

Ph.D. in English Academic Assessment Plan 2012-2013

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Kenneth Kidd
kbkidd@ufl.edu

Office of the Provost

*University of
Florida*

*Institutional
Assessment*

*Continuous Quality
Enhancement*

Table of Contents

Academic Assessment Plan for Ph.D. in English	3
A. Mission	3
B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures	3
C. Research.....	4
D. Assessment Timeline.....	4
E. Assessment Cycle	5
F. Measurement Tools.....	5
G. Assessment Oversight.....	6
Figure 1. University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric.....	8
University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric, continued.....	9

Academic Assessment Plan for Ph.D. in English

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

A. Mission

The **PhD in English** offers advanced study in English studies, broadly conceived. Course offerings and programs of study are flexible and foster both scholarly and creative learning. In addition to offerings in the traditional literary periods, areas of PhD concentration include film studies, media and technology studies, cultural studies, children's literature, literary theory, rhetoric and composition, and postcolonial studies. In sum, there are 18 Tracks that students may elect to follow; students may also devise individual tracks with the oversight of the Graduate Coordinator.

The Department's nationally-prominent faculty is dedicated to the common pursuit of the university's threefold mission—teaching, research and service—and to preparing graduate students in those areas, as well. Graduate students enjoy rich intellectual and creative opportunities both inside and outside of the classroom. The PhD program supports graduate students in the creation of new knowledge and the pursuit of new ideas. The program strives to create a broadly diverse environment necessary to foster critical thinking, reading, and writing skills. This important mission is manifest at all stages of graduate education from recruitment of new graduate students to course design and rigorous, professional mentoring of each graduate student in his or her research. Because our program cultivates a critical understanding of the cultural and material conditions that shape the production of historical and contemporary texts, we align with the College mission to help students "understand our place in the universe" and disseminate knowledge by engaging with "fundamental questions" in the arts and humanities.

B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures

SLO Type	Student Learning Outcome	Assessment Method	Degree Delivery
Knowledge	1. Students identify and discuss a problem or gap in scholarship in their specialization.	PhD Dissertation evaluation and oral defense (see rubric).	Campus
Skills	2. Students teach an entry-level college writing course and/or a lower-division course in their field in a professional manner, organizing and delivering content in a mode appropriate to audience.	Supervisory review and comprehensive scores from student evaluations.	Campus

Professional Behavior	3. Students engage in professional research and writing activity at the PhD level, for example, conference-ready papers and/or materials appropriate for publication.	Supervisory review of professional materials.	Campus

C. Research

The PhD is a research-intensive graduate program that prepares students for full-time academic employment. Admission is selective, and emphasizes current capacity for research as well as potential for expansion of research ability. While in coursework, students are required to write seminar papers for most of their seminars, and all assignments require critical analysis. The degree requires coursework, the passing of area exams, and the writing and defense of a dissertation. Throughout the program, both formally and through optional professionalization workshops, students learn how to engage in the research genres of the profession: the seminar paper, the conference paper, the book review, the journal article, the dissertation. Most PhD students present research papers at a professional conference; many do so frequently and at the national and even international level.

D. Assessment Timeline

Program Ph.D. in English

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Assessment	Assessment 1
SLOs	
Knowledge	
#1	PhD Dissertation evaluation
Skills	
#2	Teaching evaluation

Professional Behavior	
#3	Review of professional materials

E. Assessment Cycle

Assessment Cycle for:

Program Ph.D. in English College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Analysis and Interpretation: annually

Program Modifications: as needed

Dissemination: annually

SLOs	Year	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
Content Knowledge							
#1		X	X	X	X	X	X
Skills							
#2		X	X	X	X	X	X
Professional Behavior							
#3		X	X	X	X	X	X

We assess SLO #2 annually for each student. SLOs 1 and 2 are assessed at the completion of the program. Because we have new groups admitted each AY, however, we assess all 3 SLOS each year.

F. Measurement Tools

SLO 1 (Content Knowledge): Dissertation Evaluation Rubric; also Oral Defense. Information about area exams, the dissertation prospectus, and the writing and the defense of the dissertation may be found here:

http://www.english.ufl.edu/resources/grad/handbook/phd_requirements.html

SLO 2 (Skills): Teaching Evaluation Rubric; University-administered student teaching evaluations (each semester), and annual supervisory teaching evaluation (written, delivered after classroom observation by a faculty member, with supervision from the Director of Graduate Student Teaching).

SLO 3 (Professional Behavior): Professional Materials Rubric. Assessment of professional research and writing activity at the PhD level, for example, conference-ready papers and/or materials appropriate for publication.

Two other measurement tools for the PhD program:

- 1) the Annual Review, which reviews student progress annually, reporting on completion of courses, formation of dissertation committee, GPA levels, and other benchmarks of program success. The Graduate Coordinator conducts this review, in consultation with the graduate faculty who serve on student committees.
- 2) Annual Report Form, modeled on UF's Annual Activities Report for faculty, required beginning Year 3 (must be signed by dissertation director for Graduate Coordinator review). This is a comprehensive assessment of progress, addressing multiple SLOS (and, indirectly, program goals). The idea is to provide an in-progress and comprehensive inventory of professional materials and activities.

SAMPLE TOOL: Dissertation Evaluation Rubric (SLO 1, Knowledge)

SLO	Exceeds 4	Achieves 3	Minimally Achieves 2	Does Not Achieve 1
Students identify and discuss a problem or gap in scholarship in their specialization.	Student identifies and discusses a very important problem or gap in existing scholarship. Student's extended analysis of several texts appropriate to the subfield of the dissertation is insightful and detailed. There is a clear connection of all supporting material to the problem or gap the student has identified in existing scholarship. The appropriateness and scope of the examples selected for the purpose to which the student puts them is clearly explained. The evidence is both sufficient and strong; the argument is thorough and persuasive.	Student identifies and discusses an important problem or gap in existing scholarship. Student's extended analysis of several texts appropriate to the subfield of the dissertation is clear and detailed. There is a clear connection of most supporting material to the problem or gap the student has identified in existing scholarship. The appropriateness and scope of most examples selected for the purpose to which the student puts them is explained. The evidence is sufficient; the argument is reasonable and persuasive.	Student identifies and discusses a problem or gap in existing scholarship. There may, however, be some lacking scholarly context to the discussion of the gap or problem. Student's analysis of several texts appropriate to the subfield of the dissertation is clear and in many cases detailed. There is a connection of most supporting material to the problem or gap the student has identified in existing scholarship, though sometimes the connection may be less salient than in others. The appropriateness and scope of most examples selected for the purpose to which the student puts them may not be clearly explained. The evidence may not always be sufficient; the argument is essentially credible but may not be uniformly persuasive.	Student may fail to identify a problem or gap in existing scholarship, or fail to sufficiently contextualize the problem. Student's analysis of several texts may not always be appropriate to the subfield of the dissertation or may be insufficiently detailed. There is inadequate connection of much of the supporting material to the problem the student is attempting to address. The appropriateness and scope of examples selected for the purpose to which the student puts them is not explained, or the explanation is unclear or not credible. The evidence is insufficient; the argument is not persuasive.

SAMPLE TOOL: Annual Report Form (indirect assessment)

Annual Report Form (AY 2010-2011: March 16, 2010-March 15, 2011)

PhD Year 3

Name:

Field(s):

Director:

Attach separate sheet if more space is necessary.

Date PhD exams passed: _____

Note: if you have not taken your exams yet, give reason for delay, and anticipated date.

Progress on dissertation research and writing this year. Include information on timeline/schedule for research and writing, such as deadlines you're trying to meet, etc.

Professional activity: conference papers, publications, etc.

Service activity: committee work, conference organization, etc.

Signature

Dissertation director signature

G. Assessment Oversight

Name	Department Affiliation	Email Address	Phone Number
Kenneth Kidd	Department Chair	kbkidd@ufl.edu	294-2801
Sidney Dobrin	Graduate Coordinator	sdobrin@ufl.edu	294-2875
Stephanie Smith	Associate Chair	ssmith@ufl.edu	294-2874

Figure 1. University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric

Related resources are found at <http://www.ua.assessment.edu>

Program:		Year:			
Component	Criterion	Rating			Comments
		Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
Mission Statement	Mission statement is articulated clearly.				
	The program mission clearly supports the College and University missions, and includes specific statements describing how it supports these missions.				
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Assessment Measures	SLOs are stated clearly.				
	SLOs focus on demonstration of student learning.				
	SLOs are measurable.				
	Measurements are appropriate for the SLO.				
Research	Research expectations for the program are clear, concise, and appropriate for the discipline.				
Assessment Map	The Assessment Map indicates the times in the program where the SLOs are assessed and measured.				
	The Assessment Map identifies the assessments used for each SLO.				
Assessment Cycle	The assessment cycle is clear.				
	All student learning outcomes are measured.				
	Data is collected at least once in the cycle.				
	The cycle includes a date or time period for data analysis and interpretation.				
	The cycle includes a date for planning improvement actions based on the data analysis.				
	The cycle includes a date for dissemination of results to the appropriate stakeholders.				

University of Florida Graduate/Professional Program Assessment Plan Review Rubric, continued

Component	Criterion	Rating			Comments
		Met	Partially Met	Not Met	
Measurement Tools	Measurement tools are described clearly and concisely.				
	Measurements are appropriate for the SLOs.				
	Methods and procedures reflect an appropriate balance of direct and indirect methods.				
	The report presents examples of at least one measurement tool.				
Assessment Oversight	Appropriate personnel (coordinator, committee, etc.) charged with assessment responsibilities are identified				