difficulty because of the prereq for 7030, noting that the 4 + 1 structure is popular in Engineering and Science. Senior permission is necessary to keep 7030 as a prereq. Drew raised the issue of whether 3.2 is an adequate GPA for entry into the program, that 3.5 might work better. Carol suggested adding a seminar component for “graduate catch up.” Chris said this might be problematic, but I didn’t write down why. The core issue with having undergrads use 4000 level classes is enforcing that they do graduate work in these courses. Rich proposed having a 4735, which would flag students in the combined program. Rich also asked if these students would be available for a TAship. Carol suggested letting LEAP hire these

students, possibly designating two TAships as ESL, which would also address the changing undergrad population.

Carol then raised the issue of 6 students who haven't completed the program, asking how these students would finish the portfolio. Drew proposed having them take a seminar and then revigin that paper. There's a 7 year window for completing the program, and students will need to petition to have older courses accepted. Language is "meet current portfolio requirements." Barry suggested making policy same as transfer—more than half. Summary: students must complete half of courses in the past seven years at WSU. Graduate director will not support petitions for more than half courses taken elsewhere.

Finally, we discussed a proposal to let Wittenburg students apply 4000 level classes for 6000 credit. No, we said, because we ask our students to do grad level work for 6000 level classes. Instead, senior permission for WB students to take grad seminars.

Minutes: Graduate Faculty Meeting
February 11, 2013. 3:30 pm

Present: Alpana Sharma (presiding), Shengrong Cai, Deborah Crusan, Jim Guthrie, John Haught, Sally Lamping, Carol Loranger, Nancy Mack, Barry Milligan (scribe), Annette Oxindine, David Seitz, Kelli Zaytoun

1. Alpana Sharma (AS) outlined the evaluation process for the new portfolio.
 - a. The first portfolios to follow the new model will be due March 6.
 - b. Jennifer is trying to distribute the evaluation load evenly, as she did with the old portfolio model.
 - c. The portfolio advisor will be one of three readers.
 - d. Portfolios will be evaluated according to a weighted scoring rubric created by the Graduate Studies Committee (copies distributed).
 - e. Faculty will have two weeks to evaluate portfolios.
2. Some faculty members present asked questions and/or voiced specific concerns regarding the portfolio process.
 - a. Chris Hall (CH) noted that the TESOL portfolio does not include an introductory essay, so that portion of the rubric would not be applicable to the TESOL portfolio. The Language Programs Committee will review the rubric and suggest appropriate modifications for the TESOL portfolio.
 - b. Jim Guthrie (JG) asked whether students whose portfolios fail in the first submission will be allowed to submit revisions. AS replied that the revision and resubmission provisions will parallel those that pertained under the previous portfolio model.
 - c. There were several questions about what specific feedback students would see. Some believed students should see only the composite scores from the committee (which will be the score that determines whether a portfolio passes) whereas others thought students should perhaps see individual scores. All present agreed that the advisor should have access to all scores upon request and could choose how to convey to the student any information from the committee.
 - d. There was general discussion about whether there should be more than one level of passing the portfolio. There was consensus in favor of the designations "Pass" (total score of 80-89) and "Pass with distinction" (total score of 90 or above).
3. AS outlined Scholarship Day, which will be held for the first time at the end of spring semester 2013.
 - a. All MA students passing the portfolio this spring will be required to present a version of their portfolio paper as part of a conference-like panel.
 - b. Faculty members will evaluate the presentations according to a second rubric developed by the Graduate Committee (copies distributed).
 - c. There will be two concurrent panels in each of three time slots over the course of Scholarship Day.
 - d. Presenters will be as follows:
 - i. 3 from Lit
 - ii. 3 from TESOL
 - iii. 8 from Comp/Rhet

- iv. 3 from undergraduate Honors
- 4. Some faculty members present asked questions and/or voiced specific concerns regarding the presentation process.
 - a. Questions included the following:
 - i. In the future, how will students who graduate in the fall present their papers if Scholarship Day is held only in the spring?
 - 1. Suggested solutions included inviting fall's graduates back to present in spring (which would not solve the problem of their being required to present in order to graduate) or holding a "mini scholarship day" at the end of fall semester (which might have too few participants to be viable). No permanent solution was adopted.
 - ii. Might the presentation be optional rather than mandatory?
 - 1. There was not clear consensus on this point, but all agreed that faculty should emphasize to students that the opportunity to present is a privilege and a valuable professional experience.
- 5. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

MA PORTFOLIO RUBRIC

MA Candidate: _____

Note: a portfolio may not pass with a) a score of 1 in any single category, b) a score of less than 16 for the introductory essay, c) a score of less than 64 for the revised seminar essay, or d) a total score of less than 80.

	0	3	4	5		Row Subtotal
Introductory Essay (20% of portfolio score)						
Introductory Essay: Mechanics, proofreading, and discipline-appropriate style are in good order					x1	4/5
Introductory Essay: The essay addresses the student's development over the course of the program and places the revised seminar essay into the context of that development					X1	4/5
Introductory Essay: The essay describes the choice of journal to be targeted					x1	4/5
Introductory Essay: The essay describes the process of revision in terms of the challenges that were faced and the strategies that were employed for meeting those challenges					X1	4/5
Must score 16 or better to pass this portion of the portfolio						16/20
INTRODUCTORY ESSAY SUBTOTAL (out of 20 possible points)						

Revised Seminar Essay (80% of portfolio score)						
Revised Seminar Essay: Mechanics, proofreading, and discipline-appropriate style are in good order					x1	4/5
Revised Seminar Essay: The essay has a clear and appropriate thesis and places this thesis in the context of its field					X2	8/10
Revised Seminar Essay: The essay maintains focus upon its thesis and offers discussion and analysis of appropriate examples to support the thesis					X3	12/15
Revised Seminar Essay: The essay cites a selection of sources that is appropriate in both size and scope.					X5	20/25
Revised Seminar Essay: The essay engages its sources appropriately, responding to them and engaging the ongoing scholarly conversation rather than merely repeating their points and appropriately groups and frames arguments of other scholars					X5	20/25
Must score 64 or better to pass this portion of the portfolio						
REVISED SEMINAR ESSAY SUBTOTALS (out of 80 possible points)						64/80
TOTAL PORTFOLIO POINTS (out of 100 possible total): 80 required to pass; 95 or more required to pass "With Distinction"						80/100

KEY: 0 = Missing or Egregious (D or F) 3 = Unacceptable (C) 4 = Good (B) 5 = Excellent (A)

MA PORTFOLIO PAPER PRESENTATION RUBRIC

MA Candidate: _____

Note: Presenter may not pass with a total score of less than 16

	0	3	4	5	Row subtotal
Presenter behaved professionally (e.g., dressed appropriately, was on time, was respectfully attentive to other panelists, dealt with audience questions in a manner that demonstrated precise and thorough knowledge of the subject)					
Presentation covered main points of the essay's argument clearly					
Presenter was organized and engaging (i.e., used eye contact and voice projection throughout and had an appropriate compromise between reading a paper verbatim and speaking with no script)					
Presentation was appropriately paced and completed within the time limit					
PAPER PRESENTATION TOTAL (out of 20 possible points)					

KEY: 0 = Missing or Egregious (D or F) 3 = Unacceptable (C) 4 = Good (B) 5 = Excellent (A)

Common language for writing research papers at the 7000-level:

MA students in English are expected to write research papers at the 7000-level. Research papers should include the following:

- a clear thesis and demonstrated awareness of how that thesis fits within the broader field of study of which it is a part;
- citation, discussion, and analysis of appropriate examples to support the thesis;
- citation of an appropriately broad and deep selection of secondary sources;
- critical engagement of secondary sources, i.e., not simply a summary of sources or use of them in place of the writer's own points, but an extension, refutation, or other meaningful response to sources that locates the writer in an ongoing scholarly conversation about the topic, the author(s), or the text under study;
- evidence of careful editing and proofreading in the proper use of mechanics and discipline-appropriate style.