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Learning Outcome #1
Theory
Students will demonstrate knowledge of central theoretical approaches, terms, and concepts of rhetoric and composition as disciplinary fields

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with 1 being “not acceptable,” 2 “acceptable,” 3 “good,” and 4 “excellent.” In 2013, the two primary members of each MA portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted by the student, 6 students in total. See Appendix A for a detailed rubric rating for each outcome.

Findings
Six portfolios were rated. The range was from 2 (acceptable), to 4 (excellent), with a mean rating of 3.1. Most portfolios were rated good.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The findings were distributed to graduate faculty, and discussed during assessment meetings. Advisory committees will encourage a more theoretical focus to MA portfolios.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #2
Communication and writing
Students will employ academic prose to communicate the results of their analyses to scholars in rhetoric and composition and other interested publics.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
The portfolios of graduating students were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with 1 being “not acceptable,” 2 “acceptable,” 3 “good,” and 4 “excellent.” The two primary members of each MA portfolio committee independently rated the portfolios submitted by the students, 6 students in total. See Appendix A for a detailed rubric rating for each outcome.

Findings
Six portfolios were rated. The range was from 3 (good), to 4 (excellent), with a mean score of 3.5, with the ratings evenly divided.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The findings were distributed to graduate faculty, and discussed during assessment meetings. While faculty were generally satisfied with this result, there was discussion about the best way to encourage excellence in this outcome for all portfolios.

Additional Comments
In 2014, we will restore a related outcome from 2012 that measures students’ ability to conduct research using methods for selecting, collecting, and analyzing data commonly employed in rhetoric and composition scholarship.
Learning Outcome #3
Pedagogy
Students will produce teaching materials and support items that demonstrate knowledge of best practices in composition theory and pedagogy

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with 1 being “not acceptable,” 2 “acceptable,” 3 “good,” and 4 “excellent.” In 2013, the two primary members of each MA portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted by the student, 6 students in total. See Appendix A for a detailed rubric rating for each outcome.

Findings
Six portfolios were rated. The range was from 3 (good), to 4 (excellent), with a mean rating of 3.9. All but one portfolio were rated excellent.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The findings were distributed to graduate faculty, and discussed during assessment meetings. Pedagogical training in the department is going through changes, and the faculty will work to ensure continued strong results in this area.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome#4
Digital communication
Students will be able to design and assemble a digital portfolio that effectively showcases their contributions to the fields of rhetoric and composition.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with 1 being “not acceptable,” 2 “acceptable,” 3 “good,” and 4 “excellent.” In 2013, the two primary members of each MA portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted by the student, 6 students in total. See Appendix A for a detailed rubric rating for each outcome.

Findings
Six portfolios were rated. The range was from 3 (good), to 4 (excellent), with a mean score of 3.8, with the ratings evenly divided.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The findings were distributed to graduate faculty, and discussed during assessment meetings. While faculty are satisfied with this result, there was discussion about the best way to encourage continued excellence in this outcome for all portfolios.

Additional Comments
None.
## Appendix A. MA Assessment Rubric Concentration in Rhetoric and Composition: AY 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Category</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>1 - Not acceptable</th>
<th>2 - Acceptable</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 - Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of central theoretical approaches, terms, and concepts of rhetoric and composition as disciplinary fields.</td>
<td>Discusses theoretical approaches, terms, and/or concepts inaccurately, vaguely, and/or with little detail; cites few (or no) secondary sources; cites sources incorrectly.</td>
<td>Discusses theoretical approaches, terms, and/or concepts accurately and with specificity; cites adequate secondary sources; cites secondary sources correctly.</td>
<td>Discusses theoretical approaches, terms, and/or concepts accurately and with specificity; states claims clearly and supports those claims with strong evidence; cites adequate secondary sources; cites secondary sources correctly and appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to conduct research using methods for selecting, collecting, and analyzing data commonly employed in rhetoric and composition scholarship.</td>
<td>Discusses methods for selecting, collecting, and analyzing data inaccurately, vaguely, and/or with little detail; cites few (or no) secondary sources; cites sources incorrectly.</td>
<td>Discusses methods for selecting, collecting, and analyzing data accurately and with specificity; cites adequate secondary sources; cites secondary sources correctly.</td>
<td>Discusses methods for selecting, collecting, and analyzing data accurately and with specificity; states claims clearly and supports those claims with strong evidence; cites adequate secondary sources; cites secondary sources correctly and appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Writing</td>
<td>Uses academic prose to communicate the results of analysis to scholars in rhetoric and composition and other interested publics.</td>
<td>Communicates the results of analysis inaccurately, vaguely, and/or with little detail; cites few (or no) secondary sources; cites sources incorrectly.</td>
<td>Communicates the results of analysis accurately and with specificity; cites adequate secondary sources; cites secondary sources correctly.</td>
<td>Communicates the results of analysis accurately and with specificity; states claims clearly and supports those claims with strong evidence; cites adequate secondary sources; cites secondary sources correctly and appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Produces teaching materials and support items that demonstrate knowledge of best practices in composition theory and pedagogy.</td>
<td>Teaching materials demonstrate best practices inaccurately, vaguely, and/or with little detail; cites few (or no) secondary sources; cites sources incorrectly.</td>
<td>Teaching materials demonstrate best practices accurately and with specificity; cites adequate secondary sources; cites secondary sources correctly.</td>
<td>Teaching materials demonstrate best practices accurately and with specificity; states claims clearly and supports those claims with strong evidence; cites adequate secondary sources; cites secondary sources correctly and appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Digital Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Designs and assembles a digital portfolio that effectively showcases contributions to the fields of rhetoric and composition relevant to the students’ future professional goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio documents are either not functional or unattractive: documents largely fail to exhibit basic knowledge of standard design criteria, including failure to appropriately use contrast, repetition, alignment, and proximity. Design elements do not clarify the purpose and function of the portfolio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio documents are minimally functional and attractive: some documents exhibit basic knowledge of standard design criteria, including appropriate use of contrast, repetition, alignment, and proximity. Design elements do not overly detract from the purpose and function of the portfolio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio documents are functional and attractive; most documents exhibit basic knowledge of standard design criteria, including excellent use of contrast, repetition, alignment, and proximity. Design elements mostly clarify the purpose and function of the portfolio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio documents are highly functional and beautiful: all documents exhibit thorough knowledge of standard design criteria, including excellent use of contrast, repetition, alignment, and proximity. Design elements clarify the purpose and function of the portfolio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>