|  |
| --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2021-2022** |
| Potter College of Arts and Letters | Department of Folk Studies and Anthropology |
| Folk Studies MA (069) |
| Ann K. Ferrell, Folk Studies Program Director |

|  |
| --- |
| ***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  |
| **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 theses 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** | Direct: 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.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)**  |
| Despite not meeting our targets, we are proud of how close we came and of the achievements of this group of students, as all of the full-time students who completed the program this year started in fall of 2020, which means that their entire graduate school experience has been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.Prior to the 2022-2023 assessment, we will:* revise the target of the measurement of SLO1 to 100% above pass by second attempt and 66-75% above “low pass”;
* request resources for the reassessment and revision of the comprehensive exam scoring rubric in 2022-2023;
* distribute the portfolio rubric during our fall portfolio session and solicit and assess student feedback;
* assess the viability of contining to measure student presentations at regional and national conferences as an instrument of SLO2 if departmental funding is not available to support student travel; and
* assess attendance at face-to-face professional development 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. 2.75-3.00 is considered a low pass; 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 Folk Studies graduate faculty (currently four). Each question is graded from 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest. Grades for each question from all faculty are averaged to reach the final grade. In 2021-22, six students completed the comprehensive exam with the results of: low pass (2), pass (3), pass with distinction (1).  |
| **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 no way of knowing whether and how it affects exam pass rates.We continue to test and assess a rubric for grading comprehensive exams, as discussed below.  |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| In 2020-21, we developed and shadow-tested a rubric for scoring the exam (see Appendix A); as described in our 2020-2021 report, we were unsatisfied with the results of the rubric. In 2021-2022, we revised the rubric (see Appendix B) and shadow-tested it once again (each faculty member applied the rubric after grading in their usual manner). Once again, all faculty felt that the rubric did not appropriately reflect the grades that, individually, we thought each response should receive. In our follow-up discussions, we determined that the problem is that despite revising the rubric to include more categories, the categories are equally weighted and should not be.Therefore, in preparation for the 2022-2023 exams, we request resources/assistance in order to again revise the rubric, this time to more appropriately weight the criteria that the exam is testing. We will then shadow-test it once again. Because the comprehensive exam is a primary measurement instrument, it is important that the rubric for grading 1) grades appropriately and fairly and 2) is not confusing to students once it is complete and we make it available.We are also questioning the Program Success Target for this measurement as we identified it in 2018-2019, at the start of the current Assurance of Student Learning assessment process. As we asses for the fourth year, we now feel that we have the data necessary to identify targets more purposefully. Although we have met the target of 100% passing since the start of this assessment format, as we reassessed this measurement this year, we realized that this is not a realistic target, as evidenced by the fact that our comprehensive exam guidelines allow students to take the exam a second time if they do not pass. For the coming year, we will modify our target from 100% pass to 100% pass *by second attempt*. Second, with the exception of the spring of 2020 (less than a month after the start of the pandemic) our results have been consistent, with rates of 66-75% above “low pass.” We think consistency is a far better measurement of student preparedness than a target that expects continued increased rates. Therefore, we will work to maintain consistency in the coming year with a new target of maintaining a range of 66-75% above “low pass.” Identifying a range instead of a single percentage will also help to mitigate the effects of varying numbers of enrolled students. % above low pass:2018 - 2019 75%2019 - 2020 25%2020 - 2021 66%2021 - 2022 66% |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| We request resources for the reassessment and revision of the comprehensive exam scoring rubric in 2022-2023. We will revise the target of the measurement of SLO1 to 100% above pass by second attempt and 66-75% above “low pass.” |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Demonstrate ability to produce professional-level products |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Direct: Analysis of theses 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, Historic Preservation, or Museum Studies 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 comprehensive exams, and passage of this final required stage of degree completion is contingent on approval of Folk Studies graduate faculty. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Successful completion of and defense of thesis or online portfolio  |
| **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** | N/A100% of portfolio students achieved “satisfactory” (83% on first attempt) |
| **Methods**  | **Thesis**: Students defend their thesis once it is complete and committee members agree it is ready to defend. Zero students completing the program in 2021-2022 elected the thesis option.**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 graduate faculty (currently four) following the passage of the exam. Each faculty member scores each student with the use of a rubric, and the scores are averaged, leading to the final score. In 2021-2022, 5 of 6 students completed an online portfolio and oral defense and passed satisfactorily on the first attempt. One student received unsatisfactory and was required to revise with the guidance of a faculty member and resubmit their portfolio; upon resubmission, the student reached satisfactory.  |
| **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 conference50% of second-year students presented at a regional or 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 3 full-time first-year students successfully presented in Spring 2022.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 2021-2022, 3 out of 6 full-time second-year students presented at a national conference (American Folklore Society annual meeting, held in hybrid form; all students presented virtually). To meet our target, four students would have had to present at regional or national conferences. We attribute this lack of success to the circumstances of the pandemic in two ways: 1) students have been less able to conduct fieldwork during the pandemic due to concerns for their safety and the safety of research participants and 2) students have reported to us that they are experiencing serious fatigue. For some students, completing minimum requirements has been a struggle in the time of COVID-19; some students reported to us that preparing and completing a conference presentation was too much. In addition, student travel funding was not available through either the department or the college. |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | Direct: 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** | 90% of full-time students attended at least two of three sessions per semester. |
| **Methods** | We held three professional development sessions in both Fall 2021 and Spring 2022. Students are informed/reminded at the opening program meeting of the semester, held the Friday before classes start, that all are expected to attend professional development sessions. Announcements and reminders are sent out via the listserv for current students and faculty, and faculty are asked to remind students of sessions in classes and to consider including the sessions as part of their participation grades on syllabi.In 2021-2022, the **fall** sessions included Preparing for Comprehensive Exams & Building Your Portfolio (11 of 11 full- and part-time students in attendance), American Folklore Society Annual Meeting 101 (9 of 10 full-time students in attendance), Careers in Museums (with five Kentucky Museum professionals; 5 of 10 full-time students in attendance\*). In addition, we held internship presentations (6 of 10 full-time students in attendance) and two optional “debrief” meetings during the American Folklore Society meetings (6 of 10 full-time students in attendance).The **spring** sessions included Workshopping Your CV/Resume & Searching for Internships and Jobs (8 of 9 full time students + 1 JUMP student in attendance), Alumni Roundtable (with three alumni; 7 of 9 full-time students + 1 JUMP student in attendance), and Collins-Bramham Annual Public Folklore Workshop (with Dr. Maribel Alvarez, founder of Southwest Folklife Alliance; all 9 full-time students attended one or both sessions and 4 students met with Dr. Alvarez individually). In Fall 2021, 90% (9) of 10 full-time students and 100% of part-time students (1) attended two out of three workshops. In Spring 2022, 89% (8) of 9 full-time students attended two out of three workshops; 100% of JUMP students (1) attended two out of three workshops.It appears that online/Zoom fatigue negatively affected our Professional Development session attendance, as all sessions with the exception of one (AFS 101) were held virtually. The rate of attendance was much higher among first-year students. The second-year students began the MA program in the pandemic in fall 2020, and this has clearly impacted their participation and academic performance.\*This session was held the last week of classes, due to scheduling difficulties, leading to the poorest turnout of our sessions. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  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 Appendix C). 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 implementation of this rubric, we have revised it regarding the scoring of the oral presentation for students who are required to revise the portfolio (see Appendix C). As we had only one portfolio student in 2021-2022, we continued 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. We intended to explore options for using the site for deeper levels of engagement between PD sessions in 2021-2022. However, we realized rather quickly in the fall of 2021 that the online fatigue of both students and faculty was severe, and that more online engagement was not what anyone needed. Therefore, we did not explore options for further usage of the site. |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| **Thesis:** No follow-up at this time.**Portfolios:**  Based on our usage of the portfolio rubric in 2021-2022, we are satisfied that the rubric is useful and will make it available to students beginning in 2022-2023.**Presentations at regional or national conferences**: It is our hope that if the pandemic continues to recede, students will once again be more able to present at conferences. However, this will also depend on the availability of student travel funding; the student travel funding requested as part of the department budget for the 2022-2023 academic year was not approved by the college, so we anticipate difficulty reaching this target.**Professional development sessions:**  It is our hope that in 2022-2023, pending the state of the pandemic, we can return to conducting the majority of professional development sessions face-to-face. We will also ensure, through more frequent and direct reminders, that students are aware that all are expected to attend these sessions, and faculty will be asked to remind students in all classes. |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| We will distribute the portfolio rubric during our fall portfolio session and solicit and assess student feedback.We will assess the attendance at face-to-face professional development sessions. We will assess the viability of continuing to measure student presentations at regional and national conferences as an instrument of SLO2 if funding is not available to support student travel.  |

APPENDIX A

Folk Studies (069)

Rubric for Evaluation of the MA Comprehensive Exams

Shadow-tested 2020-2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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:** |  |

APPENDIX B

Rubric for Evaluation of the Folk Studies MA Comprehensive Exams

Revised for shadow-implementation 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 directly and comprehensively to the question asked**  | Fully and directly 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 an accurate working knowledge of the methods, theories, and history of the field** | Demonstrates a thorough, accurate, and clearly articulated knowledge of the methods, theories, and history of the field | Demonstrates a satisfactory, accurate, and well-articulated knowledge of themethods, theories, and history of the field | Demonstrates an unsatisfactory and/or inaccurate knowledge of themethods, theories, and history of the field | Fails to demonstrate knowledge of themethods, theories, and history of the field |  |
| **Demonstrates a working conceptual knowledge of the methods, theories and history of the field** | Demonstrates a thorough and clearly articulated conceptual knowledge of the methods, theories, and history of the field | Demonstrates a satisfactory and well-articulated conceptual knowledge of themethods, theories, and history of the field | Demonstrates an unsatisfactory conceptual knowledge of themethods, theories, and history of the field | Fails to demonstrate a conceptual knowledge of themethods, theories, and history of the field |  |
|  |  |  |  | **SCORE Q1:** |  |
| 1. **2: Reading list**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Responds directly and comprehensively to the question asked, using appropriate selections from the reading list** | Fully and directly responds to the question asked, using appropriate selections from the reading list, and avoids making points not relevant to the question | Responds to the question asked, using appropriate selections from the reading list, with few points not directly relevant to the question | Responds in part to the question asked, with selections from the reading list of varying appropriateness and/or is diverted by points not relevant to the question | Fails to respond directly to the question asked and/or does not use appropriate selections from the reading list |  |
| **Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the specific selections from the comprehensive exam reading list** | Demonstrates a thorough, accurate, and clearly articulated knowledge of the specific selections from the reading list | Demonstrates a satisfactory, accurate, and well-articulated knowledge of the specific selections from the reading list | Demonstrates an unsatisfactory and/or inaccurate knowledge of the specific selections from the reading list | Fails to demonstrate knowledge of the specific selections from the comprehensive exam reading list |  |
| **Demonstrates a working conceptual knowledge of the specific selections from the comprehensive exam reading list** | Demonstrates a thorough and clearly articulated conceptual knowledge of the specific selections from the reading list | Demonstrates a satisfactory and well-articulated conceptual knowledge of the specific selections from the reading list | Demonstrates an unsatisfactory conceptual knowledge of the specific selections from the reading list | Fails to demonstrate a conceptual knowledge of the specific selections from the reading list |  |
|  |  |  |  | **SCORE Q2:** |  |

APPENDIX C

Folk Studies (069)

Rubric for Evaluation of Online Portfolios

Implemented 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.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CURRICULUM MAP 2021-2022** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Program name:** | Folk Studies MA |  |
| **Department:** | Folk Studies and Anthropology |  |
| **College:** | PCAL |  |
| **Contact person:** | Ann Ferrell, Folk Studies Program Director |  |
| **Email:** | ann.ferrell@wku.edu |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |
| **KEY:** |  |  |  |
| **I = Introduced** |  |  |  |
| **R = Reinforced/Developed** |  |  |  |
| **M = Mastered** |  |  |  |
| **A = Assessed** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Research Thesis concentration** |  |  | **LEARNING OUTCOMES** |
| **Course Subject** | **Number** | **Course Title** | **LO1: Demonstrate competency in the history, methods, and theories of the discipline of folklore** | **LO2: Demonstrate ability to produce professional-level products** |
| FLK | 569 | Folklore Genres | I |   |
| FLK | 578 | Folklore Fieldwork | I | I |
| FLK | 577 | Folklore Theory | R | R |
| FLK | 561 | Folk Art | R | R |
| FLK | 571 | Folk Narrative | R | R |
| FLK  | 575 | Folk Belief | R | R |
| FLK | 4xxG - 5xx  | one applied course | R | R |
| FLK | 599 | Thesis Research and Writing | M, A | M, A |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| Both learning outcomes are also assessed through a comprehensive exam |   |   |   |   |