English (PhD)

PG 1 Employment success after graduation

Goal: Train students concentrating in our many specialized disciplines for employment success after graduation.

Evaluation Method:

Tracking of graduates; increased advising for job market; use of departmental exit interview. We have a series of workshops to help graduate students to prepare their job materials and practice interviewing entitled, "MarketWise." We also give individual feedback on all job materials. Finally, we did a survey of all students who graduated between 2005-2015 to get a more indepth understanding of our placement record and how the downturn in jobs in English have affected our doctorates.

Results:

18 students completed their doctoral degrees in AY 201718. Faculty found out that 13 have secured full time positions while 1 earned a part-time appointment; at the end of the reporting period, 4 were still job searching. Of the 13 full time positions the breakout was as follows: 6 were awarded tenure-track jobs (4 of these at Doctoral Research Universities, 1 at a Masters University, and 1 at Baccalaureate/Associate's College according to Carnegie Classifications); 1 was awarded a Postdoc; 2 were appointed Lecturers and; 3 secured full time positions in Private 9-12 College Preparatory Schools; 1 took a position in private industry (publishing). The MLA also reported that published job ads declined for a fifth straight year, reaching a new low (https://mlaresearch.mla.hcommons.org/category/academic-workforce/)

By placing 6 of 18 students (33.3%) in tenure-track jobs, our program exceeded the placement percentage reported by the MLA (26.1% of those who earned their PhD between 2009-2015 reported to the MLA that they held tenure-track positions). Based on our professionalization support and tracking of recent graduates, the criteria for success was met.

XOn Campus: true

XProgram CIP: 23.0101

XOnline: false

XOther Site: false

XIf Other Site:

PG 2 Increase international opportunities for graduate students

Goal: Increase international opportunities for graduate students.

Evaluation Method:

Tracking of graduate student aid.

Results:

11 graduate students attended international conferences. The Department of English also hired three international faculty members in 2017-18, which assists international mentorship, professionalization, and recruitment.

XOn Campus: true

XProgram CIP: 23.0101

XOnline: false

XOther Site: false

XIf Other Site:

PG 3 Assess the overall quality, culture and functioning of the program

Goal: Assess the overall quality, culture and functioning of the program.

Evaluation Method:

Self-study and external review.

Results:

Faculty implemented a number of recommended changes including: removal of foreign language requirement, reduction of seminars for students entering with a BA (after we learned that our peer institutions require between 12 and 14 seminars); offered a revised proseminar instead of the previous requirement for LAE6947, and hired a graduate program assistant to replace our former program assistant (who retired in October 2017). Faculty began work on a proposal for a course or semester-long workshop to assist ABD students in revising a paper for publication and learned that the Graduate School agreed to increase stipends for new admits to 17K for 6 years for BA applicants and 4 years for MA applicants. To ensure breadth and viability of course offerings, we estimated enrollment numbers for the next two years. Faculty also faced ongoing challenges: applications and admissions targets dropped: Dean's office target for admissions had been reduced from 20 in 2016 to 15 in 2018, evidence of a

shrinking program and challenges in recruiting top students. Faculty learned that the peer institutions that compete for graduate students fund their MA applicants for five or 6 years, putting us at continued disadvantage for applications and recruitment, despite the stipend increase (because the UF stipend is only 4 years).

XOn Campus: true

XProgram CIP: 23.0101

XOnline: false

XOther Site: false

XIf Other Site:

SLO 1 Knowledge

Outcome: Students identify and discuss a problem or gap in scholarship in their specialization.

SLO Area (select one): Knowledge (Grad)

Assessment Method:

PhD Dissertation evaluation and oral defense (see rubric).

SLO Not Assessed This Year:

Results:

The threshold of acceptability is 80%. Of the 16 students assessed, 16 met the outcome, for a percentage of 100%. More precisely: 10 (62.5%) exceeded the outcome; 5 achieved the outcome solidly (31.3%); 1 (6.3%) minimally achieved the outcome; 0 students did not achieve the outcome. This exceeded our criteria for success.

Start: 07/01/2017

End: 06/30/2018

Threshold of Acceptability: 80

How many students did you assess for this outcome?: 16

How many students met the outcome?: 16

What percentage of students met the outcome?: 100

Does this meet your threshold of acceptability?: Yes

SLO 2 Skills

Outcome:

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.

SLO Area (select one): Skills (Grad)

Assessment Method:

Supervisory review and comprehensive scores from student evaluations.

SLO Not Assessed This Year:

Results:

The threshold of acceptability is 80%. 48 students passed the assessment out of 48 students for a percentage of 100% of students met the outcome. This met the criterion for success.

Department faculty assessed all PhD students teaching in-Department in Fall semester, and the Department announced Department Teaching Awards in Spring. In Fall 2017, 48 PhD students taught writing, literature, film, and media courses in the English Department: all 48 received a faculty evaluation consisting of a classroom visit, a consultation, and a review of graded assignments. The Director of Graduate Student Teaching (DGST) ensured that each graduate student taught courses of interest and received feedback on their teaching. This met our criteria for success. Additional note: While assessment by department faculty occurs only in fall semester, in Spring 2018: 43 PhD students taught 43 Department courses, and in Summer 2018: 21 PhD students taught 21 Department courses (including entry level college writing and/or lower division courses).

Start: 07/01/2017

End: 06/30/2018

Threshold of Acceptability: 80

How many students did you assess for this outcome?: 48

How many students met the outcome?: 48

What percentage of students met the outcome?: 100

Does this meet your threshold of acceptability?: Yes

SLO 3 Professional Behavior

Outcome:

Students engage in professional research and writing activity at the PhD level, for example, conference-ready papers and/or materials appropriate

for publication.

SLO Area (select one): Professional Behavior (Grad)

Assessment Method:

Supervisory review of professional materials.

SLO Not Assessed This Year:

Results:

The threshold of acceptability is 80%. 56 out of 59 students passed the assessment for this outcome, for a total of 94.9%.This met our criteria for success.

95% of our doctoral students in AY 2017-18 maintained the level of professionalism and active engagement expected of our program, including presenting at conferences, organizing conferences, publishing articles, publishing book reviews, editing peer-reviewed journals, and actively contributing to the intellectual life of the program. The revised annual report template allowed us to assess our students' progress, involvement, goal setting and achievement with more depth than the prior report.

Start: 07/01/2017

End: 06/30/2018

Threshold of Acceptability: 80

How many students did you assess for this outcome?: 59

How many students met the outcome?: 56

What percentage of students met the outcome?: 95

Does this meet your threshold of acceptability?: Yes

Programmatic Use of Results

Program: English (PhD)

Programmatic Use of Results:

The current and incoming Graduate Coordinators and the Department chair reviewed the results. To improve retention, faculty bolstered the mentoring and tracking of students through a combined annual activity report and IDP form. Faculty also decided to continue (for the third year) a proseminar that provides students with a better understanding of the requirements for success in the program and in their field. To shorten time to degree, we modified degree requirements that were not enhancing students' research and were slowing students down unnecessarily: for example, faculty voted to remove the foreign language requirement which was not increasing or improving students' use of foreign language in their research; and faculty reduced the number of required seminars for students entering the program with BA degrees from 15 to 12 courses, to allow students to complete course work in three years, and to align with our peer institutions, which required between 12 and 14 seminars. To address the reduction in tenure-track positions, the faculty group adapted the MarketWise placement program timeline and updated all workshop sessions with current materials; we had alumni that secured positions come talk to students and offer advice for success; we also contributed to the CLAS Humanities PhD Taskforce.

Program Results Not Reported This Year:

Ph.D. English Detail

End: 06/30/2018

Start: 07/01/2017

Providing Department: English (PhD)

Assessment Cycle (All AAPs):

Analysis and Interpretation: annually
Program Modifications: as needed
Dissemination: annually

	Year	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20
SLOs							
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.

SLO Assessment Rubric (All AAPs):

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

Research (Graduate and Professional AAPs only):

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.

Measurement Tools (Graduate and Professional AAPs Only):

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:

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.

Assessment Timeline (Graduate and Professional AAPs only):