

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): PhD in Theological Studies
Department: Theological Studies
College/School: College of Arts and Sciences
Date: June 22, 2018
Primary Assessment Contact: Mary Dunn

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

5: Graduate students will acquire the skills necessary to succeed on the academic job market as well as to flourish as successful academic professionals.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

We run a bi-weekly seminar on different professionalization topics, such as how to craft a compelling CV, how to present at an academic conference, and how to interview on campus, *inter alia*, intended to equip our PhD students with the skills necessary to succeed on the academic job market and as professional academics. In order to assess whether the seminar is effective in achieving the above outcome, we collected the following data:

1. attendance at and participation in the seminar
2. participation in professional development activities associated with the seminar
3. annual review of our PhD students
4. exit interview
5. job placement rates

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

As part of our annual review process, faculty meet together as a group to discuss each individual student's progress in the program. One of the categories of evaluation in the annual review process considers students' efforts toward professional development, giving faculty the opportunity to evaluate students' attendance at and participation in the seminar series. The Director of Graduate Studies receives and examines the exit interviews provided by graduating students. The Graduate Placement Officers evaluate job placement rates.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

This is the first year we've run the professionalization series, and it seems to have been quite successful. Based on feedback received through the exit interview as well as informally, we learned that students have found that the seminars give them the skills necessary to succeed on the academic job market as well as to flourish as successful academic professionals. Our job placements this year, in particular, strongly indicate that the seminar series, in conjunction with the efforts of our Graduate Placement Offices, has been effective in realizing the above-stated learning outcome. Three of our four graduating PhD students landed academic jobs.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Again, since this is the first year we've run the professionalization series, our data was limited. We expect that future iterations of this series will provide additional constructive data that will inform revisions. This year, however, the data indicated that we needed to make it clearer to our PhD students that attendance in and participation in the series was required. One student, in particular, attended only irregularly. We were able to remind him—and others—through the annual review process that the series is mandatory.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (*For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?*)

This is the first time we've assessed this learning outcome.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.