

Learning Outcomes Assessment Worksheet

Master of Liberal Arts for 08-09 AY
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania

Program-Initiated Goal or Objective	Where, When, and How Monitored	Expectation for Satisfactory Performance	Observations of Student Performance	Results Analyzed When and by Whom	Outcome of Analysis	Dept. or Program Follow-up
Capstone Proposal	LART600 Core Introductory Seminar creates the learning environment for the development of the Capstone Proposal.	Capstone Proposal is submitted via the Independent Study application process. Approval of the IS and evaluation via the attached rubric.	How many students SP 2008 - <u>2</u> met <u> </u> incomplete 2 TOTAL FA 2008 - <u>3</u> met <u>2</u> incomplete 5 TOTAL SP 2009 – <u>3</u> In progress 3 TOTAL Data form CARS	The Capstone Proposal is assessed by the Instructor of LART 600, the Capstone Advisor and the Dean of the College of Arts and Science using the attached rubric.	Objective satisfied Follow-up strategy: Advisor and Director work with students until they meet the expectation	None required Annually data collected and review
Capstone Presentation	Capstone Forum is the venue for the presentation of completed capstone projects. The Capstone Forum is held on the Wednesday of Finals week in the semester that the student has declared they will graduate	See attached rubric.	How many students SP 2008 - <u>6</u> met <u>3</u> incomplete 9 TOTAL Fall 2008 <u>5</u> met 5 TOTAL Spring 2009 <u>7</u> In progress 7 TOTAL Data form CARS	The forum presentations are video taped and the capstone is assessed by both the director of the program and the capstone advisor using the attached rubric.	Objective satisfied Follow-up strategy: Advisor and Director work with students until they meet the expectation	None required Annually data collected and review
Capstone Project Report	Capstone Committee which consists of the Capstone advisor and a minimum of two readers reviews and edits the project report. The report is assessed using the attached rubric.	See attached rubric.	How many students SP 2008 - <u>6</u> met <u>3</u> incomplete 9 TOTAL FA 2008 - <u>3</u> met <u>2</u> incomplete 5 TOTAL SP 2009 – <u>7</u> In progress 7 TOTAL Data form CARS	Dept. meeting date: <i>or</i> Other analysis (describe):	Objective satisfied Follow-up strategy: Advisor and Director work with students until they meet the expectation	None required Annually data collected and review

Other observations? Unexpected findings? Overall what changes/improvements are planned as a result of the assessments shown in the table?

Standards for the program have been adopted and are being utilized to assess student learning outcomes.

All grades will be assigned in accordance with university policy and based on criteria to include participation, completion of assignments relating to state and national standards.

The grades achieved on each activity serve as the assessment for this course. Each activity is aligned with the numerically corresponding standard below:

1. Writing and Discourse
2. Ideas, Cultural Traditions, and Values
3. Society and Human Behaviour
4. Scientific Reasoning and Discovery
5. Qualitative, Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning
6. Creative and Aesthetic Experience
7. Critical Issues in a Global Context
8. Technology Proficiency

Participating in the design and implementation of a MLA student portfolio using Foliotek.
Utilizing Waypoint Outcomes to assess course learning outcomes.

Student Name _____

Evaluator _____

Advisor

Reader

Self

Capstone Topic:

Oral Presentation Rubric	
Capstone Presentation – Evaluation Rubric	
Presentation	
Performance	
1	The oral presentation was smooth and seamless. The presenter appeared calm and in command of the information.
2	The oral presentation was mostly smooth and seamless. There were few verbal pauses. The presenter appeared calm and had a general grasp of the information.
3	The oral presentation was choppy and difficult to follow. The presenter did not have a grasp on the information. There were frequent pauses for him or her to find their place.
4	The oral presentation was inarticulate and difficult to follow. The presenter did not seem to know the material and read a transcript.
Organization/Critical Analysis of the Content	
1	A clear purpose is established, major ideas are summarized and the audience is left with full understanding of presenter’s position, the presentation contains pertinent examples, facts, graphs and/or statistics, and draws a conclusion supported by the evidence.
2	There is some success defining the purpose, major ideas are summarized and the audience has a general idea of the focus, includes some examples, facts, graphs, and/or statistics; which supports ideas, but needs to refine the summary of data and final conclusions.
3	There is an attempt to define the purpose, major ideas may need to be summarized, audience is left with vague idea to the purpose, the examples, facts, and/or statistics are weak and do not adequately support the ideas or conclusions.
4	The purpose of the presentation is not clearly defined; major ideas left un-clear, audience left without an understanding of the purpose, the examples, facts, and/or statistics are weak and totally insufficient to support ideas or conclusions.
Presenter Response to Questions	
1	Correctly responded to all questions in an accurate and confident manner.
2	Correctly responded to most of the questions, confidence in responding was variable.
3	Correctly responded to some of the questions but lacked confidence.
4	Incorrectly handled questions or handled the questions in an unprofessional manner.

Student:

Evaluator:

Chair Reader Student

Master of Liberal Arts		
Capstone Proposal - Evaluation Rubric		
Capstone Proposal – “Public Intellectual” – Evaluation Rubric		
	Proposal Topic / Title	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The topic is clear, and the title constitutes a concise statement of purpose.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The topic is only moderately clear, and the title inadequately conveys the purpose.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The topic/title is vague or fails to convey a statement of purpose
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The topic/title is unclear or misleading.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The topic/title is missing or lacks coherence.
	Purpose Question / Argument	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The questions are relevant and substantive. The argument is clearly detailed and original.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The questions are relevant, yet lacking in substance. The argument is original but needs more development.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The questions lack relevance or substance. The argument is moderately flawed or questionable.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The questions are unrelated to the topic or otherwise lack substance. The argument is illogical or unconvincing.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The questions are incomplete or lack direction. The argument is missing or incoherent.
	Resources and Preliminary Review of Literature	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The literature review is well developed and comprehensive, including at least 10-15 major resources. There view demonstrates that the project is researchable, yet original.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The review is somewhat comprehensive, including at least 8-10 significant resources, demonstrating that the topic is researchable, yet original.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The review is only minimally comprehensive, fewer than 8 works, but the topic appears to be researchable and original.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The review needs further development, with more annotated sources. The project may need to be revised.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The review is not annotated or includes very few or no resources. The research topic is not demonstrably original or researchable.
	Research Methods	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Data collection techniques are fully described. Samples of questionnaires, surveys, observation forms, or other tools are provided. If needed, an IRB proposal is included, depending on the topic.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Data collection techniques are adequately described. Sample questionnaires, surveys, observation forms, or other tools are described. If needed, an IRB proposal is included, depending on the topic.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Research or data collection methods are minimally described. Samples are undeveloped or otherwise incomplete.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Research or data Collection methods are unclear or inadequately described. Little evidence that data collection methods have been developed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Research methods are missing or otherwise poorly developed.

Anticipated Conclusions		
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Conclusions or anticipated results reveal excellent critical thought. Research results logically follow from project's thesis or methods.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Conclusions or anticipated results reveal moderately effective critical thought. Research results follow from project's thesis or methods.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Conclusions or anticipated results are vague or only partially follow from project's thesis or methods.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Conclusions or anticipated results do not logically follow from project's thesis or methods.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Conclusions are missing or fail to coincide with research methods.
Bibliography / References		
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The resources list is comprehensive, conforming to correct standard formats.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The resources list is fairly complete, but formats are not completely correct.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The resources list is minimal, and formats are not always correct.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The resources list is incomplete, and formatting is incorrect.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The resources list is missing, and/or mixed, or formatting is non-standard.

Student:

Evaluator:

Chair Reader Student

**Master of Liberal Arts
Capstone Project - Evaluation Rubric**

Capstone Proposal – “Public Intellectual” – Evaluation Rubric

Proposal Topic / Title	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 The topic is clear, and the title constitutes a concise statement of purpose.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 The topic is only moderately clear, and the title inadequately conveys the purpose.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 The topic/title is vague or fails to convey a statement of purpose
<input type="checkbox"/>	4 The topic/title is unclear or misleading.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 The topic/title is missing or lacks coherence.
Purpose Question / Argument	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 The questions are relevant and substantive. The argument is clearly detailed and original.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 The questions are relevant, yet lacking in substance. The argument is original but needs more development.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 The questions lack relevance or substance. The argument is moderately flawed or questionable.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4 The questions are unrelated to the topic or otherwise lack substance. The argument is illogical or unconvincing.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 The questions are incomplete or lack direction. The argument is missing or incoherent.
Research Methods	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 Data collection techniques are fully described. Samples of questionnaires, surveys, observation forms, or other tools are provided. If needed, an IRB proposal is included, depending on the topic.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 Data collection techniques are adequately described. Sample questionnaires, surveys, observation forms, or other tools are described. If needed, an IRB proposal is included, depending on the topic.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 Research or data collection methods are minimally described. Samples are undeveloped or otherwise incomplete.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4 Research or data Collection methods are unclear or inadequately described. Little evidence that data collection methods have been developed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 Research methods are missing or otherwise poorly developed.
Anticipated Conclusions	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 Conclusions reveal excellent critical thought. Research results logically follow from project’s thesis or methods.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 Conclusions reveal moderately effective critical thought. Research results follow from project’s thesis or methods.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 Conclusions are vague or only partially follow from project’s thesis or methods.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4 Conclusions do not logically follow from project’s thesis or methods.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 Conclusions are missing or fail to coincide with research methods.
Bibliography / References	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 The bibliography is well developed, annotated, and comprehensive, including at least 10-15 major resources. They demonstrates that the project is researchable, yet original.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 The bibliography is annotated, somewhat comprehensive, including at least 8-10 significant resources, demonstrating that the topic is researchable, yet original.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 The bibliography is only minimally comprehensive, fewer than 8 works, but the topic appears to be researchable and original.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4 The bibliography needs further development, with more annotated sources. The project may need to be revised.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 The bibliography is not annotated or includes very few or no resources. The research topic is not demonstrably original or researchable.