

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: English and the Humanities (MA)

SUBMITTED BY: Marguerite Rippy, Director of MA program in English and Humanities

DATE: 10/5/2018

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED: In Assessment/Graduate Program folder within Literature and Languages, Box folder. <https://marymount.app.box.com/folder/41739443262>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog:

Marymount's Master of Arts in English and Humanities is a flexible, student-centered, interdisciplinary program of study that immerses students in the unique cultural resources and opportunities of the Washington, DC, area while deepening their understanding of the human condition. Graduate study in the humanities enhances historical consciousness, fosters clear and critical thinking, and hones writing and presentational skills. The program's small seminar classes engage students with the world of ideas through close textual study, individual research, and classroom discussion.

The MA program in English and Humanities prepares students for an array of academic and alternative academic futures. The program prepares students for further advanced study and entry into competitive doctoral programs; for career development or advancement in secondary and community college teaching; or for master's-level careers invested in research, writing, editing, and the nonprofit sector.

This program requires the completion of 33 credit hours of coursework. Students can elect to cap their coursework with either a thesis or an internship practicum. Students planning to pursue advanced work in a doctoral program are encouraged to complete a thesis, which requires an oral defense, while those seeking professional enhancement and/or a career change are encouraged to complete an internship practicum, which also requires public presentation. Degree-seeking students in the English and Humanities MA program are also eligible to pursue the Teaching English at the Community College (TECC) graduate certificate jointly.

The MA program allows students to build their course of study in one of three tracks:

- In the literature track, students engage with and analyze texts from a variety of theoretical perspectives. Literary study enhances cultural awareness and aesthetic appreciation, fosters sensitivity and mental suppleness through the consideration of multiple viewpoints, and encourages critical thinking.
- In the language and composition track, an emphasis is placed on linguistic and rhetorical study, with a practical edge. This course of study heightens understanding of the theoretical and practical aspects of language and perfects students' abilities to critique and improve their own writing in light of its purpose and audience.
- In the humanities track, students engage in humanistic inquiry from a variety of disciplinary perspectives suited to their interests and professional needs, including history and politics, the history of art and architecture, philosophy, literature, and comparative religion.

Upon successful completion of this program, students will be able to

- write and create substantial academic papers and projects in which they analyze source material, develop original arguments, and demonstrate clarity, organization, grace of expression, and audience awareness;
 - analyze source material with informed consideration of its historical, cultural, critical and/or theoretical context;
 - deliver professional and engaging oral presentations of their academic work that focus on their arguments and ideas, and that show thorough research and preparation; and
- fully acknowledge the use of all forms of intellectual property.

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

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
1.) Students will write and create substantial academic papers and projects in which they analyze source material and develop original arguments.	2016-17	X	2019-20*
2.) Students will demonstrate clarity, organization, grace of expression, and audience awareness.	2009; 2012; 2015	X	2021-22*
3.) Students will analyze source material with informed consideration of its historical, cultural, critical and/or theoretical context.	2008, 2010; 2014; 2016		2018-19*
4.) Students will deliver professional and engaging oral presentations of their academic work that focus on their arguments and ideas, and that show thorough research and preparation.	2012; 2016		2018-19*
5.) Students will fully acknowledge the use of all forms of intellectual property.	2016-17		2019-20*

****Year of next planned assessment reflects program request to move to two-year reporting cycle, including scheduled Program Review in 2019-20.***

6.) Students will evaluate pedagogical theories and research.**	2013 (Spring 2014) (as TECC Outcome 2), 2015		N/A
7.) Students will apply pedagogical theories and research to college teaching practices.**	(as TECC Outcome 1), 2016		N/A

***** Learning Outcomes 6 and 7 were specific to the Teaching English at Community College certificate when it was offered separately from the MA. The certificate is no longer assessed separately from the program.***

Describe briefly how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan *(generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points):*

Graduate Studies in English and Humanities fosters academic excellence in the liberal arts and helps to prepare students for master’s-level careers in fields such as academia, publishing, communications, grant/professional writing, government, and the non-profit sector. The Master of Arts degree in English and Humanities may be paired with an accompanying certificate in Teaching English at Community Colleges.

Our student learning outcomes measure students' abilities to think critically, contextually and originally; to analyze sources thoroughly; to research and document source use fully; to present ideas succinctly and clearly; and to argue persuasively—both in writing and in speech. These outcomes relate directly to Marymount's mission to emphasize academic excellence and scholarship within the liberal arts tradition. The Graduate English and Humanities learning outcomes focus on mastering the practical professional skills of reading, analyzing, researching, writing, and speaking; therefore, the outcomes also support the University's dedication to providing learning opportunities that will aid students in career preparation and professional development. We measure our commitment to diversity not only in our curricula development but also in our adherence to the standard expressed in our measurable outcomes that our students approach the subjects that they study contextually, thoroughly, and via multiple perspectives; we demonstrate our commitment to ethical intellectual process in the importance we give to assessing our students' mastery of documentation practices.

Our assessment practices support Marymount's strategic plan even in the types of documents that we use to measure student learning outcomes. These include substantial student writing projects during the latter part of the degree (between 15-50 pages of sustained master's-level, argument-driven, research-informed writing) and entry level course materials gathered in EN 501. This allows us to gauge progress toward learning outcomes as well as satisfaction of outcomes in the capstone projects. Thesis and practicum presentations are attended by faculty, friends, family, and the larger community. Students are encouraged to submit their research to academic conferences, and public presentation of research is an indirect measure of outcomes. In the past, students have shared their work at the Student Research Conference, the Virginia Humanities Conference, and the national subject-area conferences.

In addition to the University's mission and strategic plan, our student learning outcomes support several specific aspects of the School of Design, Arts, and Humanities (formerly Arts and Sciences) strategic plan. Our outcomes hold students to standards of subject mastery and informed consideration of historical, cultural, and critical contexts; we support the use of resources in the local Washington D.C. area and emphasize interdisciplinarity and creativity.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements to the process, and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment (*generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points*):

Papers were gathered from two courses (EN 501: Building Textual Interpretation and TRS 565: Violence, Peacemaking, and Religion), along with the two Master's theses completed in Spring 2018. A link to a google folder with assessment materials, with identifying information of students removed, was sent to all full-time, tenure-track faculty members in the department and to the professor who taught TRS 565, in order to get full participation of all faculty who taught in the program in AY 2017-18. A separate link to a Qualtrics assessment tool prepared by Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) in consultation with the Graduate Director was included with the link to materials, and faculty were assigned to review groups of materials. Faculty were given two weeks to review assigned materials, with at least two faculty raters for each paper.

The Qualtrics assessment instrument was an electronic form provided by Institutional Effectiveness. As in previous years, the form contains a 1-5 scale, where:

- 1 = fulfills the outcome inadequately
- 3 = fulfills the outcome adequately
- 5 = fulfills the outcome systematically, at a sophisticated level (Appendix E).

A strength of our assessment process is the participation of many raters and the ability to gauge student outcomes between entry level and capstone moments. This improves the reliability of the data reporting. It also reflects the culture of continuous assessment in the department. As a group, we participate in an ongoing conversation about assessment standards at monthly department meetings, resulting in a solid understanding of the overall assessment process of the program. At the October meeting of each year, the director discusses the year's report with department faculty and proposes materials to be collected for the next year's assessment.

The weakness of our process is that it is time-consuming. It can be complex to organize faculty and materials for both undergraduate and graduate programs on different cycles. In addition, it represents significant faculty time commitment. This is one reason why the graduate program would like to move to an every-other-year assessment process.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
<p>1. Students will write and create substantial academic papers and projects in which they analyze source material and develop original arguments.</p>	<p>The outcomes will be discussed twice with the English faculty – once in the fall and once in the spring – focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examining reasons for scoring discrepancies in papers with a scoring range greater than 1. • Strengthening our shared understanding of assessment norms. <p>I would also like to add a comment option to the rubric next year. This would allow raters to share their reason for assigning scores, particularly scores at the extreme ends of the scale, which would, in turn, aid in the interpretation of data.</p>	<p>Learning Outcomes and assessment processes were discussed twice as a department. First, at our September 6, 2017 meeting, planned improvements and the overall assessment findings and process were specifically discussed. At our department’s October 4, 2017 meeting the graduate program learning outcomes were discussed as part of a general conversation regarding transferrable skills in the undergraduate and graduate programs.</p> <p>In Spring 2018 we had two full-day department retreats to review curricula for both the undergraduate and graduate programs in preparation for next year’s program review.</p> <p>Some ideas for making the importance of this outcome more immediately apparent to students included fostering more presentation of student research at campus and local conferences to stress the critical importance of meaningful engagement with source material in substantive projects.</p> <p>As planned, the incoming graduate director implemented the Comments section on this year’s assessment rubric as of July 2018.</p>
<p>5. Students will fully acknowledge the use of all forms of intellectual property.</p>	<p>The outcomes will be discussed twice with the English faculty – once in the fall and once in the spring – focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examining reasons for scoring discrepancies in the single paper with a scoring range greater than 1. 	<p>Learning Outcomes and assessment processes were discussed twice as a department. First, at our September 6, 2017 meeting, planned improvements and the overall assessment findings and process were specifically discussed. At our department’s October 4, 2017 meeting the graduate program learning outcomes</p>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examining reasons for the lack of any paper being rated a 5 in the advanced course. Exploring possible strategies for raising students' proficiencies in advanced courses based on the discussion of the previous bullet point. <p>As I stated under the first outcome, I would also like to add a comment option to the rubric next year. This would allow raters to share their reason for assigning scores, particularly scores at the extreme ends of the scale, which would, in turn, aid in the interpretation of data.</p>	<p>were discussed as part of a general conversation regarding transferrable skills in the undergraduate and graduate programs.</p> <p>In Spring 2018 we had two full-day department retreats to review curricula for both the undergraduate and graduate programs in preparation for next year's program review.</p> <p>This learning outcome was discussed as essential to Outcome 1. If students are able to engage with sources substantively, they will be able to recognize the various forms of intellectual property clearly as well. Depending on findings of Program Review in 2019-20, we might integrate this learning outcome into outcome #1.</p> <p>As planned, the incoming graduate director implemented the Comments section on this year's assessment rubric as of July 1, 2018.</p>

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:

Comment: All areas not marked as exemplary or acceptable are addressed below. A revised report was submitted on December 2017 that included a copy of the Qualtrics assessment tool.

Executive Summary: Marked exemplary;

Implemented Improvements: Marked Acceptable

Outcomes: Marked Acceptable, *but more use of Bloom's taxonomy in outcomes was suggested.*

Program Response, regarding Planned Improvements: *We are planning a fairly substantive revision to our Outcomes during our 2019-20 Program Review, and will consider using Bloom's Taxonomy to help structure new Outcomes.*

Assessment Measures and Targets: Marked Developing

Comments: The direct measures are great but there are no targets/benchmarks. What is the "form"? Is this a rubric? Is the rubric tied to the outcome so that conclusions can be drawn? For both Outcome #1 and #5, include a target for the graduating student survey. What would indicate endorsement?

Program Response: *A revised report was submitted on December 2017 that included a copy of the Qualtrics assessment tool.*

Analysis of Results and Implications: Marked Developing

Comments: This section is problematic since you do not have performance targets set. The “endorsement” numbers are not reported, although you do discuss them in the interpretation. Data collection is vague.

Program Response: A revised report was submitted on December 2017 that included a copy of the Qualtrics assessment tool, which clarified data collection process and scale. This year’s report includes specific performance targets based on consultation with the department and coordination with the undergraduate program.

Use of Assessment to Improve Effectiveness: Marked acceptable

Outcomes Assessment 2017-2018

Learning Outcome 1:

Program Outcome 1: Students will write and create substantial academic papers and projects in which they analyze source material and develop original arguments.

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>Direct measure: 14 student papers (7 graduate seminar papers from TRS 565 and 7 from EN 501) were collected, along with and 2 theses. 501 papers were assessed only for discussion, since fulfillment of this outcome is not expected in the entry course. Materials were rated by all full-time, tenure-track faculty in the Literature and Languages department and the one faculty member outside the department who taught in the program. Faculty used a shared rubric made available via Qualtrics link. (Appendix E)</p> <p>EN 501 is a foundational course required for all students, so data from its assessment was excluded from this report since we don’t expect students to</p>	<p>The form uses five levels of measurement, from 1-5, with a rating of "1" equivalent to "fails to meet criteria" and 5 equivalent to “exceeds criteria” (Appendix E)</p> <p>Faculty were asked to add a comment regarding any paper that fell below a 3.</p> <p>The department target is for at least 90% of capstone/thesis product ratings to meet or exceed the 2.5-3.4 “meets criteria” range.</p> <p>Overall mean ratings of all products should not fall below 2.5.</p> <p>For non-thesis courses, 75% of ratings in any course should</p>	<p>The 7 papers rated for the assessment were collected from TRS 565 (EN 501 was assessed for the purposes of discussion only on this standard). Theses were collected by the Program Director.</p> <p>The Program Director worked with PIE to create the Qualtrics survey tool; PIE compiled data and provided official reports (Appendices A, E).</p> <p>EN 501 is a foundational course required for all students, so data from its assessment was excluded from this report since we don’t expect students to meet this outcome upon entry to the program.</p> <p>TRS 565 consists of students in all stages of the degree; the thesis is</p>	<p>1. The program director reviewed all data provided by PIE; discussed the assessment process at the May 2018 department retreats and again at the September 2018 department meeting, and reviewed findings at the October 2018 department meetings.</p> <p>The program director compiled the report and worked with PIE to create tables with mean scores for each course that was assessed, as well as to pull out the mean scores for EN 501 on Outcome 1 since this is an entry-level course (Appendix A).</p> <p>2. The assessment protocol was effective in that twelve faculty reviewed assigned work (7 papers from 2 courses; 2 theses) and no assessment product had fewer than 2 reviewers. The addition of comments was helpful. In one case, the program director had to request feedback on a product after the survey had closed, but all other products rated below a “3” received explanatory comments.</p> <p>The capstone thesis projects were rated highly in this category and clearly met the outcome standard, with the mean being 3.75. The mean of 2.92 in the combined total assessment of TRS 565 and thesis is acceptable. Nevertheless, we will discuss</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>meet this outcome upon entry to the program.</p> <p>TRS 565 is a humanities course in theology and religious studies; usually it would be taken in the early to mid-stage of the program. The two theses represent capstone work.</p>	<p>meet or exceed the “meets criteria” range of 2.5 to 3.4.</p>	<p>the written capstone project for the degree.</p>	<p>it as a department at our October 2018 meeting, because 14.3% of ratings fell in the 1.5-2.4 range, indicating the work did not meet outcome standards.</p> <p>When reviewing TRS 565 products separately from the theses, the overall mean rating is 2.76, which barely meets our target. In addition, no paper merited an average rating in the top two tiers. Looking at raw data, one low-rated paper may represent a student who is struggling to meet program standards. Faculty comments indicated that sources were not utilized in a way that allowed for an original argument, and that the logic of the paper was scattered at best. The overall 2.76 average ratings may also suggest a difficulty with faculty rating a product from outside their discipline. At our meeting we will discuss how to agree on a consistent standard by which to evaluate products from other humanities disciplines.</p> <p>In particular, the terms “analyze source material” and “original argument” seemed to resonate differently for faculty when not applied to literature, as indicated by individual comments on the survey. In the future, it would probably be best to have faculty from the Humanities discipline in which the course is taught assess the paper, or to have them discuss in advance with raters how to interpret these terms in another discipline.</p>
<p>Direct measures: Results from the 2017 Alumni Data and 2016 English and Humanities Supplemental Report; Graduating Students Survey (2016-17; no report produced for 2017-18 with only 2 graduates*) and Alumni Data (Appendix B-D)</p> <p>Indirect measures: acceptance to peer reviewed conferences or</p>	<p>Above 50% satisfaction rate in related areas on alumni and graduating student surveys.</p> <p>Acceptance to peer reviewed conferences or publications</p> <p>Academic awards for student scholarship.</p>	<p>PIE provided data for all direct measures (Appendix A-D); conference acceptances were tracked by the program director as part of the process of awarding the Hoare travel award.</p>	<p>1. The program director reviewed all data provided by PIE; discussed the assessment process at the May 2018 department retreats and again at the September 2018 department meeting; and reviewed findings at the October 2018 department meeting.</p> <p>The program director compiled the report and worked with PIE to collect all the direct measure surveys. The program director gathered information on presentations from the prior department chair and other faculty members.</p> <p>2. All 5 responding alumni were in 100% agreement that the program prepares them very well in the fields of research and</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
publications; academic awards for student scholarship.			<p>writing, which are key to this outcome. Feedback on the overall experience is positive with 80% of alumni in the 2017 survey praising their overall experience and academic quality of the program. Lower ratings were given to advising and Marymount’s academic reputation, which could be seen as related to guiding students into appropriate areas in which to work on substantial research projects. This year we are working to streamline the advising language in the catalog, the curriculum advising sheets, and MyMUPlan. We have put forward a proposal to the Graduate Studies Committee to revise language in these documents to make advising much clearer for students. No area, however, fell below 60% of alumni rating the program as Good or Excellent.</p> <p>The 4 respondents on the Supplemental Report similarly cite improved reading, writing, and analytical skills as a strength of the program, and single out faculty interaction and skill as a hallmark of the program.</p> <p>In the 2016-17 Graduating Student Report, 100% of the 3 respondents rated the program good or excellent in terms of preparation, which is tied explicitly to using knowledge and skills to evaluate sources and develop written projects.</p> <p>One student received the Hoare travel award for her presentation of thesis research to the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies.</p>

Interpretation of Results

Describe the extent to which this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

The program is successful in achieving this outcome through the capstone experience of the program, as demonstrated by the assessment of the thesis, and by measures showing very high levels of alumni and graduating student satisfaction with their ability to produce substantive written papers and arguments. In addition, student research was

accepted for presentation to a professional conference in the discipline. The department will discuss how to assert more uniform standards regarding outcome expectations in interdisciplinary humanities courses, since the average ratings raise questions about how well we are meeting this outcome prior to the thesis stage of a student's career.

Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

Interdisciplinary study is often cited as a strength of the program, and in fact one graduating student was wanted more available electives outside the department. However, interdisciplinary study makes it more difficult to achieve uniform standards for learning outcomes. This creates an opportunity for us to meet with faculty outside our discipline who teach in the program to help establish reasonable expectations, both in terms of teaching toward the fulfillment of our outcomes and in terms of applying our outcomes in other disciplines. During our program review next year, we will discuss the role of humanities courses within the program and how to better articulate consistent expectations for outcomes across disciplines.

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

The program director will invite faculty teaching in other humanities disciplines to talk to the department at an upcoming meeting about how our learning outcomes translate into their field. In addition, the director will meet with faculty outside the department who teach within the program to discuss outcomes and rubrics for assessment, and make sure they are aware of our standards. We will plan programming to support humanities courses by including lectures from outside the discipline at some of our special events. We have a History course running in the program in Fall 2018, and we will have an Art History course running in the Spring 2019, so we will target programming and feedback toward those disciplines.

In addition, advising materials and catalog language will be revised to clarify courses offerings that might scaffold the research and writing experience better for students during the mid-section of their degree program in particular.

Learning Outcome 2: Program Outcome #2 Students will demonstrate clarity, organization, grace of expression, and audience awareness.

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
Direct measure: 14 student papers and two theses (7 graduate seminar papers from TRS 565 and 7 from EN 501) were collected; rated by all full-time, tenure-track faculty in the Literature and Languages department and the one faculty member outside the department who taught in the program. Faculty used a shared rubric	The form uses five levels of measurement, from 1-5, with a rating of "1" equivalent to "fails to meet criteria" and 5 equivalent to "exceeds criteria" (Appendix E) Faculty were asked to add a comment regarding any paper that fell below a 3.	The 14 papers used for the assessment were collected from EN 501 and TRS 565. Theses were collected by the Program Director. The Program Director worked with PIE to create the Qualtrics survey tool; PIE compiled data and provided official reports. (Appendix A, E)	1. The program director reviewed all data provided by PIE; the department discussed the assessment process at the May 2018 department retreats and again at the September 2018 department meeting, and reviewed findings at the October 2018 department meetings. The program director compiled the report and worked with PIE to create tables with mean scores for each course that was assessed (Appendix A).

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>made available via Qualtrics link. (Appendix E)</p> <p>EN 501 is a foundational course required for all students, and TRS 565 is an advanced humanities course in theology and religious studies; usually it would be taken in the early to mid-stage of the program. The two theses represent capstone work.</p>	<p>The department target is for at least 90% of capstone/thesis ratings to meet or exceed the 2.5-3.4 “meets criteria” range.</p> <p>Overall mean ratings of all products should not fall below 2.5.</p> <p>For non-thesis courses, 75% of ratings in any course should meet or exceed the “meets criteria” range of 2.5 to 3.4.</p>	<p>EN 501 represents products from students at the entry point of the degree; TRS 565 consists of students in all stages of the degree; the thesis is the written capstone project for the degree.</p>	<p>2. The assessment protocol was effective in that twelve faculty reviewed assigned work (7 papers from 2 courses; 2 theses) and no assessment product had fewer than 2 reviewers. The addition of comments was helpful for context.</p> <p>As in Outcome 1, the capstone thesis projects were rated most highly in this category and clearly met the outcome standard, with the mean being 3.75. Greater range of quality was seen in the seven TRS 565 products. The combined mean for all products from EN 501, TRS 565 and thesis was 3.31, indicating we are meeting this standard.</p> <p>The mean of 2.76 for the TRS 565 products merits discussion as a department at our October 2018 meeting. While more ratings exceeded criteria expectations than on Outcome 1, with 14.3% falling into the 3.5-4.4 range, 57.1% of ratings fell into the 1.5-2.4 range. One paper, which received consistently low evaluations, may represent a student who is struggling to meet program standards. When questioned about this paper, faculty indicated dissatisfaction with the logic of the paper, which was scattered, and the use of passive voice, which may be a disciplinary preference. We need to establish specific benchmarks for “clarity and organization” across disciplines before rating products from humanities courses.</p> <p>Interestingly, the 7 assessed papers from EN 501, an entry level course, had the highest mean rating of the group with a 3.8. This is probably because of the concise format of the assignment, a book review, which gave students a strong structure to work within and yet was short enough that it let them focus closely on rhetorical style. This assignment works well for an entry-level course, letting students exhibit mastery within a simplified structure.</p>
<p>Direct measures: Results from the 2017 Alumni Data and 2016 English and Humanities</p>	<p>Above 50% satisfaction rate in related areas on alumni and graduating student surveys.</p>	<p>PIE provided data for all direct measures (Appendix A-D); conference acceptances were</p>	<p>1. The program director reviewed all data provided by PIE; discussed the assessment process at the May 2018 department</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>Supplemental Report; Graduating Students Survey (2016-17; no report produced for 2017-18 with only 2 graduates*) and Alumni Data (Appendix B-D)</p> <p>Indirect measures: acceptance to peer reviewed conferences or publications; academic awards for student scholarship.</p>	<p>Acceptance to peer reviewed conferences or publications</p> <p>Academic awards for student scholarship.</p>	<p>tracked by the program director as part of the process of awarding the Hoare travel award, and via reports from department social media presence and student correspondence with faculty.</p>	<p>retreats and again at the September 2018 department meeting, and reviewed findings at the October 2018 department meeting.</p> <p>The program director compiled the report and worked with PIE to collect all the direct measure surveys. The program director gathered information on presentations from the prior department chair and other faculty members.</p> <p>2. All 5 responding alumni were in 100% agreement that the program prepares them very well to produce coherent oral and written communication. Feedback on the overall experience is positive with 80% of alumni in the 2017 survey praising their overall experience and academic quality of the program. No area fell below 60% of alumni rating the program as Good or Excellent.</p> <p>The 4 respondents on the Supplemental Report similarly cite improved writing, and communication skills as a strength of the program.</p> <p>In the 2016-17 Graduating Student Report, 100% of the 3 respondents rated the program good or excellent in terms of preparation, which is tied explicitly to using knowledge and skills to develop written and oral arguments.</p> <p>One student received the Hoare travel award for her presentation of thesis research to the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies. Another student was selected as the graduate commencement speaker, indicating a high level of clarity, organization, and grace of expression.</p>

Interpretation of Results

Describe the extent to which this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

The program is successful in achieving this outcome by the capstone experience of the program, as demonstrated by the assessment of the thesis, and by indirect measures showing very high levels of alumni and graduating student satisfaction with their ability to produce organized persuasive writing. The department will discuss how to assert more uniform standards regarding outcome expectations in interdisciplinary humanities courses, since there are indications that we may need to improve how students meet this outcome in interdisciplinary humanities courses.

Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

A strength is that the program develops coherent written expression from entry into the program through exit by scaffolding assignments so that earlier classes require students to work within a tighter format. As in the previous outcome, the opportunity lies in smoothing the application of our outcomes to other disciplines and offering students a more coherent interdisciplinary experience. We need to work with faculty outside our discipline who teach in the program to help establish reasonable expectations by meeting with them in advance of teaching the course and of assessing the course product. During our program review next year, we will discuss the role of humanities courses within the program and how to better articulate consistent expectations for outcomes across disciplines.

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

The program director will invite faculty teaching in other humanities disciplines to talk to the department at an upcoming meeting about how our learning outcomes translate into their field. In addition, the director will meet with faculty outside the department individually to discuss outcomes and rubrics for assessment, and make sure they are aware of our standards. In addition, we will try to coordinate programming to support humanities courses by bringing in at least one guest speaker to support a course outside the discipline. We have a History course running in the program in Fall 2018, and we will have an Art History course running in the Spring 2019, so efforts will be targeted toward those disciplines.

Appendices

Appendix A: PIE Data on Mean, Count, and Outcome Ratings

Learning Outcome #1: *Students will write and create substantial academic papers and projects in which they analyze source material and develop original arguments.*

Thesis & TRS 565	
Criteria	•
Mean Rating	2.92
Number of Ratings	25
Average Ratings¹ - Percentage of papers in each range (Scale: 1 - Fails to meet criteria; 5 - Exceeds criteria)	
(1.) 1.0 to 1.4	0.0%

¹ Percent totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

(2.) 1.5 to 2.4	14.3%
(3.) 2.5 to 3.4	85.7%
(4.) 3.5 to 4.4	0.0%
(5.) 4.5 to 5.0	0.0%
Number of Papers	7

Thesis	
Criteria	•
Mean Rating	3.75
Number of Ratings	4
Average Ratings² - Percentage of papers in each range (Scale: 1 - Fails to meet criteria; 5 - Exceeds criteria)	
(1.) 1.0 to 1.4	0.0%
(2.) 1.5 to 2.4	0.0%
(3.) 2.5 to 3.4	50.0%
(4.) 3.5 to 4.4	0.0%
(5.) 4.5 to 5.0	50.0%
Number of Papers	2

² Percent totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TRS 565

Criteria	•
Mean Rating	2.76
Number of Ratings	21
Average Ratings³ - Percentage of papers in each range (Scale: 1 - Fails to meet criteria; 5 - Exceeds criteria)	
(1.) 1.0 to 1.4	0.0%
(2.) 1.5 to 2.4	28.6%
(3.) 2.5 to 3.4	71.4%
(4.) 3.5 to 4.4	0.0%
(5.) 4.5 to 5.0	0.0%
Number of Papers	7

Learning Outcome #2: *Students will demonstrate clarity, organization, grace of expression, and audience awareness.*

Thesis, TRS 565, & EN 501

Criteria	•
Mean Rating	3.31
Number of Ratings	45
Average Ratings⁴ - Percentage of papers in each range (Scale: 1 - Fails to meet criteria; 5 - Exceeds criteria)	
(1.) 1.0 to 1.4	0.0%
(2.) 1.5 to 2.4	14.3%
(3.) 2.5 to 3.4	42.9%
(4.) 3.5 to 4.4	42.9%
(5.) 4.5 to 5.0	0.0%
Number of Papers	7

³ Percent totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

⁴ Percent totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Thesis	
Criteria	•
Mean Rating	3.75
Number of Ratings	4
Average Ratings⁵ - Percentage of papers in each range (Scale: 1 - Fails to meet criteria; 5 - Exceeds criteria)	
(1.) 1.0 to 1.4	0.0%
(2.) 1.5 to 2.4	0.0%
(3.) 2.5 to 3.4	50.0%
(4.) 3.5 to 4.4	0.0%
(5.) 4.5 to 5.0	50.0%
Number of Papers	2

TRS 565	
Criteria	•
Mean Rating	2.76
Number of Ratings	21
Average Ratings⁶ - Percentage of papers in each range (Scale: 1 - Fails to meet criteria; 5 - Exceeds criteria)	
(1.) 1.0 to 1.4	0.0%
(2.) 1.5 to 2.4	57.1%
(3.) 2.5 to 3.4	28.6%
(4.) 3.5 to 4.4	14.3%
(5.) 4.5 to 5.0	0.0%
Number of Papers	7

⁵ Percent totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

⁶ Percent totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

EN 501	
Criteria	•
Mean Rating	3.80
Number of Ratings	20
Average Ratings⁷ - Percentage of papers in each range (Scale: 1 - Fails to meet criteria; 5 - Exceeds criteria)	
(1.) 1.0 to 1.4	0.0%
(2.) 1.5 to 2.4	0.0%
(3.) 2.5 to 3.4	28.6%
(4.) 3.5 to 4.4	42.9%
(5.) 4.5 to 5.0	28.6%
Number of Papers	7

⁷ Percent totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.