Outcomes Data: PhD in Technical Communication and Rhetoric

As described in “assessment mapping” earlier in this document, we have instituted five points of assessment that all PhD TPPC students must participate in. These are:

A. Coursework (including seminar papers, projects, and presentations)
B. Qualifying Exam
C. Comprehensive Exam
D. Annual Reviews
E. Dissertation Proposal Defense
F. Dissertation Defense

2019-20

A. Outcomes Data from Courses

The Ph.D. assessment requires evaluation of all Ph.D. courses taught in the academic year. The following courses were taught in 2019-2020:

- 7400: Editing
- 7410: Introduction to Technical Communication
- 7420: Usability Studies and Human Factors in Professional Communication
- 7480: Studies in Technology and Writing
- 7830: Introduction to Rhetorical Theory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of PhD seats</th>
<th>L1: Demonstrate mastery of major theoretical and rhetorical contributions to the field.</th>
<th>L2: Demonstrate field-expertise skills in technology and design.</th>
<th>L3: Demonstrate a variety of pedagogical skills and defend pedagogical practices.</th>
<th>L4: Develop and apply a research method(s) in research projects and dissertation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fall 2019 through Summer 2020 | 19                        | H:15  
M:3  
L:1                                                                 | H:7  
M:12  
L:0                                             | H:15  
M:4  
L:0                                               | H:17  
M:2  
L:0                                             |

**B. PhD Degree Milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Yr Span*</th>
<th>Qualifying Exam</th>
<th>Annual Exam</th>
<th>Comprehensive Exam</th>
<th>Internship Presentation</th>
<th>Dissertation Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2015-2020  | 7 Passed  
1 Leave of Absence | 14 Passed  
2 Passed with Distinction  
3 Passed with Probation | 6 Passed  
1 Passed with Distinction  
1 Failed | 9 Passed*** | 8 Passed |
| 2009-2014  | 8 Passed***     | 4 Passed    | 2 Passed  
1 Passed with Distinction  
1 Failed | N/A         | 2 Passed |

*Data is reported in five-year spans to protect student anonymity. Otherwise, students may recognize themselves and others in the data.

*** This milestone was created in 2014

***More students passed their dissertation proposal than the internship presentation because four students completed their internships before a formal presentation was required. Upon completion of their internship, they proceeded directly to the dissertation proposal.
2018-19

A. Outcomes Data from Courses

Between Fall 2018 and Spring 2019, we offered the following five PhD classes:

ENGL 7410 Intro to Tech Comm, Walton
ENGL 7440 Cultural Research Methods, Colton
ENGL 7830 Intro to Rhetorical Theory, Colton
ENGL 7860 Teaching Tech Comm, Edenfield
ENGL 7420 Usability Studies and Human Factors in Professional Communication, Moeller

The total number of seats occupied by PhD students in Fall 2016-Summer 2017 classes was 14. Below is a chart that describes how these students performed on the learning objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of PhD seats occupied</th>
<th>L1: Demonstrate mastery of major theoretical and rhetorical contributions to the field</th>
<th>L2: Demonstrate field-expertise skills in technology and design</th>
<th>L3: Demonstrate a variety of pedagogical skills and defend pedagogical practices</th>
<th>L4: Develop and apply a research method(s) in research projects and dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. PhD Degree Milestones
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Yr Span*</th>
<th>Qualifying Exam</th>
<th>Annual Exam</th>
<th>Comprehensive Exam</th>
<th>Internship Presentation</th>
<th>Dissertation Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>7 Passed</td>
<td>2 Passed</td>
<td>2 Passed with Distinction</td>
<td>6 Passed**</td>
<td>10 Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Leave of Absence</td>
<td>with Distinction</td>
<td>16 Passed with Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>7 Passed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9 Passed</td>
<td>N/A (This milestone was instituted after this 5-yr span)</td>
<td>7 Passed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More students passed their dissertation proposal than the internship presentation because four students completed their internships before a formal presentation was required. Upon completion of their internship, they proceeded directly to the dissertation proposal.**

2017-18

A. Outcomes Data from Courses

Between Fall 2017 and Spring 2018, we offered the following five PhD classes:

ENGL 7800 Teaching Online, Grant-Davie
ENGL 7400 Advanced Editing, Grant-Davie
ENGL 7460 Studies in Digital Media, Colton
ENGL 7480 Studies in Technology and Writing, Colton
ENGL 7000 Empirical Research Methods, Moeller

The total number of seats occupied by PhD students in Fall 2016-Summer 2017 classes was 12.

Below is a chart that describes how these students performed on the learning objectives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of PhD seats occupied</th>
<th>L1: Demonstrate mastery of major theoretical and rhetorical contributions to the field.</th>
<th>L2: Demonstrate field-expertise skills in technology and design.</th>
<th>L3: Demonstrate a variety of pedagogical skills and defend pedagogical practices.</th>
<th>L4: Develop and apply a research method(s) in research projects and dissertation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**B. PhD Degree Milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Yr Span*</th>
<th>Qualifying Exam</th>
<th>Annual Exam</th>
<th>Comprehensive Exam</th>
<th>Internship Presentation</th>
<th>Dissertation Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>5 Passed</td>
<td>1 Passed with Distinction</td>
<td>2 Passed with Distinction</td>
<td>6 Passed**</td>
<td>10 Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Leave of Absence</td>
<td>13 Passed</td>
<td>8 Passed 1 Failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>7 Passed</td>
<td>N/A (This milestone was created in 2014)</td>
<td>9 Passed</td>
<td>N/A (This milestone was instituted after this 5-yr span)</td>
<td>7 Passed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More students passed their dissertation proposal than the internship presentation because four students completed their internships before a formal presentation was required. Upon completion of their internship, they proceeded directly to the dissertation proposal.**
2016-17

A. Outcomes Data from Courses

Between Fall 2016 and Summer 2017, we offered the following five PhD classes:

ENGL 7410 Walton  
ENGL 7830 Moeller  
ENGL 7440 Colton  
ENGL 7860 Walton  
ENGL 7400 Grant-Davie

The total number of seats occupied by PhD students in Fall 2016-Summer 2017 classes was 20.

Below is a chart that describes how these students performed on the learning objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of PhD seats occupied</th>
<th>L1: Demonstrate mastery of major theoretical and rhetorical contributions to the field.</th>
<th>L2: Demonstrate field-expertise skills in technology and design.</th>
<th>L3: Demonstrate a variety of pedagogical skills and defend pedagogical practices.</th>
<th>L4: Develop and apply a research method(s) in research projects and dissertation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fall 2016 through Summer 2017 | 13                                | H: 9  
M: 4  
L: 0  
Note that 5 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement | H: 6  
M: 3  
L: 4  
Note that 5 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement | H:9  
M: 4  
L: 0  
Note that 5 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement | H: 9  
M: 4  
L: 0  
Note that 5 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement |
B. Qualifying Exams

Between Fall 2011 and Summer 2017, 11 students took qualifying examinations. Below is a table displaying the results of student assessment of qualifying exams. The data is grouped together (rather than presented by year) in this report so that individual students’ performances can’t be identified/discerned. Please note that we are including five years of data in this assessment point in order to protect the identities of students, who might otherwise recognize themselves and others in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total who took qualifying exam</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam with distinction*</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam*</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam with probation*</th>
<th>Number who failed qualifying exam probation*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program before completing qualifying exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C: Comprehensive Exams
Between Fall 2011 and Summer 2017, 7 students took comprehensive examinations. As described in the “Assessment Plan” portion of this document, the comprehensive examination is an extensive written exam undertaken by students as they finish their coursework (usually the fourth semester).

Note that data for individual years are not supplied because it would violate FERPA, as our program is so small that, depending on the year, only one student might defend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total who took qualifying exam</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam with distinction*</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam*</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam with probation*</th>
<th>Number who failed qualifying exam probation*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program before completing qualifying exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates that student’s performance excels in mastery of all four learning objectives

*Indicates that student’s performance meet expectations of performance and/or mastery of all four learning objectives.

*Indicates that student’s performance does not meet expectation of performance and/or mastery in one learning objective

*Indicates that student’s performance does not meet expectations of performance and/or mastery of all four learning objectives

D. Annual Review (for students in second year and after) from Fall 2014 to present
As described in the “Assessment Plan” portion of this document, all PhD students under an annual exam in the spring semester of years two, three, and four (and beyond the fourth year if the student takes more time to finish).

Below is a table displaying the results of students’ annual reviews from Fall 2014 to Spring 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number who passed with distinction*</th>
<th>Number who passed*</th>
<th>Number who passed with probation*</th>
<th>Number who failed*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out program between comprehens exam and dissertation defense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Proposal Defense

From Fall 2011 to Summer 2017, seven students have defended their dissertation proposals. Below is a table that describes the outcomes of these oral defenses. As described in our “Assessment Plan” (III.E), the proposal defense results in four possible outcomes.

Please note that data for individual years are not supplied because it would violate FERPA, as our program is so small that, depending on the year, only one student might defend his/her proposal.
We include six years of data in this assessment point in order to protect the identities of students, who might otherwise recognize themselves and others in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total</th>
<th>Number who passed with distinction*</th>
<th>Number who passed*</th>
<th>Number who achieved low pass*</th>
<th>Number who failed*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program between comprehensive exam and proposal defense.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Indicates student excels in all four learning objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>*Indicates student meets expectations of mastery in all four learning objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>*Indicates student does not meet expectation of mastery in all four objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>* Indicates student performs far below expectations of mastery in one or more of four objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Dissertation Defenses

As described in the Assessment Plan, students must defend their written dissertation in an oral defense. The defense can result in one of four outcomes.

See below the data below for dissertation defense results and how they map onto our learning objectives. Note that data for individual years are not supplied because it would violate FERPA, as our program is so small that, depending on the year, only one student might defend. We include six years of data in this assessment point in order to protect the identities of students, who might otherwise recognize themselves and others in the data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total</th>
<th>Number who passed with no revisions*</th>
<th>Number who passed*</th>
<th>Number who achieved low pass*</th>
<th>Number who failed*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program between comprehensive exam and proposal defense.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Exels in all four objectives (exceeds expected level of mastery)</td>
<td>*Indicates student meets expectations of mastery in all four learning objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>*Indicates student does not meet expectations of mastery of all four learning objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>*Indicates student performs far below expectations of mastery in one or more of four objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Student Presentations and Publications

As described in the “Assessment Plan” of this document, although not a required part of students’ Program of Study, doctoral students are expected to engage in the professional activities of scholars by attending conferences, presenting at conferences, and if possible, publishing their work in reputable venues. Students also submit evidence of engagement with scholarship and the dissemination of that scholarship in their annual reviews.

Below is a table that describes how student presentations and papers address the program’s learning objectives. Under each learning objective is the number of presentations or papers that year that gave that particular learning objective either High or Medium priority. Please note that these presentations and publications are organized by calendar year, not academic year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of presentations that demonstrate L1 (mastery of major theoretical and rhetorical contributions to the field)</th>
<th># of presentations that demonstrate L2 (field-expertise skills in technology and design)</th>
<th># of presentations that demonstrate L3 (a variety of pedagogical skills and defend pedagogical practices)</th>
<th># of presentations that demonstrate L4 (Develop and apply a research method(s) in research projects and dissertation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Presentations</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>H=2</td>
<td>H=2</td>
<td>H=3</td>
<td>H=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M=6</td>
<td>M=5</td>
<td>M=3</td>
<td>M=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Presentations</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>H=7</td>
<td>H=1</td>
<td>H=4</td>
<td>H=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M=8</td>
<td>M=6</td>
<td>M=3</td>
<td>M=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Publications</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>H=0</td>
<td>H=0</td>
<td>H=0</td>
<td>H=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M=1</td>
<td>M=0</td>
<td>M=1</td>
<td>M=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Publications</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>H=2</td>
<td>H=2</td>
<td>H=0</td>
<td>H=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M=2</td>
<td>M=1</td>
<td>M=0</td>
<td>M=2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentations

2017

- Huntsman, S. (14 October 2017). “Virtual Relationships: Reclaiming Office Hours in Distance Education.” Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association Conference. Spokane, WA.
• Shirley, B. (October 2017). “Technological embodiment, disability, and environmentalism.” Western States Rhetorics and Literacy Conference. Salt Lake City, UT.

• Huntsman, S. (7 October 2017). “Perspectives on Accessibility in Course Development”. Councils for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication Conference, Savannah, GA.

• Dayley, C. (6 October 2017). Student perceptions of diversity in TPC programs. Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication (CPTSC), Savannah, GA.


• Dayley, C. (11 August 2017). The effects of desperate naming conventions in TPC academic programs. Special Interest Group for Design of Communication (SIGDOC), Halifax, NS.


• Shirley, B. (March 2017). “Epistemological play and cultivating impactful relationships through gamification of learning in the classroom, campus, and communities.” Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). Portland, OR.


• Scucchi, J. (March 2017). "Playing well with others in the composition classroom." Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), Portland, OR.

2016

• Huntsman, S. (14 October 2016). “Cyborgs in the Writing Center.” International Writing Center Association Conference. Denver, CO.

• Scucchi, J. (October 2016). "Put yourself in their shoes: Empowering technical communication students with pedagogy of empathy." Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association (RMMLA), Salt Lake City, UT.

• Shirley, B. (October 2016). “Ethical agency: New materialism as a mode for effective climate change communication.” Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association Conference. Salt Lake City, UT.


• Dayley, C. (7 October 2016). Informing Efforts to Increase Diversity in TPC Academic Programs. Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association (RMMLA), Salt Lake City, UT.

• Petersen, E. J. (11 June 2016). Mother’s work: Organizing Mormon motherhood in the early twentieth century. Mormon History Association, Snowbird, UT.


• Matheson Martin, B. (April 2016). Broadening the scope of disability advocacy in technical and professional communication: A mental health perspective. ATTW 2016 in Houston, Texas.


• Petersen, E. J. (6 April 2016). “Reasonably bright girls”: Theorizing women’s agency in technological systems of power. Association of Teachers of Technical Writing (ATTW), Houston, TX

• Petersen, E. J. (1 April 2016). Using antenarrative to uncover systems of power in mid-twentieth century policies on marriage and maternity at IBM. European Social Science History Conference, Valencia, Spain.

• Petersen, E. J. (9 January 2016). The state of female practitioners in technical and professional communication. Modern Language Association, Austin, TX.


• Petersen, E. J. (3 March 2016). Beyond biography: Using technical and professional documentation to contextualize Mormon women’s lives. Church History Symposium, Salt Lake City and Provo, UT.


2017


2016

- Petersen, E. J. (2016). Empathetic user design: Understanding and living the reality of an audience. *Communication Design Quarterly 4*(2), 23-36. (Special Issue: Online Networks, Social Media, and Communication Design)

2016

- Scucchi, J. (October 2016). "Put yourself in their shoes: Empowering technical communication students with pedagogy of empathy." Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association (RMMLA), Salt Lake City, UT.
- Shirley, B. (October 2016). "Ethical agency: New materialism as a mode for effective climate change communication." Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association Conference. Salt Lake City, UT.
- Dayley, C. (7 October 2016). Informing Efforts to Increase Diversity in TPC Academic Programs. Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association (RMMLA), Salt Lake City, UT.
• Petersen, E. J. (11 June 2016). Mother’s work: Organizing Mormon motherhood in the early twentieth century. Mormon History Association, Snowbird, UT.
• Matheson Martin, B. (April 2016). Broadening the scope of disability advocacy in technical and professional communication: A mental health perspective. ATTW 2016 in Houston, Texas.
• Petersen, E. J. (6 April 2016). “Reasonably bright girls”: Theorizing women’s agency in technological systems of power. Association of Teachers of Technical Writing (ATTW), Houston, TX
• Petersen, E. J. (1 April 2016). Using antenarrative to uncover systems of power in mid-twentieth century policies on marriage and maternity at IBM. European Social Science History Conference, Valencia, Spain.
• Petersen, E. J. (9 January 2016). The state of female practitioners in technical and professional communication. Modern Language Association, Austin, TX.
• Petersen, E. J. (3 March 2016). Beyond biography: Using technical and professional documentation to contextualize Mormon women’s lives. Church History Symposium, Salt Lake City and Provo, UT.

Publications

2017


2016


• Petersen, E. J. (2016). Empathetic user design: Understanding and living the reality of an audience. *Communication Design Quarterly* 4(2), 23-36. (Special Issue: Online Networks, Social Media, and Communication Design)  

Publications  
2017  

2016  


• Petersen, E. J. (2016). Empathetic user design: Understanding and living the reality of an audience. *Communication Design Quarterly* 4(2), 23-36. (Special Issue: Online Networks, Social Media, and Communication Design)
A. Outcomes Data from Courses

The PhD courses address four learning objectives. Below are tables evaluating how students met their learning objectives in classes from Fall 2014-2016. Students are evaluated by their high, medium, or low (H, M, or L) proficiency/mastery of the learning objective. Note that the assessment begins in Fall 2014 because this is when the new Director of Graduate Studies took over the position. Previous to this year we do not have data for how students met learning objectives in the graduate classes. Please also note that several classes have no data available because the instructor has retired. In the future we will make certain to collection this data every year, before a faculty member retires.

Because our PhD program is very small, students might easily recognize themselves and others in the data if we were to publish the results for individual classes online. Therefore, rather than giving semester by semester tables online, we have regrouped the data here to protect student identities.

Between Fall 2014 and Summer 2015, we offered the following nine PhD classes:

ENGL 7410 Moeller
ENGL 7460 Hailey (data unavailable due to retirement)
ENGL 7480 McNeill (data unavailable)
ENGL 7830 Grant-Davie
ENGL 7400 Grant-Davie
ENGL 7430 Hailey (data unavailable due to retirement)
ENGL 7860 Walton
ENGL 7470 Walton
ENGL 7470 McLaughlin

The total number of seats occupied by PhD students in Fall 2014- Summer 2015 classes was 7.

Between Fall 2015 and Summer 2016, we offered the following nine PhD classes:

ENGL 7890 McLaughlin
ENGL 7410 Walton
ENGL 7420 Hailey (Data unavailable due to retirement)
ENGL 7480 Colton
ENGL 7400 Grant-Davie
ENGL 7450 Hailey (Data unavailable due to retirement)
ENGL 7460 Hailey (Data unavailable due to retirement)
ENGL 7800 Grant-Davie

The total number of seats occupied by PhD students in Fall 2014- Summer 2015 classes was 15.
Below is a chart that describes how these students performed on the learning objectives in all of these classes, combined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of PhD seats occupied</th>
<th>L1: Demonstrate mastery of major theoretical and rhetorical contributions to the field.</th>
<th>L2: Demonstrate field-expertise skills in technology and design.</th>
<th>L3: Demonstrate a variety of pedagogical skills and defend pedagogical practices.</th>
<th>L4: Develop and apply a research method(s) in research projects and dissertation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2015 through Summer 2016</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>H: 10, M: 0, L: 0, Note that 5 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement</td>
<td>H: 9, M: 1, L: 0, Note that 5 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement</td>
<td>H:10, M: 0, L: 0, Note that 5 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement</td>
<td>H: 8, M: 2, L: 0, Note that 5 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2014 through Summer 2015</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>H: 3, M: 0, L: 0, Note that 4 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement</td>
<td>H: 3, M: 0, L: 0, Note that 4 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement</td>
<td>H: 3, M: 0, L: 0, Note that 4 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement</td>
<td>H: 3, M: 0, L: 0, Note that 4 students were included in classes where the data is unavailable due to retirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Qualifying Exams
Between Fall 2011 and Summer 2016, 10 students took qualifying examinations. Below is a table displaying the results of student assessment of qualifying exams. The data is grouped together (rather than presented by year) in this report so that individual students’ performances can’t be identified/discrimined. Please note that we are including five years of data in this assessment point in order to protect the identities of students, who might otherwise recognize themselves and others in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total who took qualifying exam</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam with distinction*</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam</th>
<th>Number who passed qualifying exam with probation*</th>
<th>Number who failed qualifying exam probation*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program before completing qualifying exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates that student’s performance excels in mastery of all four learning objectives.

*Indicates that student’s performance meets expectations of performance and/or mastery of all four learning objectives.

*Indicates that student’s performance does not meet expectation of performance and/or mastery in one learning objective.

*Indicates that student’s performance does not meet expectations of performance and/or mastery of all four learning objectives.

C. Comprehensive Exams

Between Fall 2011 and Summer 2016, 7 students took comprehensive examinations. As described in the “Assessment Plan” portion of this document, the comprehensive examination is an extensive written exam undertaken by students as they finish their coursework (usually the fourth semester).

Note that data for individual years are not supplied because it would violate FERPA, as our program is so small that, depending on the year, only one student might defend.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total</th>
<th>Number who passed with distinction*</th>
<th>Number who passed*</th>
<th>Number who received a low pass*</th>
<th>Number who failed*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program between qualifying and completing comprehensive exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Annual Review (for students in second year and after) from Fall 2014 to present

As described in the “Assessment Plan” portion of this document, all PhD students under an annual exam in the spring semester of years two, three, and four (and beyond the fourth year if the student takes more time to finish).

Below is a table displaying the results of students’ annual reviews from Fall 2014 to present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number who passed with distinction*</th>
<th>Number who passed*</th>
<th>Number who passed with probation*</th>
<th>Number who failed*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program between comprehensive exam and dissertation defense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Proposal Defense

Since Fall 2011 to present, 5 students have defended their dissertation proposals. Below is a table that describes the outcomes of these oral defenses. As described in our “Assessment Plan” (III.E), the proposal defense results in four possible outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass with distinction</th>
<th>Written proposal and oral exam excel in all four objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Written proposal and oral exam meet expectations of mastery in all four objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Pass</td>
<td>Written proposal and oral exam do not meet expectation of mastery in all four objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Written proposal and oral exam display performance far below expectations of mastery in one or more of four objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that data for individual years are not supplied because it would violate FERPA, as our program is so small that, depending on the year, only one student might defend his/her proposal. We include five years of data in this assessment point in order to protect the identities of students, who might otherwise recognize themselves and others in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total</th>
<th>Number who passed with distinction*</th>
<th>Number who passed*</th>
<th>Number who achieved low pass*</th>
<th>Number who failed*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program between comprehensive exam and proposal defense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Indicates student excels in all four learning objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>*Indicates student meets expectations of mastery in all four learning objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>*Indicates student does not meet expectations of mastery of all four learning objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td>*Indicates student performs far below expectations of mastery in one or more of four objectives (or appropriate objectives for topic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Dissertation Defenses

As described in the Assessment Plan, students must defend their written dissertation in an oral defense. The defense can result in one of four outcomes.

See below the data below for dissertation defense results and how they map onto our learning objectives. Note that data for individual years are not supplied because it would violate FERPA, as our program is so small that, depending on the year, only one student might defend. We include five years of data in this assessment point in order to protect the identities of students, who might otherwise recognize themselves and others in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students in total</th>
<th>Number who passed with no revisions*</th>
<th>Number who passed*</th>
<th>Number who achieved low pass*</th>
<th>Number who failed*</th>
<th>Number who dropped out of program between comprehensive exam and proposal defense.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Student Presentations and Publications

As described in the “Assessment Plan” of this document, although not a required part of students’ Program of Study, doctoral students are expected to engage in the professional activities of scholars by attending conferences, presenting at conferences, and if possible,
publishing their work in reputable venues. Students also submit evidence of engagement with scholarship and the dissemination of that scholarship in their annual reviews.

Below is a table that describes how student presentations and papers address the program’s learning objectives. Under each learning objective is the number of presentations or papers that year that gave that particular learning objective either High or Medium priority. Please note that these presentations and publications are organized by calendar year, not academic year.
### Event Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of presentations</th>
<th># of presentations</th>
<th># of presentations</th>
<th># of presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that demonstrate L1</td>
<td>that demonstrate L2</td>
<td>that demonstrate L3</td>
<td>that demonstrate L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(mastery of major</td>
<td>(field-expertise</td>
<td>(a variety of</td>
<td>(Develop and apply a research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>theoretical and</td>
<td>skills in technology and</td>
<td>pedagogical</td>
<td>research method(s) in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rhetorical</td>
<td>and design)</td>
<td>skills and defend</td>
<td>research projects and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contributions to the field)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedagogical practices)</td>
<td>dissertation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Presentations</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>H=4 M=4</td>
<td>H=5 M=2</td>
<td>H=2 M=1</td>
<td>H=7 M=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Presentations</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>H=2 M=1</td>
<td>H=2 M=0</td>
<td>H=2 M=0</td>
<td>H=2 M=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Presentations</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>H=3 M=1</td>
<td>H=3 M=0</td>
<td>H=2 M=0</td>
<td>H=1 M=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Publications</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>H=2 M=0</td>
<td>H=1 M=1</td>
<td>H=0 M=2</td>
<td>H=2 M=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Publications</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>H=2 M=1</td>
<td>H=3 M=1</td>
<td>H=1 M=1</td>
<td>H=2 M=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Publications</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>H=2 M=2</td>
<td>H=3 M=0</td>
<td>H=2 M=1</td>
<td>H=2 M=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentations

2016

- Petersen, E. J. (accepted for October 2016). Reterritorializing workspaces: Entrepreneurial podcasting as situated networking, connected mediation, and
contextualized professionalism. ProComm, IEEE International Professional Communication Conference, Houston, TX.

- Petersen, E. J. (11 June 2016). Mother’s work: Organizing Mormon motherhood in the early twentieth century. Mormon History Association, Snowbird, UT.
- Petersen, E. J. (6 April 2016). “Reasonably bright girls”: Theorizing women’s agency in technological systems of power. Association of Teachers of Technical Writing (ATTW), Houston, TX.
- Petersen, E. J. (1 April 2016). Using antenarrative to uncover systems of power in mid-twentieth century policies on marriage and maternity at IBM. European Social Science History Conference, Valencia, Spain.
- Petersen, E. J. (9 January 2016). The state of female practitioners in technical and professional communication. Modern Language Association, Austin, TX.
- Petersen, E. J. (3 March 2016). Beyond biography: Using technical and professional documentation to contextualize Mormon women’s lives. Church History Symposium, Salt Lake City and Provo, UT.
- Hoffman, D.D. “Considering the Experiences of Online Educators.” Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association Conference, Salt Lake City, UT, October 8-10, 2016. (Accepted.)

2015

- Petersen, E. J. (6 June 2015). Looking for career-woman models in the 1930s: Virginia Hanson’s correspondence with Margaret Sanger and Clare Boothe Luce. Mormon History Association, Provo, UT. Helen Z. Papanikolas Award Winner, Best Graduate Student Paper on Utah Women’s History

2014

- Petersen, E. J. (27 September 2014). Women, religion, and professional communication: Communication design for the Female Relief Society, 1842–1920. Special Interest Group on Design of Communication (SIGDOC), Colorado Springs, CO.
- Petersen, E. J. (24 April 2014). ‘Invent this, o ye men’: The female inventor of the dishwasher and communication. European Social Science History Conference, Vienna, Austria.

Publications

2016

- Petersen, E. J. (2016). Empathetic user design: Understanding and living the reality of an audience. Communication Design Quarterly 4(2), 23-36. (Special Issue: Online Networks, Social Media, and Communication Design)

2015


2014