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| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2020-2021** |
| Potter College of Arts and Letters | Department of Folk Studies and Anthropology |
| Folk Studies MA (069) |
| Ann K. Ferrell |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.*** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1:**  Demonstrate competency in the history, methods, and theories of the discipline of folklore |
| **Instrument 1** | Direct: Comprehensive examination  |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2:**  Demonstrate ability to produce professional-level products |
| **Instrument 1** | Direct: Analysis of thesis or portfolios (dependent on concentration) |
| **Instrument 2** | Direct: Tracking of the number of students presenting research at the WKU Research Conference and regional or national conferences |
| **Instrument 3** | Indirect: Tracking of attendance at program-sponsored professional development (PD) workshops |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)**  |
| We will reassess, revise, and retest the comprehensive exam scoring rubric in 2021-22.Due to the limited number of students who defended a portfolio (1), we are unable to determine the results of the implementation of the rubric for evaluating portfolios and will do so in 2021-2022.In 2020-2021, we created a Blackboard Organizational site for all Folk Studies MA students. In 2021-2022, we will explore options for using the site for deeper levels of engagement between PD sessions.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Demonstrate competency in the history, methods, and theories of the discipline of folklore |
| **Measurement Instrument 1**  | Direct: Comprehensive examination: All students in the Folk Studies MA program must pass a written comprehensive examination based on course work and a program reading list in order to obtain their degree. The exam can be taken in either the third or fourth semester. The exam consists of two questions: one addressing methods, theory, and history of the discipline of folklore and the other testing knowledge of the graduate reading list. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | A student must have a total 2.75 average to pass, with a minimum of 2.0 on either question. A 2.75-3.00 is considered a low pass; a 3.75 is considered passing with distinction. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 100% pass75% above “low pass” | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% pass66.6% above “low pass” |
| **Methods**  | Exams are graded through a double-blind process by all four Folk Studies graduate faculty. Each question is graded from 1 to 4 using the attached rubric, with 4 being the highest (no partial numbers are given). Grades for each question from all faculty are averaged to reach the final grade. In 2020-21, three students completed the comprehensive exam with the results of: low pass (1), pass (2), pass with distinction (0).  |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| We determined in 2018-2019 that although all students receive detailed information about the expectations of the comprehensive exam through the formal Comprehensive Exam policy handout, as well as in courses and in individual meetings with the graduate program coordinator, a more formal presentation of expectations has the potential to raise the percentage of students receiving above a “low pass.” In Spring 2020, we implemented a required meeting of all students taking comprehensive exams in order to ensure that expectations are clear. We continue to hold this meeting each semester in which the exam is given, and while we think it helps to provide students with an opportunity to more thoroughly understand the exam expectations, we have not held an exam under non-pandemic circumstances, with both the meeting and the exam itself held virtually, so we do not yet know whether this will improve exam pass rates.  |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| Per our follow-up plans described on the last report, in 2020-21, we developed and tested a rubric for scoring the exam (see Appendix). We shadow-tested the rubric, with each faculty scoring it after grading in the usual manner. All four faculty found that the rubric changed grades that we were not satisfied with, mostly 0.5 higher, but lower in some cases. One faculty member noted, “ I'm concerned the rubric places too much weight on just answering the question.” We will revise the rubric in 2021-2022 and shadow-test it once again. |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| We will reassess, revise, and retest the comprehensive exam scoring rubric in 2021-22. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Demonstrate ability to produce professional-level products |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Direct: Analysis of thesis or portfolios (dependent on concentration within the MA program; all students do one or the other and none are required to do both)**Students who elect the Thesis option** are required to write an extended monograph based on primary research that must be approved by a committee of three faculty members and must be orally defended. **Students who elect the non-thesis option within the Public Folklore or Historic Preservation concentrations** must complete a web-based portfolio of their graduate work that demonstrates, to faculty and prospective employers, the breadth and impact of their education, skills, and experience attained through coursework, research, projects, internships, professional presentations, assistantships, and other experiences. An oral defense of the portfolio is required following the completion of exams, and passage of this final required stage of degree completion is contingent on approval of graduate faculty. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Successful completion of and defense of online portfolio or thesis |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 100% of thesis students will successfully defend their thesis100% of portfolio students will achieve “satisfactory” (75% on first attempt) | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% of thesis students successfully defended their thesis100% of portfolio students achieved “satisfactory” (100% on first attempt) |
| **Methods**  | **Thesis**: Students defend their thesis once it is complete and committee members agree it is ready to defend. Two students completing the program in 2020-2021 elected the thesis option and successfully completed and defended the thesis in Spring 2021.**Portfolios**: Students provide links to their online portfolios prior to sitting for comprehensive exams, and they are then required to present and defend their portfolios to the four graduate faculty following the passage of the exam. The scores assigned by the four graduate faculty are averaged, leading to the final score.In 2020-2021 one student completed an online portfolio and oral defense and passed on the first attempt.  |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | Direct: Tracking the number of students presenting research at the WKU Research Conference and regional and national conferences |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Full-time students will: a) present research at the WKU Student Research Conference in their first year; b) present research at a regional or national conference in their second year. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 100% of students will present at the WKU Student Research Conference in their first year75% of students will present research at a regional or national conference in their second year | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% of first-year students presented at the WKU conference100% of second-year students presented at a national conference  |
| **Methods** | Students are required to present at the WKU Student Research conference in their first year; this is a requirement of FLK 577 Folklore Theory, required of all first-year students. All six full-time first year (second semester) students presented in Spring 2021. The conference was held virtually.Students are encouraged to adapt term papers/thesis chapters for presentation at regional or national conferences in their second year, and they work directly with a faculty member in order to develop their proposals and conference papers. In 2020-2021, all three full-time second year students, as well as one part-time student and one first-year student, presented at a national conference (American Folklore Society annual meeting) that was held virtually. |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | Indirect: Attendance at program-sponsored professional development workshops |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Evaluation of student attendance at a minimum of two of three program-sponsored professional development workshops each semester |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 100% of full-time students will attend two of three sessions per semester. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% of full-time students attended at least two of three sessions per semester. |
| **Methods** | We held three professional development sessions in both Fall 2020 and Spring 2021. In Fall 2020, 100% (11) of our students, full- and part-time, attended all three workshops. In Spring 2021, 11 full-time students attended all three workshops, one full-time student attended two, and one part-time student attended one of the three workshops.  |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| **Portfolios:** In 2018-2019 we recognized the need to formalize our assessment of portfolios in order to give students more concrete feedback and create a means of assessing areas of needed improvement through clearly measurable outcomes. In order to formalize this process, we implemented a rubric for assessing online portfolios in 2019-2020 (see attachment). Upon recommendation from the Dean’s Office, we revised the rubric to include four, rather than three, scoring categories for implementation in 2020-2021. In addition, based on our implemention of this rubric, we have revised it regarding the scoring of the oral presentation for students who are required to revise the portfolio (see attached rubric). As we had only one portfolio student, we will continue to assess the adequacy of the portfolio rubric in 2021-2022.**Professional development sessions:** In 2020-2021, we created a Blackboard Organizational site for all Folk Studies MA students, in order to facilitate virtual attendance and engagement with professional development sessions. |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| **Thesis:** In AY 2020-2021, we considered introducing a rubric for the thesis defense. However, because the committee members, led by the chair, work closely with students as they develop and write their theses and students are not allowed to defend until the committee is satisfied that the thesis is satisfactory, we do not see that a rubric will be beneficial to the student.**Portfolios:** Due to the limited number of students who defended a portfolio in 2020-2021 (one), we are unable to determine the results of the implementation of the rubric for evaluating portfolios and will do so in 2021-2022.**Professional development sessions:** In 2020-2021, we created a Blackboard Organizational site for all Folk Studies MA students. In 2021-2022, we will explore options for using the site for deeper levels of engagement between PD sessions.  |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| We will continue to assess the usefulness of the portfolio rubric, and we will explore using the Blackboard organizational site to engage students in professional development topics throughout the academic year.  |

APPENDIX

Folk Studies (069)

Rubric for evaluation of Online Portfolios

For implementation 2019-2020

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria for evaluation** | **Exemplary****4** | **Excellent****3** | **Satisfactory****2** | **Unsatisfactory****1** | **SCORE** |
| 1. **Clearly demonstrate the skills, competencies, and achievements you have mastered during your time in the Folk Studies MA program.**
 | Demonstration of skills, competencies and achievements is thorough, clear, and exceeds expectations. | Demonstration of skills, competencies and achievements is thorough and clear. | Demonstration of skills, competencies and achievements is reasonably thorough and clear, but could be improved.  | Demonstration of skills, competencies and achievement is inadequate and/or unclear. |  |
| 1. **Project a clean, professional, and consistent theme across pages and items.**
 | A clean, professional, and consistent theme is projected across pages and items and demonstrates thoughtful consideration of potential professional audiences.  | A clean, professional, and consistent theme is projected across pages and items. | Pages and items are generally clean, professional and consistent, but could be improved. | Pages and items are not clean, professional, and/or consistent. |  |
| 1. **Easy of navigation with a clear, intuitive method of organizing each page and the collection of pages.**
 | Portfolio is consistently easy to navigate and well-organized, and the collection of pages is well-integrated in order to create a cohesive site. | Portfolio is consistently easy to navigate and well-organized. | Portfolio is generally easy to navigate and well organized, but could be improved. | Portfolio is not easy to navigate and/or well organized. |  |
| 1. **Offer material items in formats that are accessible and convenient for your visitor.**
 | Items are in formats that are accessible and convenient, with detailed attention to differing forms of access. | Items are in formats that are accessible and convenient. | Items are generally in formats that are accessible and convenient, but could be improved. | Items are not in formats that are accessible and/or convenient. |  |
| 1. **Include photos or images but do so considering the purpose and audience of your site.**
 | Photos or images are well chosen and combine to create a visually polished site.  | Photos or images are well chosen. | Some photos and images are well chosen, but some could be improved.  | Photos and images are not well chosen. |  |
| 1. **Follow acceptable standards for Internet content delivery and accessibility.**
 | Portfolio exceeds acceptable standards for Internet content delivery and accessibility. | Portfolio follows acceptable standards for Internet content delivery and accessibility. | Portfolio generally follows acceptable standards for Internet content and accessibility, but could use improvement. | Portfolio does not follow acceptable standards for Internet content and accessibility. |  |
| 1. **Provide a professional presentation of the portfolio during the oral defense.**
 | Presentation is professional and exceeds expectations. | Presentation is professional. | Presentation is professional, but could use improvement. | Presentation is not sufficiently professional. |  |

All graduate faculty will score each student’s portfolio/presentation based on this rubric, and scores will be averaged.

A student must receive an average of 20 or above to achieve “exemplary” and 14 or above, *with no average score in any individual category at or below 1*, to receive “satisfactory.” Any student receiving “unsatisfactory” must revise their portfolio until it is re-evaluated by the faculty and deemed “satisfactory.” If a student receives “unsatisfactory” and must revise, but received “satisfactory” or above on criteria #7, the student can choose to either retain the original score on that metric or to re-present the revised portfolio and be re-scored on the metric.

Folk Studies (069)

Rubric for Evaluation of the MA Comprehensive Exams

Implemented 2020-2021 (to be revised 2021-2022)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria for evaluation** | **Excellent****4** | **Satisfactory****3** | **Unsatisfactory****2** | **Fail****1** | **SCORE** |
| 1. **1: Methods, theory, and history of the discipline of folklore**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Responds to the question asked** | Fully responds to the question asked and avoids making points not relevant to the question | Responds to the question asked with few points not directly relevant to the question | Responds in part to the question asked, but is diverted by points not relevant to the question | Fails to respond to the question asked |  |
| **Demonstrates knowledge of the methods, theory, and history of the discipline of folklore** | Demonstrates a thorough and clearly articulated knowledge of the methods, theory, and history of the discipline of folklore | Demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the methods, theory, and history of the discipline of folklore | Demonstrates unsatisfactory knowledge of the methods, theory, and history of the discipline of folklore | Fails to demonstrate knowledge of the methods, theory, and history of the discipline of folklore |  |
|  |  |  |  | **SCORE Q1:** |  |
| 1. **2: Reading list**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Responds to the question asked** | Fully responds to the question asked and avoids making points not relevant to the question | Responds to the question asked with few points not directly relevant to the question | Responds in part to the question asked, but is diverted by points not relevant to the question | Fails to respond to the question asked |  |
| **Demonstrates knowledge of the comprehensive exam reading list** | Demonstrates a thorough and clearly articulated knowledge of the comprehensive exam reading list | Demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the comprehensive exam reading list | Demonstrates unsatisfactory knowledge of the comprehensive exam reading list | Fails to demonstrate knowledge of the comprehensive exam reading list |  |
|  |  |  |  | **SCORE Q2:** |  |