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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

List all of the program's learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Year of Last Assessment</th>
<th>Year of Next Planned Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Students will respond to a literary text in a way that reflects an awareness of aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach. | 2005-06  
  2007-08  
  2009-10 | 2013-14 |
| 2. Students will write coherent, well-organized essays that establish a clear focus, provide appropriate evidence, and are grammatically correct. | 2006-07  
  2007-08  
  2008-09  
  2009-10  
  2010-11 | 2014-15 |
| 3. Students will conduct appropriate research and synthesize their own original ideas with those advanced by literary critics and other scholars. (Inquiry Outcome) | 2005-06  
  2007-08  
  2008-09  
  2010-11 | 2015-16 |
| 4. Students will demonstrate a thoughtful understanding of their own writing process | 2007-2008 | 2016-17 |
| 5. Students will analyze literary works - in all genres - with respect to structure, style, and theme | 2006-07  
  2008-2009 | 2013-14 |
| 6. Students will demonstrate information and technological literacy in research and competence in MLA documentation. | 2008-2009  
  2009-2010  
  2010-11 | 2014-15 |
7. Students will deliver oral presentations that are focused, well-organized, effective, and establish a connection with the audience.

      2008-09
      2011-12
      2013-14

Students will use technology for research and writing and, for writing track students, to produce well-designed written products

      2004-05
      No longer in use
      Rewritten

Deliver effective oral presentations and, for dramatic arts students, enact scenes with energy, clarity, and rhythmic movement

      2006-2007
      No longer in use
      Rewritten

Communicate ideas in writing in a manner that is logical, well-organized, mechanically correct, and original

      2006-07
      No longer in use
      Rewritten

Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s Mission, Strategic Plan, and relevant school plan:

Our learning outcomes are written to make clear connections between our program and the university’s goals regarding the liberal arts core, writing intensive courses, and student-based inquiry. Our learning outcomes stress the importance of the liberal arts tradition and offer students a foundation for understanding literary arts. We provide student-centered opportunities for intellectual growth through textual analysis and writing. The program’s learning outcomes emphasize critical thinking, effective written communication, scholarly research, and intellectual self-awareness. Outcomes 2 and 4 specifically support the university’s writing intensive initiative, and outcomes 3 and 5 focus on skills needed for the inquiry learning initiative. All outcomes work together to prepare students for either an entry-level professional position that involves research, writing and presentation, or for graduate study in any research and writing based program.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements:

This year, as previously planned, we focused on student skills in literary analysis at the upper-level, and oral presentation at both entry and exit points from the program. This allowed us to assess students’ ability to engage specific literary forms, as well as their ability to present their findings to an audience. We feel that alternating between various groupings of outcomes offers us insight into the multifaceted education of the English major, and gives us time to look more deeply into how students process and are affected by the curriculum. As indicated in our assessment plan for the previous year, we examined oral presentations in particular to see if the strong presentation skills indicated at the 200-level in our 2011-12 report were retained from the beginning to the end of our program. We underwent program review in 2012-13, which means the most recent assessment report with feedback from the UAC was for 2011-12.

We implemented a variety of strategies to increase the level of feedback from and interaction with graduating students and alumni, including moving our MUBlog department page onto MU Commons and disseminating the new link, bolstering our social media presence via Twitter, Facebook and Flickr, and hosting Homecoming events geared to bring alumni and current students together. This approach seems to be working with graduating students, with an increase to 8 respondents, up from 2 respondents the previous report. Alumni numbers held at the previous low level of 3 respondents. We are still working to increase alumni engagement, and we
have solid turnout from a variety of current students and alumni at events like Homecoming and English Night. Alumni seem not to want to respond to surveys, however. Perhaps engaging them through social media or in-person surveys might yield higher response rates.

We have a clear, confidential assessment process that engages all department faculty, so we kept with the basic parameters of our previous assessment process. Papers to be assessed have identifying information removed; syllabi in all classes state that student work may be used for confidential assessment; assessment ratings are put in a database generated by Institutional Assessment; student papers are stored in a google docs folder shared only with tenure-track faculty and with all identifying information removed. Hard copies are printed only on request and shredded after evaluation. Assessment reports are stored on the Marymount S:\ drive and the department chair's Marymount computer in a clearly labeled assessment folder.

Each year we examine a cluster of learning outcomes to determine how various aspects of our program are impacting student learning goals. This year the department assessed both student papers and presentations, with a focus on students' knowledge of literary context, structure, and themes, and their ability to communicate research findings orally. We rated 15 papers from EN 424, our Senior Seminar, which we regularly assess to gauge the skills of outgoing seniors. We rated oral presentations in both EN 200 (our “gateway” course, which is usually taken in the second semester of the freshman year or first semester sophomore year) and also in EN 424 to see potential areas of growth between freshman and senior years.

To assess presentations, department members were invited to final class presentation sessions. Faculty were given an assessment rubric that we had discussed previously in a department meeting, and asked to submit the sheet after seeing presentations. For the two outcomes that assessed written products, the professor of EN 424 gathered papers in electronic form, removed identifying information, and shared the papers with full-time, tenure-track members of the department via googledocs, along with an online rating survey listing outcomes and score ranges. The professor for the course, who had graded the papers and thus knew the student identities, was not part of the rating process.

Each paper and presentation had a minimum of 2 readers. Faculty received assessment rubrics to evaluate individual papers and presentations, and we discussed standards and expectations at a department meeting prior to rating. Scores were tabulated on online surveys provided by Institutional Effectiveness. We kept a model of evaluation from previous years which uses a 5 point scale on which 1 = fails to meet criteria; 3 = meets criteria; and 5 = exceeds criteria. We agreed that a rating of 2.5-3.4 in the statistical tables provided to us by Institutional Effectiveness would indicate the basic minimum expectation of proficiency; 4.5-5 would represent true fluency. Scores falling below 2.4 merit discussion, and any categories in which papers were consistently scoring 1.4 or lower would be seen as problem areas to address.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:
Our department rotates our assessment of outcomes in clusters that show us various aspects of the program each year. Because of this, we do not re-evaluate each outcome each year, particularly if overall assessment reflects that the outcome is being achieved. Holistic planned improvements in our assessment process appear below this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Planned Improvement</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome 3:</strong> Students will conduct appropriate research and synthesize their own original ideas with those advanced by literary critics and other scholars. (Inquiry Outcome) <strong>Overall Mean Rating:</strong> 3.23</td>
<td>This outcome rated highly, and our goals are to encourage students to excel even at the highest levels in research skills. In 2015-16, we will look at this outcome at the 400 level to make sure that students in our curriculum work their way toward competency or even fluency at the highest levels in this outcome.</td>
<td>While we did not re-examine this outcome in 2013-14, Outcomes 1 and 7 also ask students to interpret texts and articulate their findings, although neither outcome focuses on research and source use specifically. We looked at these outcomes at the 400-level to ensure that students are sustaining high-quality work from entry to exit in the program. We will re-examine this specific research outcome in 2015-16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome 4:</strong> Students will demonstrate a thoughtful understanding of their own writing process <strong>Overall Mean rating of 2.93</strong></td>
<td>Only one subcategory of this outcome in one class had any ratings below 2.5, and after discussion, we decided this reflected a poor choice of assessment sample in one course. In 2016-17 when we reassess this outcome, we will be sure to choose a work product that asks students to meet all subcategories of the outcome, or adjust the rubric to address only the overview outcome of knowledge of writing process.</td>
<td>This outcome was not assessed in 2013-14, since we were looking at research essays and presentations, not process-oriented reflection papers. We will reassess this outcome again in 2016-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome 7:</strong> Students will deliver oral presentations that are focused, well-organized, effective, and establish a connection with the audience. <strong>Overall Mean rating: 3.06</strong> (average score of both 200-level courses, all subtopics of outcome)</td>
<td>This outcome assessed very well, with an overall <strong>Mean rating ranges in 2011-12 from 2.74 to 2.95</strong> in 3 subcategories from courses at the entry level. We agreed to assess this outcome at both entry and exit points this year.</td>
<td>Faculty assessed 8 presentations in EN 200 and 12 presentations in EN 424 in 2013-14. Department members attended final class presentation sessions. Faculty were given an assessment rubric previously discussed in a department meeting, and asked to submit the sheet after presentations. Ratings were then</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Plan Improvements by the department *(italics denote responses to goals enacted in 2013-14):*

#1: The department will assess three learning outcomes that relate to literary research and knowledge, as well as presentation skills. Outcomes 1, 5 and 7 will be examined, looking particularly at upper-level courses for presentation skills. *We followed this plan for 2013-14 assessment.*

#2 The department will continue to try to involve all faculty in phases of assessment, and maximize the number of faculty who attend and assess oral presentations. *We continued to involve all tenure-track faculty in our assessment process, with at least 2 faculty members evaluating written work from EN 424, an average of 5-6 faculty members evaluating each EN 200 presentation, and 2-3 faculty members evaluating each Senior Seminar presentation.*

#3 The department will continue to work to build stronger ties with alumni in order to increase the response rate to surveys. We will reach out to majors while they are still on campus through workshops with the Career Center in particular, since one alumnum indicated a greater need in this area. Our goal is to have a seamless transition between the student experience while at MU and the alumni experience after graduation. *We have enhanced our social media and web presence, scheduled events with alumni and the Career Center, and continue to work to get response rates up on alumni surveys. We had only 3 alumni respondents to surveys in 2013-14, but the graduating student survey indicates that our outreach efforts are working, since we had 8 graduating respondents (about 53% participation from our graduating class). 66% of respondents found our program effective at finding them appropriate employment; 100% of responding graduates were employed within 6 months of graduation; 2/3 of responding graduates were accepted into a graduate program and pursued graduate study (they are working while going part-time to graduate MA and PhD programs). 75% of our graduating students feel prepared to find a job in their field; 87.5% of graduating students feel prepared to apply to an appropriate graduate program. Our program averages in these areas exceed university averages in this category by 15-20%, a remarkable fact considering we are not identified as a pre-professional program.*

Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report: *(List each recommendation and provide a specific response to each).*
The department was very pleased with our last assessment process and report, as we have been for several years. We met expectations in all critical areas and few recommendations were made. Since we went through a program review last year, our most recent assessment response from UAC came with our 2011-12 report (see appendix). The comments were positive, suggesting that we continue an assessment process that serves as "a model for other programs." It was also suggested that we explain from where papers were retrieved, so I have stipulated in this report that the papers are collected by the course instructor, identifying information is removed, and then papers are placed in a shared departmental google doc folder for review.

**Outcome and Past Assessment**

**Learning Outcome 1:** Students will respond to a literary text in a way that reflects an awareness of aesthetic values, historical context, ideological orientation, and critical approach. **Mean Rating: 3.6**

Is this outcome being reexamined? X Yes □ No

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

This outcome was assessed previously in 2008-09 and 2009-10. The previous overall mean rating in this outcome was 3.18 in 2008-09 and 3.09 in 2009-10, but that reflected a sampling of papers in 200 and 300 level courses, as well as in 424 Senior Seminar. Therefore, we would expect that the mean rating this year, when we looked only at senior papers, would be higher than in previous years. Student papers have been consistently highly rated in this area, but this year’s ratings represent an impressive level of proficiency, with no papers falling in either of the two lowest categories. This reflects a strong senior class, and we can’t expect this level of uniform proficiency in all future senior seminars, but it certainly reflects a program that consistently meets its goals in this Learning Outcome. We would like to see more students achieve the highest level of fluency in this category, and we suspect that encouraging promising students to present their research publicly and to engage in undergraduate research at earlier stages in their career might support that goal. We have changed the teaching rotation of Senior Seminar to ensure that several faculty rotate through the course, rather than having a single faculty member dedicated to this course. That seems to be helping the quality of instruction by encouraging broader conversations about how best to engage students in sustained undergraduate research projects.

### Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure:</strong> 15 papers from EN 424, Senior Seminar, rated by</td>
<td>A rating of &quot;meets criteria&quot; on the relevant section of the Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>EN 424 is required of all majors in the literature track. All students in the</td>
<td>1. Multiple readers assessed papers from EN 424, with a minimum of two readers per paper. Readers used the same assessment rubric for all papers to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interpretation of Results**

**Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):**

Direct and indirect measures indicate this outcome is a strength of our program. While analysis of a literary text may seem like a narrow skill, it in fact represents a set of critical thinking and communication skills working together in a given context. That graduating students and alumni feel confident in their ability to read, decipher, and respond to a broad variety of source material in a given professional or cultural context reflects positively on this outcome. Even more clearly, the assessment of student work in this outcome has been very high for over 5 years, indicating that the curriculum serves to develop this learning outcome adequately.
Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:
Our process is working well, and we plan to maintain the process rather than adjust it. We will continue to use an online evaluation rubric to compile data on this outcome, examining different clusters of products every few years to ensure we are moving toward fluency between program entry and exit.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:
We will continue to review senior seminar papers each year as a department, even if they are not being assessed for this specific outcome. We will continue to keep all faculty involved in the assessment process, and we will continue to rotate various faculty members through the instructional role in EN 424 Senior Seminar in order to maintain the department’s sense of ownership and involvement in this outcome in particular.

Outcome and Past Assessment
Learning Outcome #5 (second examined in 2013-14): Students will analyze literary works - in all genres - with respect to structure, style, and theme. **Mean Rating: 3.49**

Is this outcome being reexamined?  □ Yes  X No
If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

This outcome was last examined in 2008-09, so our program has undergone significant revision since its last assessment, including the implementation of WI courses and 400-level topics courses. The 2008-09 report reflects that faculty were pleased with the results of this outcome and made no changes with a mean rating 3.18; however they studied a broad range of papers from 200, 300 and 400 level courses, whereas we only examined exit papers from EN 424 Senior Seminar. As with the previous outcome, we would expect a higher mean rating when examining this outcome relative only to senior seminar papers. We were pleased with the results overall, although one paper fell into the second lowest category, falling in the 1.5-2.4 category. The majority of papers fell within the acceptable 2.5-4.4 rating area, and one paper achieved fluency in this area, scoring 4.5 and above. We would like to see 10% of the seminar (1 or 2 students) achieve the highest level of fluency, and we would ideally like to ensure that no paper in senior seminar falls below the 2.5 range. However, variability of students and their own learning goals may prevent us from getting everyone to achieve at desired levels. As with Outcome 1, we think encouraging students to present research publicly might help them attain the highest skill level.

Assessment Activity
### Outcome Measures
Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.

### Performance Standard
Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.

### Data Collection
Discuss the data collected and student population.

### Analysis
1) Describe the analysis process.
2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.

#### Direct Measure: 15 papers from EN 424, Senior Seminar, rated by multiple faculty with a shared rubric (See Appendix)
A rating of "meets criteria" on the relevant section of the Outcomes Assessment Criteria form, divided into 2 subtopics:
- The paper demonstrates awareness of the genre of literature it studies.
- The paper recognizes conventions of form (narrator, technique, imagery, etc.), when appropriate, in establishing its argument.
A rating of "meets criteria" on the relevant section of the Outcomes Assessment Criteria form (Mean score of 2.5 or above)
1. Multiple readers assessed papers from EN 424 with a minimum of two readers per paper. Readers used the same assessment rubric for all papers to ensure uniform criteria.
2. Only one paper scored below a 2.5 rating, and it fell into the 1.5-2.4 range. One paper met the highest criteria. Faculty have high expectations for senior seminar papers, and the ratings this year represent an increase in the number of students achieving an acceptable level in this outcome.

Results represent an increase in proficiency from prior years, and a generally acceptable level of student performance.

#### Indirect: acceptance of graduates and alumni to graduate programs and confidence in preparedness as shown on alumni and graduating student surveys. (See Appendix)
Reports of over 50% satisfaction and exceeding the overall student satisfaction average for A&S alumni and graduating students. Survey responses from 3 alumni and 9 graduating students. Data reports supplied by Institutional Effectiveness.
Alumni note in our supplemental survey questions (prepared in conjunction with alumni/graduating student surveys) that they are attaining jobs in their fields, are confident in research skills, and are gaining admission to graduate programs in their field of interest. Our satisfaction averages consistently exceed the School of A&S satisfaction in preparation and skills, and students are particularly comfortable in areas addressing research and analysis (87-100% satisfaction). Specific competence in locating sources of information and applying knowledge and skills are at 100% satisfaction among graduating students and alumni.

### Interpretation of Results
Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results)*:

The vast majority of our students feel confident in their analytical skills and produce work that is deemed proficient by faculty and prospective employers or graduate programs. One alumni respondent rated his/her overall academic experience below the good or excellent range, but then rated the specific skills developed in the program very highly. We suspect the career aspirations for this individual may have been a bad match for the major itself, particularly since advising was also rated in a low category by this respondent. The learning outcome itself seems to have been achieved overall, by both the group and this individual, however.

**Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:**

Our program produces competent, marketable graduates, and we will continue to build on strategies for success that have had impact, such as encouraging students to present their research publicly beyond the confines of the classroom. In addition, we will continue to review senior seminar papers each year as a department in order to discuss how we are preparing our graduates.

**Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:**

We have already discussed as a department the need to focus students on senior seminar projects that involve in-depth research and offer structure as well as opportunities for personal expression and engagement. Creating a strong framework within which to engage in literary analysis allows students to tailor their research skills to their own interests, and thus to produce projects that meaningfully engage them. Based on one alumni response that indicated dissatisfaction, advisors will continue to reach out to students who aren't succeeding in the program.

**Outcome and Past Assessment**

**Learning Outcome 7:** Students will deliver oral presentations that are focused, well-organized, effective, and establish a connection with the audience. **Overall Mean rating: 3.02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Mean Ratings 1</th>
<th>Mean Ratings 2</th>
<th>Mean Ratings 3</th>
<th>Mean Ratings 4</th>
<th>Overall Mean Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN 200</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 424</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this outcome being reexamined?  X Yes  ☐ No
If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.
This outcome was also last analyzed in 2011-12, and is a traditional strength of our program in terms of outcomes assessment. This year we assessed presentations at the entrance and exit levels from our program, and saw significant improvements in several subtopics of this outcome between the start and end of the program. Our faculty fully participated in the evaluation of this outcome, with at least 5 faculty attending each set of course presentations for EN 200 and at least 2 rating presentations for EN 424. Mean ratings in categories in 2011-12 were as follows for EN 200:

| EN 200 2011-12 Mean Rating | 2.74 | 2.83 | 2.80 | 2.95 |

Between 2011-12 and 2013-14, the overall Mean average held steady (3.06 vs. 3.02). There were significant gains in the areas of developing clear objectives and clear understanding of subject matter in presentations at the 200-level (up to 2.96 from 2.74 and 3.15 from 2.8), while the other 2 categories maintained levels from 2011-12. All levels evaluated scored above the 2.5 range, reflecting acceptable competency.

We didn’t assess the senior presentations in 2011-12, so there’s no direct correlation with this year’s assessment at the exit level of our program. However, we are pleased that the senior presentations seemed adequate at all levels, and excelled in clarity of purpose and poise. Effective organization of content seems to be a perennial challenge to students, so we will continue to work on ways to enhance student strategies for organizing information in order to deliver findings to an audience. We suspect that the slight decline in the area of clarity of understanding of subject matter between freshman and senior year relates to the more complex theses of senior seminar papers and the higher expectations of faculty rating the presentations. Seniors excel in areas of polished confidence of the presentation while finding the organization of complex material to be a challenge.

Presentation skills are key to our discipline because research findings are often first presented orally at academic conferences. We have had good experiences getting our students to present in public venues like the Student Research Conference and regional undergraduate conferences, and public presentations support our students’ high rates of success in pursuing graduate education and research-oriented professions. In addition, oral presentation skills are frequently a key indicator of success in internship and job placement, and internship supervisors often cite oral presentation skills in tandem with research skills as a key area of strength in our interns.

**Assessment Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Standard</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 presentations in EN 200 and 12 presentations in EN 424 rated by a minimum of 2 and maximum of 6 full-time, tenure, track professors. A rating of “meets criteria” on the relevant section of the Outcomes Assessment Criteria form, with the minimum goal of a mean score of 2.5 or above in any of the 4 subcategories assessed:
- The presentation identifies clear purpose/objectives.
- Content is well organized and effectively presented.
- Speaker demonstrates a clear understanding of the subject.
- Speaker is poised, articulate, and audible, and establishes a connection with the audience.
Both courses consist of English majors and minors only. EN 220 is usually taken in the freshman or sophomore year; EN 424 is usually taken in fall of senior year. Professors rated 8 presentations in EN 200 and 12 in EN 424 during in-class final presentations. Raters were provided with standardized rating sheets that they submitted at the end of the session. Results were entered into an online survey from Institutional Effectiveness.

| Indirect: confidence in presentation skills as shown on alumni and graduating student surveys. Job placement of graduating students. Student conference presentations. | Satisfaction above 50% from alumni/graduating student surveys | Survey responses from 3 alumni and 9 graduating students. Data reports supplied by institutional assessment. | 1. Multiple faculty assessed presentations from EN 200 and 424 with a minimum of two faculty assessing each presentation. Faculty used the same assessment rubric for all papers to ensure uniform criteria.  
2. No category fell below 2.5 in the mean score, indicating that students are meeting this learning objective at both the freshman and senior levels. Students get more adept in the areas of setting clear presentation objectives and developing a sense of audience between freshman and senior year. Students struggle most to develop a sense of content mastery of their subject matter at the senior level, perhaps because the subject at that level is complex and multifaceted.  
75% of graduating students and 66.7% of Alumni felt confident in oral presentation skills. Internship supervisors reported during site visits and interviews that students were well prepared to present work orally, although confidence was cited as a potential area for improvement in two cases. One student was offered a job from her internship, in part because of strong communication skills overall. Undergraduate students presented research this year the Comparative Drama Conference in Baltimore, the Virginia Humanities Conference, the Mid-Atlantic Writing Centers Association, and Marymount’s own Student Research conference. |
Indirect: Internship supervisor evaluations and feedback.

| Ratings of Good or Excellent from Internship supervisors | Supervisor feedback provided by Career Services for Spring/Summer 2014 interns | The supervisor feedback form changed this year, since we are now using the MUJobs4Saints software. Since this software wasn’t used for Fall 2013, only the spring/summer internships are included in the appendices. Students were rated highly overall in oral presentation skills. One student received a job after graduation from her internship site. |

Interpretation of Results

**Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students** *(Use both direct and indirect measure results)*:

Students are regarded as delivering competent oral presentations at both the entry and exit levels of our program. The majority of alumni feel confident in oral presentation skills as well. Senior students seem to struggle with how best to formulate a structure within which to present complex information, but have greater confidence and poise than entry-level students. Students are succeeding at getting papers accepted to conferences for presentation. Overall, alumni and graduating students feel competent in this area.

**Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome**:

Our most motivated students are presenting their research at student conferences, regional professional conferences, and in rare occasions at national professional conferences. This is a program strength, but also an opportunity to encourage more students to take advantage of local and regional chances to present at conferences. We also need to continue to work with students at the 400-level on strategies for presenting complex material to an audience in a concise manner.

**Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome**:

Overall, program performance is strong in this outcome. However, as a department, we will discuss specific strategies for supporting students in their presentation skills at the senior level in particular. Ideas might include adding a specific session on presentation preparation in Senior Seminar, directing students to our MU Commons department site to see opportunities for upcoming conferences, and providing direct outreach through advisors in terms of submitting student work to appropriate conferences.

*A complete student learning assessment report includes appendix of rubrics, survey questions, or other relevant documents and information.*