

## 2010 OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ANNUAL “RESULTS” REPORT

Name of Program: Master of Humanities/Master of Social Science

Program Director: Myra Bookman

E-mail for Program Director: [myra.bookman@ucdenver.edu](mailto:myra.bookman@ucdenver.edu)

Person Completing Report: Myra Bookman assisted by Margaret Woodhull

E-mail for Person Completing Report: [myra.bookman@ucdenver.edu](mailto:myra.bookman@ucdenver.edu); [margaret.woodhull@ucdenver.edu](mailto:margaret.woodhull@ucdenver.edu)

Date Report Submitted: May 2010

### 1. Describe the program goals.

The programs aim to provide a uniquely rich interdisciplinary education and to provide:

- an “interdisciplinary understanding” defined as the capacity to integrate knowledge and modes of thinking....(Mansilla, V. 2005; drawn from Mary Allen’s handout).
- a foundation that includes general critical and argumentation skills as well as the ability to problem-solve and to synthesize information
- content-specific knowledge appropriate to a discipline, theme, or problem within particular areas of focus, tracks, or certificate programs
- advancement toward oral and written language fluency appropriate to a student earning a master’s degree
- an academic foundation (through required graduate level core courses) on which students build as they pursue advanced work in the humanities and the social sciences

- opportunities for students to read and become critical consumers of specific areas of scholarly literature as appropriate to her/his interests and needs.
- critical skills to be applied in government agencies, educational institutions, international work, and business.

## **2. Describe the learning outcomes for students.**

a. To demonstrate the “capacity to integrate knowledge and modes of thinking drawn from two or more disciplines to produce a cognitive advancement...in ways that would have been unlikely through single disciplinary means”...as measured by demonstrating (i.e., making clear in writing): (Adapted from Mansilla)

1. “Disciplinary grounding” - student selects appropriate disciplines; concepts are used in accurate ways
2. “Integrative leverage” - student calls attention to a novel concept, interpretation or relationship
3. “Critical stance” - student identifies the significance of the integrated stance and ways to reconcile diverse or conflicting views.

b. To critically analyze and synthesize information

c. To demonstrate relevant information pertaining to particular areas of focus

d. To write effective, grammatically correct, organized scholarly papers

e. To demonstrate foundational knowledge within the Humanities or Social Sciences depending on degree sought

f. To demonstrate the ability to read critically scholarly literature

g. To demonstrate skills to apply knowledge to particular field of work

### **Reference**

Mansilla V. (2005, January /February) Assessing student work at a disciplinary crossroads. *Change*, 37, 14-21. (Cited in Allen, M, Handout on Integrative Thinking and Learning.)

ASSESSMENT RESULTS RUBRIC: SPRING 2010

<b>OUTCOME A: MODES OF THINKING AND KNOWLEDGE INTEGRATION NOT TYPICAL IN SINGLE DISCIPLINE STUDIES</b>	<b>OUTSTANDING</b>	<b>EFFECTIVE</b>	<b>ADEQUATE</b>	<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>
<b>1A: DISCIPLINARY GROUNDING: APPROPRIATE DISCIPLINES SELECTION</b>	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	12.5%
<b>1B: DISCIPLINARY GROUNDING: ACCURATE USE OF CONCEPTS</b>	50%	12.5%	12.5%	25%
<b>2: INTEGRATIVE LEVERAGE</b>	25%	37.5%	12.5%	25%
<b>3: CRITICAL STANCE</b>	50%	25%		25%

**ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

	<b>3. TYPES OF ASSESSMENTS</b>	<b>4. SAMPLING (FROM WHOM)</b>	<b>5. DATA COLLECTION METHOD</b>	<b>6. ASSESSMENT SCORING METHOD</b>	<b>7. RESULTS</b>	<b>8. SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS</b>	<b>9. USE OF INFORMATION</b>
<p><b>LEARNING OUTCOME A:</b></p> <p><b>INTEGRATION OF DISCIPLINES (4 SUBPARTS NOTED ABOVE)</b></p>	<p>8 Master of Humanities Thesis and Project proposals assessed</p>	<p>Proposals submitted from Directed Reading and Research in Interdisciplinary Humanities course (for which this is the culminating assignment).</p>	<p>8 MH proposals were scored. (This was the total number of submitted papers in the class.)</p>	<p>Papers read and scored based on Learning Outcome A and its subparts. (See rubric above.)</p>	<p>See above.</p>	<p>75% of the papers were either outstanding or effective on Disciplinary Grounding 1a suggesting appropriate disciplines were selected for the designated study; 65% were outstanding or effective on 1b suggesting accurate use of concepts. Slightly less competence was demonstrated on Integrative Leverage in which 62.5% were outstanding or effective, but 75% were in those categories Critical Stance.</p>	<p>Continue current pedagogical methods with increased focus on Integrative Leverage and Critical Stance by emphasizing these aspects in scholarly readings assigned in class; using better papers as samples for weaker students; emphasizing the need for and the development of skills to integrate knowledge and modes of thinking from different disciplines to produce an outcome that would be more effective than using one alone. Since there were many fewer papers scored this year, it is difficult to assess the meaningfulness of changes. In this sample, there were 2 very weak papers, which</p>

							degraded the overall percentages quite a bit. The most obvious improvement is the score on Critical Stance from 60% in the high categories last year to 75% this year, indicating that among the better papers, the ability to take an integrated critical perspective across disciplines has improved.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---