1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Generally, learning outcomes have been achieved. For example, in 2009-2010 our target goals were set at 80% of students meeting or scoring a 3 or 4 on a rubric scale on all standards and course sections met or partially met all learning outcomes. These goals were maintained in the 2010-2011 year and again all course sections met or partially met all learning outcomes. In 2011-2012, we met or partially met goals that were held constant. However, we also began to modify goals for learning outcomes in some areas to hone our assessment strategies and set the stage for improving instructional approaches. For example, we changed our 80% goal to seeing improvement for 50% of students between first and fourth assignment assessments within a particular class. This goal was not achieved, yielding further examination of the data (some students scored high to start) and assignment and course structure practices. I do not know what was done the following year.

The undergraduate committee concurred throughout this process that it is necessary to generate reliable data across students in multiple terms to best ensure that learning outcomes are actually being met and to identify potential areas where learning outcomes are not being met and why. Because a variety of faculty teach sections of the courses where assessment is occurring, it was deemed necessary to generate a larger period of data before addressing issues identified. Upon generating a few years of data, changes in assessment goals and instructional strategies was instigated, informed by the data that we had gathered as a program. General programmatic changes have been (and continue to be) implemented, with an eye to ensuring deliberate implementation so that changes in findings can be linked to changes made.

During this period significant changes were implemented in the structure of the curriculum, advisement processes, and follow-up with students having difficulty in particular courses as tracked by the advisement team. These changes were implemented in response to, in part, movement of the department to another college as well as drawing on the assessments generated. For example, for the latter, the critical thinking through writing requirement was removed from one course and inserted into another due to assessment findings and follow-up information gathered from faculty and students enrolled in the former course. This change allowed instructors to generate a greater focus on the skills specifically targeted in the learning outcomes of interest.
2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

As noted above, assessment led to removal of the CTW requirement from the Methods course and replacement of this requirement into the Ethics in Criminal Justice course. Furthermore, the Ethics course was moved into a curricular area that students are required to take prior to taking electives courses. This shift in strategy was prompted by assessment outcomes followed by data received from faculty and students involved in these courses. It yielded not only a revised curriculum but also significant revision of course content within the two courses.

The curriculum was fully assessed in the 2008-2009 term and courses as well as curriculum were reviewed to ensure that they met with the educational goals of the program. Courses deemed important in generating learning outcomes were strategically placed at early stages in the curriculum, with a capstone course identified as a key assessment course strategically placed at the back end of the curriculum progression (it is a last course taken in conjunction with a field placement). This sets up the ability to assess pre and post learning outcomes as the department gathers appropriate and relevant data across related courses.

It was determined that prior to any additional significant curriculum revisions being made, data should be collected on students entering through the new curriculum to determine what effects these changes have had. As such, data collection continues and assessment strategies continue to be pointed towards ensuring that changes generated are data driven.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

As noted in the response to the first outcome, it was determined that it would be inconsistent to implement changes on a regular basis, but more informative to gather data on students across a number of terms before generating changes learning outcomes, measures, or targets. In 2011-2012 targets were revised to determine changes in student outcomes within a single course. Rotating personnel on the undergraduate committee (and the undergraduate coordinator) ensures that regular review of learning outcomes and assessments occurs.

It also should be noted that there has been some inconsistency in feedback received from the university level regarding the learning outcomes generated by the program and strategies for assessment from year to year. Specifically, while we did not change outcomes or strategies across a number of years, our approach was regarded as sound in some reporting periods but was deemed problematic or poorly phrased in others. We have attempted to ensure consistency as appropriate but have continued to hone our approach to generating learning outcomes and goals to the best of our ability with the resources that we have been provided.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? *Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.*

**ECON Department Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).**

SLO 1. To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics.

SLO 2. To be able to apply theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics to specific fields of economics.

SLO 3. To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.

SLO 4. To be able to communicate, using appropriate writing and oral conventions, basic economic theories, concepts, analytical methods, and policy choices.

**Assessment Results Summary from past five years.**

To measure the success of Economics majors in the undergraduate program in learning core economic concepts, the Department of Economics developed two Tracking Exams (TEs), one for Principles of Microeconomics (MicroTE) and one for Principles of Macroeconomics (MacroTE). Each exam is comprised of 20 multiple choice questions that cover the core concepts taught in the two principles courses. The TEs were previously administered each fall and spring semester in a selection of 3000/4000 level courses. At the end of the 20 questions, the student is asked whether or not they are majoring in Economics, and the student is presented with a list of all undergraduate economics courses and is asked to indicate which courses they have taken. Students are not allowed to take a copy of the exam with them, and are not given the answers to the exam at any point. The two TEs were developed and first administered in Fall 2004. Starting in Fall 2006, the TEs were administered in the newly developed ECON 4999: Senior Capstone Course in Economic Policy. The TEs count for 5% of the final course grade in ECON 4999 (addressing a concern a couple of years ago about students taking the TEs seriously). ECON 4999 is required for all new undergraduate economics majors, effective Fall 2009 (effective Fall 2006, it was required for all undergraduate economics majors except the BA in International Economics and Modern Languages; effective Fall 2009, it is required for all BA IEML majors too). The exam is administered twice - once during the first week of classes and again at the end of the semester - and the higher of the two scores is the one that counts toward the course grade.

In the academic years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09, we used the TEs as our primary assessment measurement instrument and reported the results in a similar way. We divided the questions into those covering micro and macro concepts and reported the average score on each part to assess our first three stated student learning outcomes. In later years, we decided that was not the ideal way to report the data, and changed it, so the results here are broken down in a way that makes our results across the years more easily comparable. Chart 1 shows the average score students earned on the micro and
macro parts of the tracking exam each of the earlier years. In almost every case, the target of 60% was met (the exception being macro in 2006-2007), and the overall trend is that the average score on each part of the tracking exam improved over the time span. This trend is also seen in Chart 2 which shows the percentage of students in each year who earned a score at or above the target score of 60%. Chart 2 also shows that students generally performed better on the micro part of the tracking exam. This might be caused by the particular questions we asked (and we later have revised them), or by the fact that the instructors of the capstone course in these earlier years had more of a micro focus. We also changed how the course was taught; we moved to a team-teaching model: two instructors team-teach the course, with one focusing on macro concepts and the other on micro concepts, and all students are exposed to both instructors.

**Chart 1:**
average scores on micro & macro TEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avg score micro TE</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg score macro TE</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 2:**
% of students scoring at or above target on micro & macro TEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of students scoring ( \geq ) target (micro)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students scoring ( \geq ) target (macro)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the academic years since then, we changed the way we reported the data, in part as a response to the feedback we received from the Undergraduate Assessment Committee (UAC). We decided it was more meaningful to match certain questions on the tracking exam to particular student learning outcomes and report the results of those questions. We still had some questions that focused more on micro and some more on macro, but we mapped the questions more directly to the particular student learning outcomes. Also, in response to UAC feedback, we increased our targets, hoping to see the average on the questions selected to assess each of the learning outcomes be at least 65%. It might be worth noting that UAC seemed to want us to raise it higher than that, but we felt 65% was a high enough target. While this may seem like a low target to an outsider, we believe it is appropriate because these questions are not necessarily emphasized in the ECON 4999 course. These are really questions that assess skills learned in the introductory (ECON 2105 and 2106) courses, and it may be quite some time since the students took those courses by the time they take the ECON 4999 course. We hesitate to ask questions beyond the introductory level because of the way our program is set up - students have a good bit of flexibility in selecting their upper level economics courses, and therefore, students in the ECON 4999 course will likely have taken different 4000 level courses. The only courses we can be sure they've all taken are the introductory and intermediate courses.

Chart 3 shows the percentage of students who answered correctly each of the five macro assessment questions which assessed SLO 1. Chart 4 shows the percentage of students who answered correctly each of the five micro assessment questions which assessed SLO 1. Note that the assessment questions were changed in 2011-2012. While the target of 65% was not met for each and every question, in many cases, it was met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 5 shows the average across all 10 macro and micro questions for SLO 1. While we fell just short of the 65% target in 2009-2010, there has been a steady increase in the average SLO 1 results since then.

Chart 6 shows the percentage of students who answered correctly each of the five macro assessment questions which assessed SLO 2. Chart 7 shows the percentage of students who answered correctly each of the five micro assessment questions which assessed SLO 2. Again, note that the assessment questions were changed in 2011-2012. While the target of 65% was not met for each and every question, in many cases, it was met, and we observed wide variation in the percentage of students...
correctly answering the various questions. Changing the way we reported the data allowed us to focus on which questions in particular were giving students more trouble and it allowed us to reconsider if our assessment questions really targeted accurately captured the concepts we felt were most important for students to learn in our program. We are still in the process of further revising the assessment questions we use each year.

**Chart 6:**
SLO 2 Assessment Results (Macro)

**Chart 7:**
SLO 2 Assessment Results (Micro)
Chart 8 shows the average across all 10 macro and micro questions for SLO 2. Perhaps the new questions in 2011-2012 were more challenging than those in previous years, explaining why the average fell slightly below our 65% target in that year, when it was met in previous years. We are still revising the assessment questions.

![Chart 8: SLO 2 Assessment Results]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of students answering correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>67.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>61.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We never mapped specific questions to SLO 3, but it is high on our priority list as we work on revising the assessment questions.

We used a group project in ECON 4999 to assess SLO 4 in all years.

**Instructions to students on the group project:** The group project will allow students to work together to analyze how the benefits and costs of a particular public policy are to be evaluated. The topic will be chosen by the group and should not be one covered in class. Groups consisting of no more than five students (and no fewer than two) will be assigned during the second week of the semester. Group presentations will take place during the last two weeks of classes, and should last about 15 minutes each. Groups must use PowerPoint for their presentations, which they will hand in at the time of the presentation. (A paper is not required for the group project.) Library research is required for the group project, and sources should be carefully noted within the presentation. The presentation should be about ten minutes long. The group can choose who speaks during the presentation. The group may have more than one of the group members speak during the presentation if the group feels it would enhance the presentation. Each individual must also hand in the evaluation sheet provided on the last page of the syllabus. The group project will count for 20% of the course grade.
In the academic years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09, we used the overall grade on the group project as our assessment of SLO 4. Our target was to see an average score of 75% on the group project. Chart 9 shows that we met our target each year.

![Chart 9: Average Score on Group Project Measurement for SLO 4](chart9.png)

Responding to feedback from UAC, in subsequent years, a rubric (using a scale of 1-10) was used to assess different skills on the group project. For SLO 4, we focused on the communication dimension on the rubric, which measured the group’s ability to verbally communicate their ideas and respond to questions during the presentation. Our target was to see groups earn an average score of 7 or more out of 10 on the communication measure of the group project. Chart 10 shows that we met our target each year.

![Chart 10: Average Score on Communication Dimension in Rubric on Group Project Measurement for SLO 4](chart10.png)

In summary, we believe our program’s student learning outcomes have been achieved quite well, although, we recognize that assessment in general is an evolving process. Since first reporting on our
student learning outcomes, we have thought more deeply about what we want our students to learn and how to assess it. We are now moving to the stage where we consider more deliberately how we might want to change the curriculum to meet our program’s goals. In fact, a full review of our undergraduate curriculum is high on our list of priorities in the near future.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

We have made some changes to our courses over the years. The capstone course (ECON 4999) was developed in part to help with our assessment efforts. We made it a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course; adding CTW dimensions to our courses represent improvements to our program. Since more faculty have been trained to teach a CTW course, it is fair to say that those methods have spread to other (non-CTW designated) courses. We are currently considering a revision of ECON 4999, while still keeping it as a CTW course and having it serve as our primary course for program assessments.

Other course/curriculum changes:
We have added econometrics (ECON 4950) as a program requirement for all BS economics majors to help distinguish the BS economics degree from the BA economics degree. We have also added some cross-listed courses with the Risk Management and Insurance department and the Philosophy department. We believe these courses will benefit students, allowing more choices for upper level economics electives.

As stated previously, we are planning a full curriculum review in the near future. In particular, we are considering adding new upper level courses which we think will be of great interest to students (such as “empirical findings”, a course that might consider interesting questions which economics can help answer – similar to the popular book Freakonomics). We are also considering if we should change our principles course and/or add a new introductory economics course with a “less is more” approach – perhaps a course where we focus on the key concepts everyone should know about economics, especially if they never take another economics course in their lifetime.

We are also experimenting with hybrid course delivery for some of our courses, and hope to perform a research study to test the effectiveness of this delivery mode. In short, we are interested in discovering any and all changes which may help our students learn economics, retain the information learned, and succeed in college. It would be nice if more of them choose to major in economics too, but even if they never take another economics course, we want to help them become better informed citizens by understanding economics concepts.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

We have already made changes to the assessment process. We have not changed the learning outcomes, but we have changed the measures and targets over the past few years. We are still making
changes to the measures (in particular, the tracking exam). We spend more time as a department discussing the assessment data and it has certainly helped inform our decisions about our undergraduate program.
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1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? *Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.*

Overall, the Undergraduate Social Work program met the majority of goals that were established for the assessment of students. Each year, less than 10% of the targets were not met within the program. Conversely, 90% and above of the goals were met each year. Beyond this description, it is difficult to assess as the SSW changed the way that assessment was completed within our program two years ago. This change was a result of new professional reaccreditation standards. The migration was to competency – based outcomes across ten major areas of social work practice. Since this major shift occurred mid-way through this reporting period, it is difficult to provide concrete examples of outcomes on student learning as the data are more limited in scope.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

As a result of analyzing assessment data for our Undergraduate students, several improvements were made in the educational program. A summary of these changes are described below:

- Although WEAVE data are across sections, data are analyzed by section before being inputted into the program. Analyses of section level data indicated that sections with part time instructors (PTIs) had different outcomes than full time faculty. In order to be more consistent across sections, “lead faculty” have been identified for required sections. The PTIs who teach these courses are accountable to these lead faculty for including required course content and oversee collection of assessment data. This
process was implemented in 2011-12. Data from the current year indicate that this situation is less problematic.

- As an additional measure to standardize content in sections with PTIs, the SSW has developed an internal orientation session at the beginning of the academic year. All PTIs attend a session that details the purpose of assessment, assessment protocol, and other information related to teaching in our program.
- There was a problem with duplication of content between two required practice methods courses in the curriculum (SW 3000 Communications & Diversity and SW SW 3700 Communication Skills). As a result, the BSW Program Committee was charged with redesigning the SW 3000 course to have a more focused approach on diversity, multiculturalism, and human rights issues.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

As a result of changes in the reaccreditation standards in social work education, the School of Social Work worked on a competency based model of assessment. As a part of this change, the School decreased the overall number of assessment points and put more focus on those activities that provide a good sample of competencies for entry level social work practice at the undergraduate level. In addition, students were asked to rate their perceived abilities on ten required competencies (and associated practice behaviors) in social work education. While these indirect measures were not used in the WEAVE assessment process, analyses of direct (course and internship assignments) and indirect (student appraisal) provided insight into the perceived efficacy of students. For example, the 2009 – 2010 year had an objective that students would provide evidence about their research – based skills in evidence-based social work practice. On the final exam in the research course, 91% of students received a B or higher on the section that measured that objective. This percentage exceeded the benchmark of 80% of students who would receive a B on this area. On their subjective appraisal of their competence, however, only 66% of students reported that they felt confident or very confident in their skills of using evidence – based practice. This percentage fell below the expected number.

As a result of this discrepancy (and the other areas where there were similar findings), the faculty reviewed communication about these competency based standards. That is, our conclusion was that students could perform competently but were unable to identify their skills in the competency-based assessment language. As a result, faculty have been linking the competencies more closely to the course related content, helping students make the link between what they are learning.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

   Overall, the Department of African American Studies (AAS) has been very successful in meeting its student learning outcomes. Table 1 lists the AAS student learning outcomes by course from 2009 to 2012. Over the 39 data collection events (i.e. student learning outcomes by course and year) we have met or exceeded our benchmarks 36 times (92%). Because of the assessment process faculty were able to isolate areas (i.e., analysis, communication, or acquisition) that were challenging to students and make targeted revisions in the either the educational program or assessment process. For example, 2009-2010 in AAS 3975 Theories and Concepts the instructor observed that students understood AAS theories and concepts, but struggled to apply these theories to their own research (Acquisition). The following year, two student learning outcomes were added to the course to improve student performance on the acquisition outcome: 1) Integrate theoretical operationalization into research problem formulation; and 2) Produce a scholarly presentation or writing sample. The rationale was to help students develop their own scholarly voice and not just merely understand existing theories, but rather apply them and create new knowledge. Subsequent assessments have shown that student performance on ‘acquisition’ have increased in subsequent years from 58% met in 2009-2010 to 98% met in 2010-2011 and 100% met in 2011-2012. Post-hoc analysis revealed that proficiency on this outcome increased among students who expressed an interest pursuing doctoral degrees. An unanticipated outcome of the two additional student learning outcomes is an increase in undergraduate presentations at professional conferences as well as an increase in graduate school admissions among AAS undergraduate majors (n=9).

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

   Changes in the educational program have occurred most recently in the graduate program. One example can be found in the AAS 6010 Research Methods course. While students were performing well on student learning outcomes, they had difficulty explaining the
significance of their research to the discipline of AAS. Three revisions to the course were made to help students articulate the relevance of their research question to the discipline: 1) the research proposal was reduced from 20 to 10 pages; 2) the Oral Presentation assignment was replaced by a Mock Review with external reviewers; and 3) merit and impact criteria were added to the assignment and assessment criteria. Each proposal is now assessed by a panel of two external reviewers who rate the impact of the proposal on a scale of 1 to 9 where 1= exceptionally strong to 9 = Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses (Attachment A). The goal is that 75% of the students will score in the 80th percentile (low to medium impact scores) across the panel of reviewers. The outcome-one student (11%) scored in the 80th percentile on the post Impact Mock Review (see Table 2. Impact/Merit Scores fall 2011-2012). Students were able to take the feedback from the Mock Review and make revisions to their final proposal. As a direct result of the revisions 66% of the students increased their scores to the 80th percentile on the final research proposal. As a result of this revision, students improved their overall impact scores by 3 points from the Mock Review to the final proposal.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

The interdisciplinary nature of our department has caused us to step back from how we assess student outcomes relative to the thesis proposal. In 2011-2012, we created a sub-committee among our faculty to review and revise our existing rubric to reflect the theoretical and methodological leanings reflected in the diverse disciplines of our faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Analytic</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAS 2010 (Core)</td>
<td><strong>Goal: Develop critical thinking.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goal: Communicate effectively in writing.</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark:</strong> 80% of students will score 3 or higher on rubric. The paper focuses on a careful critique of the material, as opposed to a restatement of what the author has stated.</td>
<td>2009-2010: 79% met the benchmark</td>
<td>2009-2010: 91% met the benchmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011: 88% met the benchmark</td>
<td>2010-2011: 92% of the students met the benchmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012: 90% met benchmark</td>
<td>2011-2012: 90% met benchmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS 3975 Theories and Concepts (BA)</td>
<td><strong>Goal: Demonstrate logical reasoning. Students will be able to develop a thesis argument based on a logical set of interrelated concepts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goal: Communication. Students will be able to communicate ideas effectively through clearly written, well organized, and appropriately formatted scholarship.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goal: Acquisition. Demonstrate the ability acquire new knowledge and add to the body of knowledge in the field of African American Studies.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2009-2010: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2009-2010: 58% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011: 96% met benchmark</td>
<td>2010-2011: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2010-2011: 98% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (AAS 4980)</td>
<td><strong>Benchmark:</strong> 80% of the students will demonstrate proficiency in each goal with minor to moderate errors.</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Demonstrate logical reasoning. Students will be able to develop a thesis argument based on a logical set of interrelated concepts</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Communication. Students will be able to communicate ideas effectively through clearly written, well organized, and appropriately formatted scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2009-2010: 80% met benchmark</td>
<td>2009-2010: 80% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011: 99% met benchmark</td>
<td>2010-2011: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2010-2011: 99% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012: 90% met benchmark</td>
<td>2011-2012: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2011-2012: 100% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (MA)</td>
<td><strong>Benchmark:</strong> 80% of the students will demonstrate proficiency in each goal with minor to moderate errors.</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Students will be able to systematically analyze and critique empirical research.</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Students will be able to articulate verbally and writing emergent areas of research in the field of African American studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2009-2010: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2009-2010: 100% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2010-2011: 100% met benchmark</td>
<td>2010-2011: 100% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012: 77% met benchmark</td>
<td>2011-2012: 80% met benchmark</td>
<td>2011-2012: 80% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012: 80% met benchmark</td>
<td>2011-2012: 100% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012: 100% met benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Prospectus (AAS 6999)</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Students will be able to systematically analyze and critique empirical research. 2009-2010: 95% met benchmark 2010-2011: 99% met benchmark 2011-2012: under review</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Communication. Students will receive 90% of the ratio score on the communication portion of the Thesis Prospectus. 2009-2010: 100% met benchmark 2010-2011: 98% met benchmark 2011-2012: under review</td>
<td><strong>Goal. Acquisition.</strong> Students will receive 90% of the ratio score on the acquisition portion of the Thesis Prospectus. 2009-2010: 100% met benchmark 2010-2011: 98% met benchmark 2011-2012: under review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT A:
AAS 6010 MOCK REVIEW ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
(PART I)

Student Name: _________________________________________________________________

Title of Research Proposal: _____________________________________________________

OVERALL IMPACT

INSTRUCTIONS. Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the proposed research to influence the field of African American Studies (AAS), in consideration of the following 7 scored review criteria. A proposal does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Overall Impact: Score _______

Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

DESCRIPTION OF MERIT SCORES. Each review criterion should be assessed based on how important each review criterion is to the research being proposed. As a result, a reviewer may give only moderate scores to some of the review criteria but still give a high overall impact/priority score because the one review criterion critically important to the research is rated highly; or a reviewer could give mostly high criterion ratings but rate the overall impact/priority score lower because the one criterion critically important to the research being proposed is not highly rated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional (A+/100)</td>
<td>Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outstanding (A/ 95)</td>
<td>Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent (A- / 90)</td>
<td>Very strong with only some minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good (B+/ 89)</td>
<td>Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good (B/ 85)</td>
<td>Strong but with at least one moderate weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfactory (B- / 80)</td>
<td>Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair (C+ / 79)</td>
<td>Some strengths but with at least one major weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marginal (C/ 75)</td>
<td>A few strengths and numerous weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor (C- / 70)</td>
<td>Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Information for Scoring Guidance Table
Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact.
Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact.
Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact.

### MOCK REVIEW ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
(PART II)

### SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Abstract: Score _____
Overview of research is comprehensive, clear, and demonstrates clear linkages between the problem/opportunity, literature, methods, Afrocentric theory/concept, analysis, and significance.

- **Strengths:**
- **Weaknesses:**

#### 2. Introduction: Score _____
The problem/opportunity statement is clear, concise, words describing the method/design are appropriate, the target group is identified, the purpose and contribution to African American Studies are clear.

- **Strengths:**
- **Weaknesses:**

#### 3. Literature Review: Score _____
Summarized according to germinal and seminal contributions, major themes, strengths and weaknesses, and gaps are clear.

- **Strengths:**
- **Weaknesses:**

#### 4. Theory/concept: Score _____
Theory is explained and appropriately applied to the research. Its relevance to the proposed research is clear and potential contribution to African American scholarship is explained.

- **Strengths:**
- **Weaknesses:**

#### 5. Significance: Score _____
The proposal explains why the study is a unique approach to the “problem” being researched, who will benefit from its completion, and in what way the study results make an original contribution to the field of AAS.

- **Strengths:**
- **Weaknesses:**
6. **Methodology**: Score _____
The design, setting, sample, measures, and procedures are explained, logical and are appropriate for the proposed research.

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

7. **Human Subjects**: Score _____
Inclusions/Exclusion criteria are clearly stated and appropriate. Risks, benefits, and protections are explained and meet IRB standards.

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

---

**Table 2. Impact/ Merit Scores - fall 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Average Post Impact Score</th>
<th>Final Average Impact Score Research Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Average Post Scores)</td>
<td>(Average Post Scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ferguson, K.</td>
<td>6 (80)</td>
<td>2 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Banks, T.</td>
<td>5 (85)</td>
<td>2 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brown, H.</td>
<td>3 (90)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coleman, S.</td>
<td>5 (85)</td>
<td>2 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gipson, G.</td>
<td>4.5 (87)</td>
<td>3 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Barnes, N.</td>
<td>8 (75)</td>
<td>6 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jackson, C.</td>
<td>7 (79)</td>
<td>5 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fannin, L.</td>
<td>5 (85)</td>
<td>2 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. McKinney, C.</td>
<td>7 (79)</td>
<td>5 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 (83)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 (91)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

This program is fairly new, and we only have 4 years of data. Across those 4 years, targets for student learning outcomes were most often met, or at least partially met. Some years, for example in 2011-2012, all student learning outcomes were achieved. In other years, one or two were not; in these cases, revisions were made either to the curriculum (see #2 below for specific examples) or to the learning outcomes and measures themselves (see #3 below for examples) in order to better achieve objectives in the future. These changes were quite effective, with each unmet target from one year met the following year after corresponding revisions to curriculum and/or objective measurement were implemented. As an example, for student learning outcome #5, which treats the written communication and editing skills of students, was only partially achieved in the 2010-2011 cycle. The next year, in the courses where this objective is measured (i.e., our Critical Thinking through Writing courses), writing assignments were re-designed as a process rather than a product, so that students submitted multiple drafts of each paper, revising their writing based on feedback from their instructors. With this change in place, the target for measure #6 related to this student learning outcome was met for 2011-2012 cycle, and the number of students demonstrating competency on this objective increased even further for 2012-2013.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

There are several instances in the past several years of curriculum improvements within individual courses such as the example above of revising the writing assignments in CTW courses. We have assigned faculty members as “course coordinators” for each undergraduate course, and these faculty have updated course texts, improved formative and summative assessments, and added online content where appropriate over the past several years. They also ensure the quality of learning in their assigned courses by monitoring syllabus creation and performing classroom observations when graduate students in our department teach courses in our undergraduate program. The biggest curricular revision in the BA, however, has been implemented over the past year. Based on unsatisfactory achievement on Student Learning Outcome #1, on Core Areas of Linguistics across the four years (with the target met on the measure for this outcome only one out of the four years), the faculty decided to restructure the curriculum in several major courses to provide more scaffolding and allow students time to gradually build knowledge and skills over several courses. Previously, with little or no preparation, students began their area G coursework with a junior level course called AL 3021 Intro to Linguistics. This course had no prerequisites, and many students struggled to master the highly technical content of the curriculum. Beginning in the next cycle (2013-2014), there is a new sophomore level prerequisite to prepare
students for AL 3021, as well as an exemption exam to allow students with sufficient background knowledge to waive the new required class and move straight into AL 3021. We hope that better preparing students to study the core areas of linguistics by providing a basic introduction in a lower level course will increase success on the associated student learning outcome and allow the target to meet for this measure in the future.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

Our department has revised student learning outcomes and measures several times over the past four years. These revisions have served two main purposes: 1.) to make learning outcomes better match changing major requirements, and 2.) to make measures more accurate indicators of student learning. An example of the first is when CTW course requirements were instituted across the university. As the department added CTW courses, the faculty also revised student learning outcomes to reflect this new component of the BA program. Student Learning Outcome #4 Reporting on Primary Research and #5, Written Communication and Editing Skills, and the associated measures of Writing Assignments in CTW Courses, were developed in this way. An instance of the second occurred when faculty realized that the measure for Student Learning Outcome #1, Core Areas of Linguistics, included final exams not only for AL 3021 Intro to Linguistics, but also for two upper level electives, AL 4011 Phonetics and Phonology and AL 4012 Morphology and Syntax. However, while the final exam for AL 3021 is mostly a test of content knowledge (a good match for this measure and outcome), the finals for AL 4011 and 4012 mostly assess analytical skills (a better match for Student Learning Outcome #3, Analysis of Linguistic Structure). These upper level courses are now being measured for SLO #3 instead of #1. In addition, a second measure was added for SLO #3 in another upper level course, AL 3041 Second Language Acquisition, which includes a writing assignment that assesses linguistic analysis skills. With these changes, the faculty feels that the set of student learning outcomes better parallel the updated curriculum and that their associated measures more accurately gauge student achievement on these outcomes.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

1. The student learning outcomes for the Department of Anthropology have overall been met over the past five years. The evolving assessment process has allowed us to verify that students achieve the department’s learning goals at the core, BA, and MA levels, while also allowing us to identify areas for attention and improvement, including both learning outcomes and assessment methods. The process has assisted in fostering dialogue and cooperation within the department to clarify and streamline student learning priorities, and continuing to develop benchmarks for the different program levels. As such, it is contributing to the following specific improvements over the past 5 years:

   a. At the core level, the department’s main topical priority is student learning with respect to the anthropological, biocultural critique of the race concept, and its effects and implications. Data over the last 5 years demonstrate a strong student learning (75-80+% annually), while indicating that this is an area of teaching and learning that requires continuous attention and careful assessment.

   b. At the BA level, the assessment process has contributed in formalizing the department’s dual focus on topical and methodological learning. Over the past 5 years the evolving assessment process has contributed in demonstrating student success in both foundational content and foundational methods in all subdisciplines (cultural, biological, and archaeological anthropology, while in the next cycle, we will also include linguistic anthropology).

   c. At the MA level, data over the past 5 years demonstrate consistent student achievement in producing professional-quality original research.

2. Over the past 5 years, the assessment process has catalyzed collaboration and discussion in the department with respect to student learning and has been implicated in two main curricular changes:

   a. Collaborative efforts in streamlining and monitoring student learning in two major topical areas in the core, the first being the anthropological biocultural critique of the
race concept, and the second being a key disciplinary topic chosen collectively by the faculty each year.

b. Adopting a specific research exercise in the 2000-level course of each subdiscipline to serve as an indicator of student mastery of concepts and methods through their application.

3. The assessment process has changed considerably in the past 5 years, as each year’s cycle has allowed the department to refine both its goals and assessment methods. In the past 5 years:

a. Assessment is increasingly streamlined and refined, based on both results and assessment feedback from each cycle.

b. We have introduced annual faculty discussion of goals and outcomes, improved planning and communication.

c. We have selected a two-topic focus for assessing learning in the core, that reflects the department’s and university’s mission and goals as a diverse, urban and global institution. We have moved from a more subjective essay format to a standardized test question format for assessment.

d. We have clarified a focus on demonstrating the ability of students to apply concepts and methods through original research exercises and projects at the BA and MA levels. The methods and targets continue to be refined based on each cycle’s assessment feedback.

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Based on an action plan first outlined in 2007-08, the Art History program has implemented some changes that have yielded better results in student critical thinking outcomes in the core courses (AH 1700, 1750, 1850). We initially set our target goal of 75% of students successfully answering CT questions, a number we believe is achievable and realistic given the large size of the courses and the fact that many of the students are freshmen and non-majors. After failing to meet that target in the first couple of years, however, we sought to introduce more discussion into the classroom of what critical thinking looks like and how it is practiced in the discipline. Having improved content delivery, we then revisited how best to translate the practice of critical thinking into measurable multiple-choice exam questions. We also agreed that at least 20% of any exam should be CT (asking students to engage in analysis, synthesis and evaluation of course content) and agreed on general types of questions. As a consequence of these changes, in the past two cycles we have met and exceeded our target goal of 75%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name: Art History Core</th>
<th>Reporter: Susan Richmond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 12 June 2013</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:srichmond@gsu.edu">srichmond@gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

As discussed in question 1, one improvement is that faculty are more self-conscious about establishing learning outcomes and making critical thinking an active process of content delivery. We feel that the achievement of our targets is a reflection of general improvements in both instructor and student expectations. The assessment process has brought about greater consistency in the types of exam questions that every professor now uses. A long term goal of the department includes the use of graduate teaching assistants, a move that would allow greater flexibility in the assignments used in the core courses, and in the types of interactions the students have with instructors (break-out groups with TAs, for instance).

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

We have not made any major changes in the assessment process. We originally devised a set of outcomes, measures and targets that we feel are adequate and realistic for the program. However, if we continue to meet and/or exceed our target goals, it makes sense that we would discuss raising the target.
The assessment of the department and the achievement of the new learning outcomes exposed issues in the curricula. For example, as the department started accumulating assessment data it became apparent that the curricula should be streamlined to avoid redundancies of low priority topics in numerous courses. These problems were addressed by comparing the syllabi of different courses and taking out material as necessary.

Since these learning objectives were new, the instructors of each course had to adjust their courses to align with these learning objectives. Mobilizing the department to assess these objectives for their courses has been challenging due to the rapidly growing size of our department. In the Fall of 2007 the Biology Dept. had 1,529 undergraduates as compared with 2,195 in the Fall of 2012. Despite this growth, however, the department has been able to improve the % of students retained after 4 years from 53.8% of the 2005 incoming class to 70% of the 2008 class. This increase in academic demand has required the Biology Dept. to hire 10 new lecturers to teach 60 new course sections. We believe that the concurrent commitment to grow the department while also assessing these new learning objectives has improved the overall quality of the curricula. As new instructors entered the department they were informed of the learning objectives, which in turn resulted in courses that were designed in consideration of these objectives. The data collected thus far has shown broad success in meeting these objectives.

In addition, the Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) initiative was implemented in 2007 to improve the students’ critical thinking skills. Data collected from CTW courses suggest that critical thinking and writing improved over the course of the semester. For example, in the Cell and Molecular Biology labs (Fall 2012) the average student improved their report scores by an average of 12% per paper.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

As stated above, the CTW initiative has improved the students’ ability to analyze scientific data and communicate their scientific findings. In addition, the assessment of student learning in Biology has revealed inconsistencies in content for courses that varied with the instructors of record. The department has addressed this issue by having all of the instructors for a course meet to agree upon a list of topics for their course. These meetings have standardized the content in the Biology courses, especially in the core, so that they each cover consistent themes and content. Assessment data collected after these meetings suggest that the content and learning objectives for each course no longer varies with the instructor of record. Thus, Biology majors are now ensured a more consistent and organized academic experience.
3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

The assessment process has been very difficult due to the size of the Biology Dept. The Biology Dept. has created an Assessment Committee which functions to oversee the assessment process and evaluate the meaning of the assessment data. The mechanism of data collection has also changed to make the process more efficient. The committee has selected various faculty members that are each responsible for collecting data for a particular course (or related courses). These faculty members then deliver their findings to one faculty member (Frank Cruz) who then submits the data onto the Weave website. Streamlining the collection of assessment data has improved the analysis of the data, which makes it easier for the department to use the data to improve the curricula.

Starting in the Fall of 2013, the Biology Dept. will assess courses in the core at the beginning and at the end of each semester. By comparing the pre and post-test scores for students, we will better understand how well a particular course is delivering the learning objective(s) being assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name: Chemistry BS and Core?</th>
<th>Reporter: Doyle Barrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: June 18, 2013</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:dbarrow@gsu.edu">dbarrow@gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

We have exceeded the learning outcomes as stated in Weave, 3 out of the 5 years for the core and B.S. degrees. There is a difference between the first 4 years and year 5. For the first 4 years we looked at Critical Thinking in the core classes. The BOR now wants us (year 5) to look at “the nature of science”.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

We have revised our Freshman and Sophomore level courses to include online homework. Courses added were mostly specialty courses which are not included in the core.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

We found that our targets were too low in years 1 and 2 so they were revised upward.
1. The targets for Journalism student learning outcomes were set high for several reasons. The faculty expect Journalism students to be above average writers and to develop superior critical thinking skills in order to compete for career opportunities in the media industries and public relations fields. There is a GPA threshold students must meet in order to be a Journalism major, and the faculty expect students to be above average compared to the student body as a whole. Another reason for a high target is to find ways to improve the instruction of critical thinking skills and writing; if the target was low and always “met,” then there will likely be complacency by the faculty to improve and to innovate their instruction.

The achievements of the past five years have been mixed in meeting these targets. Some years had several of the targets met, while others most of the targets have not been met. Because of the uneven results it is unclear what effect the assessment process has made on student learning.

What has resulted is the analysis on the assessment process. This will be reflected in item #3.

2. The Journalism faculty has offered a significant revision of its curriculum which is awaiting approval from the university’s Committee on Academic Programs. This revision coincided with the initial results from the assessment process showing that students were not meeting rigorous standards for writing and critical thinking skills. The frustration is that the revision was expected to be approved and implemented years ago, and that expected improvements in student learning outcomes could be demonstrated by now.

The revised curriculum has more required writing and production courses, and there are more practically oriented reporting courses which would require further development of critical analytical skills. A new course developed for the revised curriculum has been implemented to provide instruction in multimedia/new media production. The initial CTW course has been revised to include multimedia elements to it. Other course changes are awaiting the approval of the revised curriculum.

There was an ad hoc Writing Committee formed to devise a strategy and tactics to improve students’ performance. One of the significant recommendations of that committee was for the department to invest in a Writing Lab. This was in a pilot test for the spring semester 2013, and it will be fully staffed and equipped for the fall semester 2013. Students in Jour 1010 and Jour 3010 will be encouraged—if not required—to make use of the lab and its resources. The anticipated improvements in the practical journalism writing skills will hopefully be seen in higher level courses where remedial writing instruction will no longer be necessary.

3. After five years of assessment with the nearly the same curriculum, the question facing the faculty is should the assessment be changed or wait for the revised curriculum to be approved and implemented? If the decision is to wait for the revised curriculum, then few changes to the assessment process will occur in the next year. This should allow for a better comparison with the assessment results from the current curriculum.

There have been changes in the assessment process already. The most significant change was to the curricular goals as the initial ones were deemed more suitable as learning outcomes and not broadly defined to be suitable for goals.
The learning outcomes are based on the accreditation standards for Journalism and Mass Communication curricula, and they cannot be changed. Because there are so many outcomes, a change was implemented to select several outcomes every year to assess rather than assess all of them every year. Completing a full cycle of every outcome before the implementation of the revised curriculum will provide the appropriate data to compare when the revised curriculum is in effect.

The sample size of the collection data has increased to achieve a more representative sample from the hundreds of journalism majors. Because so much of the measures involving assessing writing, the workload on the assessors makes a census of the journalism students an undue burden. There will always be sampling, but the issue would be if there should be larger sampling frame to lessen the effect of any one sample item on the results.

If the faculty decide to change more assessment items before the implementation of the revised curriculum, then many assessment issues should be debated and possibly changed. The first would be the targets set for the outcomes. If they were lowered, then it’s likely that nearly all will be met consistently. Another issue to consider would be to change the rubrics used to determine if targets are met. Perhaps having more items in a rubric would be helpful to determine if there were component parts of an outcome that could be pinpointed as an area of instructional improvement. Perhaps it would be adjusting the weights assigned to existing rubric items that the faculty would rather tweak instead of change the number of rubric items. Another issue is having the faculty properly trained in the instruction to ensure that the curricular goals and outcomes are being adequately addressed. More instructors are being assigned to teach CTW courses, and it is a priority that they know the critical thinking goals and outcomes to be emphasized in those courses.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved?

As our detailed assessment report shows, the department has made an average success rate of 85%.

What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

We think that our program has been adequate and so have not made many changes within the department. The changes we made were to add and drop classes, as well as to change the course content. In addition, a tutoring center was open for students enrolled in several core undergraduate CS courses: CSc 2010, CSc 2310, CSc 2510, CSc 3210, CSc 3320, and CSc 3410. Tutoring is free.

We have also collaborated with the following departments in doing research:

- Collaborates with the Department of Geosciences specifically Geoinformatics.
- Collaborates with the Department of Computer Information Systems with a four plus one scheme. (student takes four years of undergraduate computer science and one year of master level courses from CIS to receive BS/MS combination)

Educational Programs:

Many of the students that graduated with a bachelor’s degree have acknowledged that especially our upper level classes helped them land a career job. For example, students who took software engineering have received jobs with Sprint, Lucent Technologies, Delta, and IBM etc.

Students Participate in Undergraduate Research Conference

Two undergraduate computer science majors participated in the sixth annual Georgia State Undergraduate Research Conference (GSURC 2012), which was held on March 21 in the Student Center. GSURC serves as a showcase for scholarly and creative projects produced by Georgia State undergraduates. At this year’s conference, students from 35 departments gave 94 poster presentations, 38 oral presentations, and nine artistic presentations.

Computer science major Brendan Benshoof gave a poster presentation titled “Exploration of Wearable Computing.” His project involved designing and building a wearable computer. After writing software to test user interfaces on the computer, Mr. Benshoof then experimented to determine which human-
computer interaction techniques are most effective for wearable devices. His faculty sponsor was associate professor Michael Weeks.

Another CS major, Mackenzie Bechtel-Hall, gave an oral presentation titled “Hardware Trojans: Attacking, Detecting, and Defending.” Hardware trojans occur when integrated circuits are modified to be malicious or to monitor the functions of their applications.

Mr. Bechtel-Hall demonstrated how hardware trojans could infiltrate a military sensor network. He then devised methods to detect and prevent such attacks. His work was done jointly with Ph.D. student Marco Valero; associate professor Anu Bourgeois was their faculty sponsor.

Service:
Many non-majors especially in Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Film, etc. have taken minors in computer science.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

The changes to courses (add or drop and revise) were made to help us achieve better student learning outcomes and to ensure the academic competitiveness of the department with other colleges/universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Curriculum Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CSC 3410</td>
<td>Data Structures</td>
<td>Add CTW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CSC 4110</td>
<td>Embedded Systems</td>
<td>PREREQUISITES CHANGED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CSC 4350</td>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>Add CTW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>CSC 4821</td>
<td>FUNDAMENTALS OF GAME DESIGN</td>
<td>ADD new course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>CSC 4222</td>
<td>INTRO TO INFO SECURITY</td>
<td>ADD new course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>CSC 4940</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE INTERNSHIP</td>
<td>Add new course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CSC 3210</td>
<td>COMPUTER ORG &amp; PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>Change prerequisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CSC 3410</td>
<td>DATA STRUCTURES</td>
<td>Change prerequisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CSC 4820</td>
<td>INTERACTIVE COMPUTER GRAPHICS</td>
<td>Change prerequisite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

We feel that the learning outcomes, measures, and targets used over the past five years are appropriate for our BS program. Therefore, the department has not made any significant changes because we think that the B.S. Program provides students with the underpinnings of computation and the basic computer science for today’s applications in industry, science, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow’s applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by everyone.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

**English B.A. (Concentration: Literature)** Targets for this concentration have been met over the past five years, with two exceptions: the outcome related to content knowledge which fell slightly below the target in 10-11 and in 12-13. Scores related to critical thinking and the mastery of basic skills were more consistently higher than those related to content knowledge.

**English B.A. (Concentration: Creative Writing)** Targets for the learning outcomes have consistently been met by students in the fiction section of the Creative Writing program, but from 2008-2010, targets for the poetry section usually fell below the target. Therefore, the targets were lowered for poetry students in 2010, and as a consequence, the students meet their targets in the past three years. The data has not revealed a clearly defined area of growth in this concentration.

**English B.A. (Secondary English)** Targets for this concentration have been met over the past five years, with two exceptions: students fell considerably below the outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics in 12-13 as they did with the outcome related to effective communication skills in the same year. Over the past five years, students have demonstrated very strong scores in their ability to reflect upon teaching. This success is likely due to the emphasis on the professionalization of students in this concentration both through the senior seminar and the internship option that enables students to spend time in a secondary or middle school setting.

**English B.A. (Rhetoric and Composition)** It has been difficult to trace student success in this concentration for multiple reasons: the faculty switched the learning outcomes being examined on more than one occasion, the faculty decided to switch from a 5-point scale to a 4-point scale in the middle of the past five years, and all the 2011-2012 assessment data for this concentration was lost due to a computer crash (this is the only concentration that asks for an electronic portfolio.) All the same, general trends suggest that the scores from Rhetoric/ Composition portfolios fluctuated over the past five years with no clear area of success.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

**English B.A. (Concentration: Literature):** Over the last five years, the major improvement in course content is that the senior seminar has been revised to give students more guidance on how to prepare
the senior exit portfolio. Class time is now devoted to this portfolio process so that students have a fuller understanding of the portfolio’s purpose as a culminating experience. Such revisions to the course have been encouraged by the department leadership through meeting held every semester for senior seminar instructors so that they can be more familiar with what is required of them in terms of portfolio instruction and CTW work.

**English B.A. (Concentration: Creative Writing):** Over the last five years, the major improvement in course content is that the senior seminar has been revised to give students more guidance on how to prepare the senior exit portfolio. (With the Creative Writing students, emphasis has been placed on the reflective essay as a vehicle for a retrospective on the students’ development of a voice and style.) Class time is now devoted to this portfolio process so that students have a fuller understanding of the portfolio’s purpose as a culminating experience. Such revisions to the course have been encouraged by the department leadership through meeting held every semester for senior seminar instructors so that they can be more familiar with what is required of them in terms of portfolio instruction and CTW work. Senior seminar instructors met each semester so that they can be more familiar with what is required of them in terms of portfolio instruction and CTW work.

**English B.A. (Secondary English):** Over the last five years, the major improvement in course content is that the senior seminar has been revised to give students more guidance on how to prepare the senior exit portfolio. Class time is now devoted to this portfolio process so that students have a fuller understanding of the portfolio’s purpose as a culminating experience. (In Secondary English, the portfolio can also serve as a professional tool that they can use when they search for a teaching position, so students are invested in the success of this project.) Such revisions to the course have been encouraged by the department leadership through meeting held every semester for senior seminar instructors so that they can be more familiar with what is required of them in terms of portfolio instruction and CTW work. Senior seminar instructors met each semester so that they can be more familiar with what is required of them in terms of portfolio instruction and CTW work.

In addition, the review of senior portfolios in this concentration has revealed over the past five years that students would benefit from additional pedagogy instruction and from field observations in middle or secondary classrooms. As a result, this concentration has undertaken a number of initiatives to enhance the program. Firstly, starting in 2010, a significant effort was made to encourage students in this concentration to do an internship in a school. To support this effort, the department leadership has assigned a faculty member to do advisement and internship instruction specifically for students in Secondary English. Also, the concentration has attempted to create an English 3040 (Introduction to Literary Studies) gateway course for Secondary English students to give them instruction in pedagogy at the beginning of their English careers instead of just at the end of them. To date, that initiative has not proven successful because there have never been enough students signing up for the class to justify creating this specialized 3040 section. Finally, the concentration has attempted to add another measure to its assessment work by asking students to write a teaching philosophy statement that is judged and reported on in the department’s assessment report. This measure is in its infancy and needs more time to become an effective determination of student understanding of pedagogy.
English B.A. (Concentration: Rhetoric and Composition): Over the last five years, the major improvement in course content is that the senior seminar has been revised to give students more guidance on how to prepare the senior exit portfolio. Class time is now devoted to this portfolio process so that students have a fuller understanding of the portfolio’s purpose as a culminating experience. Such revisions to the course have been encouraged by the department leadership through meeting held every semester for senior seminar instructors so that they can be more familiar with what is required of them in terms of portfolio instruction and CTW work.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

English B.A. (Concentration: Literature): Five years ago, the department transitioned from reporting all the undergraduate concentrations together to breaking them out in terms of concentration. For one year after that, the same three learning outcomes (knowledge of language and linguistics, effective written communications, and reading interpretation and critical thinking skills) were applied to all four concentrations, but by 2010-2011, the department switched from using the same learning outcomes to assess students in all four concentrations to allowing each concentration to choose the outcomes most relevant to its students. In literature, the outcomes selected were as follows: 1) the knowledge of figures, genres, moments, approaches, and terms; 2) reading interpretation skills; and 3) ability to use basic elements of writing. In recent years, efforts have been made to create additional assessment measures and to formulate a mission statement and goals particular to this concentration, but these intentions have not yet been fulfilled. (One additional change during the past five years is that the department also measured student performance in the senior seminar class up until 2009. At that point, it was determined that the senior seminar was already being assessed for CTW work and that it was onerous to also ask instructors to assessment student work for the purposes of the department’s assessment report. Discussions have taken place since then exploring the possibility of creating other assessment measures at earlier points in the program, but this has not yet been acted upon.)

English B. A. (Concentration: Creative Writing) Five years ago, the department transitioned from reporting all the undergraduate concentrations together to breaking them out in terms of concentration. For one year after that, the same three learning outcomes (knowledge of language and linguistics, effective written communications, and reading interpretation and critical thinking skills) were applied to all four concentrations, but by 2010-2011, the department switched from using the same learning outcomes to assess students in all four concentrations to allowing each concentration to choose the outcomes most relevant to its students. In the Creative Writing concentration, the outcomes selected were as follows: 1) the knowledge related to Creative Writing and 2) the familiarity with literature works. This concentration also began to split their results in terms of specialty, thereby reporting the results of fiction students separate from the results of poetry students. This has revealed that there are fewer students in the poetry specialty than in previous times and their results tend to run lower. The targets for poetry students were lowered from 4.2 to 4.0 to address this concern. In recent
years, efforts have been made to create additional assessment measures and to formulate a mission statement and goals particular to this concentration, but these intentions have not yet been fulfilled. (One additional change during the past five years is that the department also measured student performance in the senior seminar class up until 2009. At that point, it was determined that the senior seminar was already being assessed for CTW work and that it was onerous to also ask instructors to assessment student work for the purposes of the department’s assessment report. Discussions have taken place since then exploring the possibility of creating other assessment measures at earlier points in the program, but this has not been acted upon.)

**English B. A. (Secondary English)**

Five years ago, the department transitioned from reporting all the undergraduate concentrations together to breaking them out in terms of concentration. For one year after that, the same three learning outcomes (knowledge of language and linguistics, effective written communications, and reading interpretation and critical thinking skills) were applied to all four concentrations, but by 2010-2011, the department switched from using the same learning outcomes to assess students in all four concentrations to allowing each concentration to choose the outcomes most relevant to its students. In Secondary English, the outcomes selected were as follows: 1) knowledge of language and linguistics; 2) effective communication skills; and 3) ability to reflect upon teaching. In recent years, this concentration has also created an additional assessment measure and has formulated its own mission statement and goals. The faculty in the concentration has also discussed the idea of creating additional pedagogy-focused English courses that can be offered on a regular basis (such as a class in digital pedagogies) and are suggesting to the department that this need could be considered in future searches. (One additional change during the past five years is that the department also measured student performance in the senior seminar class up until 2009. At that point, it was determined that the senior seminar was already being assessed for CTW work and that it was onerous to also ask instructors to assessment student work for the purposes of the department’s assessment report. Discussions have taken place since then exploring the possibility of creating other assessment measures at earlier points in the program, but this has not been acted upon.)

**English B. A. (Rhetoric and Composition)**

Five years ago, the department transitioned from reporting all the undergraduate concentrations together to breaking them out in terms of concentration. For one year after that, the same three learning outcomes (knowledge of language and linguistics, effective written communications, and reading interpretation and critical thinking skills) were applied to all four concentrations, but by 2010-2011, the department switched from using the same learning outcomes to assess students in all four concentrations to allowing each concentration to choose the outcomes most relevant to its students. In Rhetoric/Composition, the outcomes selected were as follows: 1) knowledge of the language and linguistics of rhetoric; 2) ability to write with structural integrity and conventional usage; and 3) ability to think critically through writing. (One additional change during the past five years is that the department also measured student performance in the senior seminar class up until 2009. At that point, it was determined that the senior seminar was already being assessed for CTW work and that it was onerous
to also ask instructors to assessment student work for the purposes of the department’s assessment report. Discussions have taken place since then exploring the possibility of creating other assessment measures at earlier points in the program, but this has not been acted upon.)

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Since we have been incorporating the First Year Book as a way to track and report on our assessment goals, we have been able to better understand how English 1101 and English 1102 students are meeting the department’s learning outcomes. Our program now has concrete statistics on student performance in the areas of reading comprehension, information retention, critical thinking exercises, and various writing goals.

Through our assessment reporting, we have initiated new training sessions for GTAs. These sessions include grade norming, assignment construction (creating assignments geared toward assessment and learning outcome goals), as well as in-class pedagogical techniques to get those students who initially score low on their first assignments to identify their writing, reading, and critical thinking weaknesses.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

The composition courses are now using a variety of approaches to teaching (ipad assignments, teaching portals, course management systems, our participating in the University’s Success Academy, etc.) as a way to revise our content and modify the way this content reaches students. Additionally, our program created (and is currently going through a second edition) a First Year Guide to Writing textbook aimed directly at our GSU student body and their learning needs.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

The most significant change to our assessment process is the way in which we gather the information. We now hold an annual assessment meeting where we train TAs on how to collect and report on assessment data. We have also created a department-wide assignment (for both reading comprehension and writing) that all GTAs use in the first two weeks of classes. Our next step will be to use a similar assignment at the end of the semester and report on the progress of each of our 3000+ students.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

With four years of evaluations available through WEAVE, it is apparent that the Department of History’s student Learning Outcome results have remained fairly consistent, with the department in general partially meeting the benchmarks. There has been variation, with some years a higher percentage of students accomplishing the department goals and other years more students falling short of the expected outcomes. For three of the four years when assessing professional values, the students partially met the goals while in one year actually meeting the high benchmark set by the department. Yet with the Learning Outcome of historiography, students did not meet the standard for two of the four years. With only four years of assessment data, it is difficult to see how changes made have enhanced student learning.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

From the assessment of student learning undertaken by the Department of History’s Undergraduate Studies Committee, the decision was made to try and strengthen instruction in historiography. By encouraging a stronger focus on the subject in upper-level courses, it was hoped by the undergraduate studies committee, that students would gain a greater appreciation for and understanding of historiography. By requiring some level of engagement with historical interpretation and methodology when undertaking research assignments in the upper level courses, and by changing the prerequisites for students trying to take the capstone course by requiring the completion of at least two 4000 level history classes before permitting registration for Hist 4990, the department believed students would demonstrate a stronger awareness of historiography in the papers used for the department’s self-assessment.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

Given the Department of History has data for only four years showing self-assessment, and that the changes implemented in the curriculum impact future students more than existing ones, few changes have been undertaken in the assessment process. True, the department did not consider for assessment purposes in the 2012-2013 cycle two of the desired student Learning Outcomes but that resulted from the faultiness of the assessment tool. Rather than develop a new process of self-assessment, the department, in consultation with the Office of Academic Assessment, dropped
altogether from its evaluation these two Learning Outcomes. The Undergraduate Studies Committee has considered lowering the percentage benchmarks to figures seen as more reasonable, but has been hesitant to do so, in part because of an abiding desire to see students reach these higher levels of understanding. In short with only four years of assessment, the findings regarding department actions based on student performance seem inconclusive.
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1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

The History Core’s assessment program was in its planning stage from 2008-2011. In 2011, our department’s Core reporter changed, and in 2011-12, the History Core assessment program was revised. In keeping with the 2009 Board of Regents mandate, we shifted our assessment focus from contemporary issues and critical thinking, to historical thinking (as articulated in the Area E Student Learning Outcome of the Social Sciences). This year (2012-13) is the first that we have implemented our assessment program and collected data. So we look forward to a future date when we will be able to evaluate the History Core’s student learning more broadly, and then implement our findings to improve our Outcomes.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

Though we are still in the process of collecting data, we have found that the very act of creating a set of common Student Learning Outcomes for all classes in the Core has shaped our Core program and transformed our course content. For instance: one of our objectives (as stated in the Assessment Report introduced in 2011-12) is that students will demonstrate knowledge of historical geography; they should be able to both identify important locations, and explain the role of change over time in geographic developments (changes in national boundaries; the function of environmental characteristics in economic expansion; transregional mass population movements; etc.). Because of the development of our Core objectives, our department has now committed to the inclusion of historical geography and map literacy as a component in our survey courses. These skills will not only enhance our students’ historical thinking, but will also serve them in other courses, and in their lives beyond the university.
3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

Though we are only in the second year of creating and implementing our current assessment process (and the first year of data collection), we have already pinpointed a few changes we intend to make next year:

- We will revise our assessment rubric, to expand the Measures of student score from 1-3 to 1-4, and revise our Targets accordingly;
- We will slightly revise the language of our Goals and Outcomes, so that they will apply to the department’s World History surveys (HIST 1111, HIST 1112).

These changes will help us to be more precise in our assessment of student learning, and will allow us to include the entirety of the History Core in our assessment program.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

During 2008-2013, the student learning outcomes of our program have experienced great success and huge improvements. Students in Math 4991 learned to use and master their skills on scientific softwares such as Maple, Mathematica, Matlab, etc., in solving mathematical problems. They successfully went through the process of finding articles of their interests in the literature, reading them, and then writing detailed reviews of them. They also learned to use LaTeX and Beamer or other typesetting programs to present their work in mathematics professionally.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

In Math 4991 itself, we added the requirement of learning Maple/Matlab/Mathematica and LaTeX/Beamer to improve the students’ skills on modern technologies. Overall, our department also added/modified courses based on the assessment process. For example, we added Math 4010 (Mathematical Biology) in Fall 2012. Also, we made Math 4442 a required course for students majoring in mathematics. In Math 3000, the course content was revised so that the students will learn more about proofs. Also, Math 3435 and Math 4435 saw their course contents revised so that they would connect to each other better.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

Over the period 2008-2013, we made it mandatory that students should learn scientific softwares such as Mathematica, Maple, Mathlab, LaTeX and Beamer. All students in Math 4991 are required to know how/where to find/read articles in literature of mathematics. More emphasis is given to the students’ proof skills.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? *Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.*

Over the past years, MATH 1111 student learning outcomes have been improved to 75% from 60%. Math1113 shares the same pattern. Math1070 and Math2211 have improved the student learning outcomes. Along with the change in teaching and learning model, assessments and assessment techniques used in the program has a great impact to identify the weaknesses and strengths of the program. The assessments we have used allowed us to judge and monitor the students' progress through observations, experiments, written assignments, and research projects. These research projects include implementation of review sessions, different software usage, and the material used in the classes. Also those assessments provide pedagogical templates that help professors to develop effective instructional techniques and provide comprehensive information about student progress, including students' strengths and weaknesses.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

Math1111 and Math1113 revised the curriculum, made several changes with the approval from the department. Also depending on the assessment results, the course material has been revised with more related real life examples and collaboration has been made with other departments to response the needs of the industry and higher education. Also, assessments have had a significant impact on instruction. Students are more motivated to learn and are more engaged.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

We believe assessment is needed for accountability. The assessment process has been changed over the years to redefine our educational goals aligned with the university's strategic plan, articulated multiple measurable objectives for each goal, designed appropriate approaches and measures to assess how well students are meeting the articulated objectives. These changes gives me an opportunity to re-examine objectives, methods and measures as feedback to help students to improve their learning.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? *Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.*

In 2003, MCL started working on assessing learning outcomes. The assessment committee then set up general guidelines for the assessment effort in Lower Division language courses. At the time, the Lower Division Language Program in French, German, and Spanish were working independently of each other. There was then a perception that the programs were different in many ways—such as teaching philosophies, methodologies, regulations, and practices. In 2008, the faculty, as represented by the language coordinators (Solange Bonnet in French, Robin Huff in German, and Oscar Moreno in Spanish) began a joint assessment effort. Drawing on the work done previously, the learning outcome assessment (LOA) committee implemented a student interview (LOA interview. See attachment 1). This interview was to be conducted at the 2001 (third semester) level first and then also at the 2002 level. The present report is based on the interview results from Spring 2010 to Fall 2012.

The interviews were started in Spring 2010 and then, for the purpose of data and semester comparison, were repeated in Spring 2011 in all three most-commonly taught languages—Spanish, French, and German. In Spring 2011, Spanish, the largest of the three programs, also conducted interviews in Span 2002, fourth semester of Spanish. In Spring 2010, the LOA committee had determined that 2002 interviews would be a convenient source of exit data, as the fourth semester in the language sequence is indeed the last course in Lower Division at MCL. The interviews in 2002 would also provide information on how the program evolved from semester to semester. The LOA committee also determined that the assessment effort would be revisited after three years in place.

**BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS AND FINDINGS**

The oral interview rubric consists of seven categories (or factors) being measured (see attachment 2). For data analysis, these categories were finally converted into a four-range scale:

- 10 range = Optimal performance
- 9 range = Good performance
- 8 range = Middle point performance
- 7 range = Needs improvement

*Optimal and Good performance mean ideal progress toward developing skills in the target language and acquiring knowledge about the language and its related culture(s). A student in a Middle point range shows achievement that is fair, needs to continue to work on some areas, but his/her performance meets expectation for a student in the process of acquiring a foreign language. A range of Needs improvement, nonetheless, shows more significant difficulties and challenge to acquiring the target language and knowledge of its related culture(s). Importantly, a student in this range does not meet expectation for the level. It should also be noted that many students at these levels are taking language course because it is a requirement, not necessarily as a matter of personal or academic preference.*
RESULTS
As Table 1 shows, the results for Spring 2010, the first time students were ever interviewed, were positive. No particular skill was identified as in need of more or special attention by the faculty. A skill would need to be reviewed whenever it scored below 8. In every category (1 to 7 in Table 1), the figures were within the Middle range or above on the four-range scale, meaning that students’ achievement had been fair for those semesters and, though some needed to continue to work on some language areas, they were meeting the expectations for learners in the process of acquiring a foreign language. As the rightmost column in Table 2 shows, only a small number of students were in need of improvement, that is, they were not progressing as expected. In Spring 2010, this was the case especially in French, with with 4 out of 16 interviewed students were in the range of 7, who needed to continue to work (harder) on most or all the language areas. In Spring 2011, a year later, the percentage of students in need of improvement looked more balanced in 2001 across the three languages (7.8% in French, 6.9% in German, and 6.8% in Spanish), and were significantly reduced in Span 2002 (2.6%).

Table 1. Spring 2010 Results by categories on seven-factor rubric (attached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor on rubric</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Spanish 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conversation initiation</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Response</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conversational strategies</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fluency</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural appropriateness</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Comprehensibility</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task completion</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Results by semester and language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th># students interviewed</th>
<th>% students interviewed</th>
<th>Average on seven rubric</th>
<th>Four range scale average</th>
<th>In Need of improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>French 2001</td>
<td>16/91</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4/91 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German 2001</td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2/28 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 2001</td>
<td>13/180</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Optimal</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>French 2001</td>
<td>16/51</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4/51 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German 2001</td>
<td>7/29</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2/29 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 2001</td>
<td>39/168</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>10/168 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 2002</td>
<td>23/116</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3/116 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures from Spring 2011 to Fall 2012 (see the result summary below) confirm the numerical tendencies first obtained in 2010 for the three languages. In general, all three major language programs (French, German, and Spanish) at MCL are meeting expected progress, and students completing the Lower Division sequence may be said to be able to use their respective target languages in brief, casual conversations with a person who has full command of the language. It should be noted that an ability to use the language after completing the 2002 level, and especially in 2001, is a functional skill. Students completing the basic language sequence –1001 to 2002 levels—will be able to face speakers with full command of the target language (such as native speakers), will do it with significant limitations (i.e.
plenty of violations to language accuracy), but will perform fairly effectively in retrieving and conveying messages in the target language. There are only three instances—marked in red for easy of reference in the Result summary below—in which a figure below 8 was recorded: fluency in Span 2001 (7.8) in Fall 2010 and Spring 2012, and conversation initiation in German 2001 in Fall 2011. These results are semester-specific only and are expected as the ability to speak the language is for students usually intimidating and among the hardest one to overcome.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

The joint effort by the three major language programs at MCL has led the faculty in all three major languages at MCL to more constant communication and, to some extent, coordination among the three programs. As a result, the Lower Division courses across languages by now offer more common teaching philosophy and course regulations, more uniform syllabi, and classroom practice more uniformly targeting all basic language skills, grammar, and culture. Online learning/teaching supplements were introduced in Spanish in 2007, and today all three languages require supplementary work online and in about the same amount and modality.

Besides, this assessment effort has also drawn the faculty's attention to some other aspects of assessment control, such as a constant and regular monitoring of DFW rates and student evaluations. Each program has implemented individual and/or semester-specific changes. For instance, Spanish saw a huge increase in DFW rates in 2010. After looking at student evaluations, the program streamlined the online component (grammar drilling, and exposure to language input through video viewing and listening activities, etc.) by reducing the number of assignments so that students could better focus on the essential ones and as determined by their own instructors. It was also clear that, with most students holding very busy agendas and oftentimes a job outside class time, the program needed to be more flexible about online submission deadlines. Partial credit then became available for late submissions. Also, it appeared that our students would benefit more if Spanish adopted more of a flip approach in class. The idea was to allow students—a significant percentage of whom initially did not welcome the online assignments—to get started online in class whenever possible so that they could see the benefits as they worked with their instructors and then continue online out of class. This would also address students’ impression that the online assignments were not in line with class activities. Today, Spanish has been able to reduce DFW rates by about 50% as compared to those in Spring 2010, to about 20%, which has remained largely stable for several semesters.

For German and French, specific changes will be discussed later. The LOA interviews, and the whole LOA process, would be revisited after three years in place. This should have taken place in the Spring 2013, but the LOA committee is running late, and is meeting in Fall 2013 instead.

The LOA committee recognizes that the process of learning/acquiring a foreign language is complex and that the challenge our faculty faces is significant: we have to help our students develop skills and acquire
knowledge in a tongue that is foreign to them and that they hardly speak—certainly an intimidating task. Success in this context is undoubtedly hard to achieve. However, we believe that in the last ten years, especially since 2008, we have been able to approach the issue of program assessment and effectiveness more systematically and technically. We have put many pieces of the puzzle together, and we can now see a large part of the puzzle picture. I am happy to report that our colleague, Peter Swanson, one of our foreign language faculty members (also a member of the LOA committee), just informed the reporter and the language faculty (by memo to the faculty on July 16) that our teacher education students who took the GACE 2 exam recently have all passed this State-mandated examination with highlights, in many cases well-above the State’s averages, and above the performance of the other schools in the State. This is certainly good news for MCL.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

In 2010, when the LOA interviews were implemented, the faculty first had to (re)define the ultimate goal of the language programs: functional mastery of the target language and knowledge of the culture(s) that were proper to each language. Secondly, once the first results became available, as reported then, there were three areas of concern about the validity of the promising figures, especially those for Spring 2010, the first semester any assessment had been attempted. It became necessary to establish a number of students to be interviewed that were representative of the levels in question. A low number of interviewed students—perhaps with the only exception of German—suggested that the number of students that were interviewed, especially in Spanish and French, might have not been representative of the number of students in 2001. Secondly, with this in mind, these figures appeared to indicate that the core courses in French, German, and especially in such a large program as Spanish, were highly effective, which thus suggested, contrary to the perception of some faculty members, that no improvement or change was needed. Third, the students who were interviewed were volunteers, and the sample was thus limited to, and influenced by, those who were willing to help or could be available for the interview at a time (last two weeks of the semester) when students in general were busy and preparing and/or taking their final exams. A large number of students who worked also made it conspicuously hard to find students who could be available at times other than class time. Thus, the Spring 2010 sample might have included, especially in Spanish (notice the zero percentage of students in need of improvement in Table 2), only those highly motivated individuals who routinely scored high in the core courses and who most probably were, or were likely, to become majors and minors. This, unfortunately, would filter out a significant number of non-major, non-minor students who might indeed need to be served more adequately and whose feedback, though essential to improving the MCL core curriculum, was not being recorded. In Spring 2011, an effort was made to obtain more even numbers and, ideally, as close as possible to 25% of the target population at every level. This may be the reason for better balanced figures for the 2001 level in Spring 2011. Tables 1 and 2 show, for instance, that Spanish 2001 went from a rubric score of 9.4 (Optimal performance) in Spring 2010 to 8.7 (Middle) a year later, more in accordance with the figures for French and German, which did not change.
The next step in the LOA process at MCL is now approaching: in Fall 2013, the LOA committee will meet again to discuss the current results and possible courses of action. For instance, there are individual figures, not included on this report as they are not complete at the time of the current report, that suggest that students in need of improvement increase and decrease after certain periodic cycles. This is, for instance, particularly the case for French. It is possible that some aspect of the French program might need some special attention and fine-tuning. Besides, as a result of practice, other forms of assessment—from DFW rates, student evaluations—may be included and officially inform LOA reports, and subsequent actions for better and more effective instruction. The LOA committee will also address the issue of a reduction in the number of students opting for a language major.

Finally, this report is work in progress. The reporter is solely responsible for the mistakes and accuracies this report may contain until all those involved can read it and approve it.

RESULT SUMMARY. Some cells are blank as the data are not available at the time of the present report for that level and semester.

Table 3. Fall 2010 Results by categories on seven-factor rubric (attached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor on rubric</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Spanish 2001*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conversation initiation</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Response</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conversational strategies</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fluency</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural appropriateness</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Comprehensibility</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task completion</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only one section

Table 4. Spring 2011 Results by categories on seven-factor rubric (attached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor on rubric</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Spanish 2001/2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conversation initiation</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.7 / 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Response</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9 / 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conversational strategies</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.6 / 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fluency</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.5 / 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural appropriateness</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7 / 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Comprehensibility</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7 / 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task completion</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7 / 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.9 / 8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Fall 2011 Results by categories on seven-factor rubric (attached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conversation initiation</td>
<td>7.8 / 8.9</td>
<td>8.3 / 8.7</td>
<td>8.7 / 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conversation initiation</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.6</td>
<td>8.9 / 8.5</td>
<td>8.2 / 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Response</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.6</td>
<td>8.7 / 8.3</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fluency</td>
<td>8.4 / 8.6</td>
<td>8.9 / 8.3</td>
<td>7.6 / 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural appropriateness</td>
<td>8.4 / 8.6</td>
<td>8.9 / 7.8</td>
<td>8.4 / 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Comprehensibility</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.6</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.3</td>
<td>8.8 / 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task completion</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.6</td>
<td>9.0 / 8.0</td>
<td>9.0 / 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8.5 / 8.6</td>
<td>8.9 / 8.2</td>
<td>8.4 / 9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one section / *one section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conversation initiation</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.4</td>
<td>9.0 / 8.6</td>
<td>8.9 / 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural appropriateness</td>
<td>8.5 / 8.3</td>
<td>9.0 / 8.8</td>
<td>9.5 / 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.3</td>
<td>9.1 / 8.8</td>
<td>9.1 / 9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved?

Given that MCL has three undergraduate major concentrations, student learning outcomes have varied, but on the whole they have been favorable. The following information ranges from the current academic year back to 2009-2010, when assessment data began. The French major initially failed to meet its target of 8.0 on a scale of 1-10 in student assessments of literary texts in the year 2009-2010, with a student average of 7.3; in 2010-2011, French majors met the target, with an average of 8.35; in 2011-2012, students “partially met” the target, with one course section reporting an 8.93 average, and the other section a 6.55, largely as a result of one particularly underperforming student. In the 2012-2013 cycle, French majors met the target, with one section averaging 8.85, and the other 8.25.

The German major has had better results, given that its students have consistently met the targeted 8.0 assessment score dating back to the 2009-2010 cycle and encompassing the current reporting cycle. Assessment scores have ranged from 8.2 to 8.75 in the previous four years.

The Spanish major has varied from “met” to “partially met”: in 2009-2010, the student averages were 8.1 and 7.9 in the two sections offered (“partially met”). In 2010-2011, the student averages were 8.2, 8.3, 8.6 and 8.6 (“met”). In 2011-2012, the averages were 7.8, 8.7, 8.2, and 8.1 (“partially met”), while in the most recent cycle the averages were 8.1, 8.8, 8.2, 8.4, and 8.8 (“met”).

What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

In the past four years, our assessment mechanisms have been refined or streamlined, to the point where for all MCL majors we assess student performance on one capstone paper each MCL major writes in their respective (German, French, or Spanish) Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts course. As student performance toward the 8.0 target has varied somewhat among the major programs (although they have hovered either slightly above or below the target, on the one hand it is hard to argue that student learning has improved. On the other hand, the fact that student performance has remained relatively high in the midst of a more refined assessment procedure suggests that students may in fact be improving in their performance.
2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

While I cannot speak for my predecessor (who retired last summer and had held this reporting position for several years prior to my appointment as his replacement) with regard to how changes in our respective majors’ educational programs stemmed from new knowledge from the assessment process, recent changes and developments in MCL majors (including a new BA/MA 5-year program) in the previous year are not directly linked to what I have learned from the assessment process. Many of these changes are linked to the particularities of the individual major programs, oftentimes addressing fluctuating enrollment mandates for all of our course offerings, the decommission of seldom-offered courses, the interests of incoming faculty members, and so on. That stated, it is increasingly clear that the assessment process can be a valuable tool for potential revisions of our educational programs. While in the past few years the focus has been on fine-tuning the assessment process itself, MCL will move toward making the assessment process more broadly beneficial to all our major programs. A stumbling block toward this end has been the consistently favorable scores in our course assessment results. MCL may need to further refine its assessment mechanisms in order to more clearly identify problem areas or weaknesses whose improvement could yield broad-based gains in our major programs.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

The major change that has occurred in our departmental assessment at the advanced undergraduate level (i.e., student work toward any of our three majors) has been a streamlining of the assessment process from multiple assessment measures to a single focus on student performance on one academic paper in the respective majors’ Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts courses. While it would be an oversimplification to state that this transition has been a narrow one (given that for this single paper there exists a detailed and organized assessment rubric), the transition has been nonetheless a favorable one in that the more narrow scope of the assessment process enables instructors to focus on a limited set of measurable targets and findings that are consistent among the three majors.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Over the past five years the School of Music student learning outcomes have largely been achieved. Those have that not in one reporting year have typically been achieved in subsequent years. The most significant improvements in student learning that can be attributed to changes we have made as a result of what we have learned from the assessment process are:

1. The band program has put individual performance evaluations into consistent use as part of the grading process. These evaluations provide students with immediate feedback during the semester and have shown to improve the quality of performances. Also, the Symphonic Wind Ensemble and Wind Orchestra have included a writing portion as part of the grade for at least one semester as a result of this process. It is hoped that this type of evaluation model will be adapted by all of the large ensemble directors.

2. In the area of applied music, the voice area has created an outstanding rubric for evaluating final juries. We believe that this change has positively impacted student learning as the students have tangible and immediate results for their work.

3. Two significant changes made in MUS 2490 – Basic Conducting. First a rubric was developed for evaluating the several conducting exams that occur throughout the course. The instructor noticed a significant increase in the results of subsequent exams once this rubric was created and implemented. A copy of that rubric is attached. Second, videotaped self-evaluation became a part of the course grade. Students would view their videotape and answer a set of questions aimed at assessing their performance and how they might improve both in preparation and future performances. A copy is attached.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

The following improvements have been made in the educational program as a result of what we learned from the assessment process:
1. Responding to a need to diversify our curriculum as shown through this assessment process, the band faculty created beginning of the year repertoire planning area meetings to ensure that students are receiving a diverse cross section of composers, genres, styles and eras.

2. Spawning from reflection about the Theory IV class and its use as a measure, the Fundamentals of Music class has been changed to an on-line only class.

3. The assessment process for our Computer Applications in Music class spawned discussions about whether this class is needed in the curriculum. Removal of the class is now being seriously discussed but has not yet been implemented.

4. The entire assessment process has prompted the School of Music administration to think seriously about our entire curriculum. Serious discussions are underway about removal of certain courses and realigning of others to more closely correlate credit hours with contact hours.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

1. The most significant change was between the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 reports when our Student Learning Outcomes were modified to line up with those set forth by the National Association of Schools of Music, our accrediting agency. We have only now begun to collect data on these new learning outcomes.

2. Over the five year period our student learning outcomes became better connected with our Goals.

3. Our Goals became more focused over the five year period primarily due to discussion with assessment advisors on the GSU campus. While we had 4 Goals in the 2008/2009 report, we have only 2 in the 2012/2013 report.

4. Over the five year period, our Targets improved. We moved away from using grades and more towards using single assessments and rubrics.

5. In the last two years we have followed the advise of the GSU assessment experts and not attempted to measure every Student Learning Outcome each year. We believe that this has created more focused reports with more realistic chances for achieving change.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

The School of Music used MUA1930/3930 Music Society and Culture as the class by which learning outcomes were measured. The following chart illustrates the results of student learning outcomes by year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>80% of students receive C or better on essay</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>80% of students C or better in MUA1930/3930</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>95% of students receive A/B on essay</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>95% of students receive A/B on essay</td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>80% of students receive acceptable rubric score on concert report</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>80% of students receive acceptable rubric score on concert report</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most significant change we have seen is the development of a grading rubric for essay questions in MUA1930/3930. This occurred between the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 evaluation periods.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

1. Through this process we determined that MUA1930/3930 could be taught just as effectively as an online course. Thus, as of two years ago, the course has become entirely online. This eliminated scheduling conflicts with other courses and allowed even more students to enroll in the class. I have attached syllabi from an older traditional class and a recent online class.

2. Through this process the primary instructor for MUA1930/3930 completely revised the way that she assessed concert reports. A copy of the new assessment method is attached.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

The primary change was in the Measures. We moved away from using final class grades and now use a single project, evaluated by rubric.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

   a. Over the years, we have been able to meet most of our goals. When we have failed to do so, it has usually been temporary.

   b. The single biggest improvement for us in the first of our Core classes, Phil 1010, has been the move to a standardized text geared to help GSU undergrads do well in all of their classes. We began using that text in 2008 and it was improved over the years, partially based on the experience we’ve had with it. The Department puts significant effort into teaching our grad students to teach this class (see http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwphi/2121.html) and the standardized text along with some standardized tests helped significantly. In addition our Supplemental Instruction Leadership program has, over the last 6 years been concentrated on 1010—in large part because of data we gathered while doing assessment—and has clearly helped the students in 1010.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

   a. One thing we learned clearly from assessing the work in our 4000 level classes—and from other data—is that students do better in classes that are not mixed with undergraduates and graduates. In 2008, many of our 4000 classes were cross-listed with 6000 level classes, typically with a 30/10 ratio. We have moved to change this, adding more 8000 level classes for grad students and reducing the number of seats in the cross-listed 4000 classes to 5.

   b. Given the various needs of students in Phil 1010 and the evidence from assessment, we have reduced the writing intensiveness in that class.

   c. We have added Phil 3000 (Introductory Seminar in Philosophy) and Phil 4990 (Senior Seminar in Philosophy) to our undergraduate curriculum, as beginning and graduating CTW classes, to tremendous success. We have also learned to encourage students, as strongly as possible, to take Phil 3000 before taking any of our 4000 level classes. Phil 3000 provides our majors a deep understanding of the skills necessary to do 4000 level work.

   d. We added other 3000 level classes to help us more smoothly transition students from the lower level classes to the more demanding 4000 level classes.
3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

a. To begin, it is useful to consider what we measured in 2008-2009 and what we measure now:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In 2008-9, we measured</th>
<th>We now measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Core classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Skills</td>
<td>1010: identifying premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Ability</td>
<td>and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ability to apply Skills to</td>
<td>1010: Critically evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary problems</td>
<td>Arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content knowledge (in Phil 2010 only)</td>
<td>2010: Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010: Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For our majors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Written Communication Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For MA program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Skills</td>
<td>Philosophical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of Acceptance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>into PHd programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the changes indicated above,

b. We have, in the last 5 years, expanded the Assessment Committee to 4 people, from 3.

c. We streamlined the process by using a random number generator (at www.random.org) to select a random sample of papers to use for assessment purposes. We have found that the data with the random sample to be reliable—and similar to using the full batch. We further streamlined the process, realizing that the assessment of Phil 4990 could be done with fewer randomly selected papers (10) than Phil 3000 (15) or Phil 1010 and Phil 2010 (20 each).

d. In the last 5 years we also moved to using an assessment-scoring rubric for all assessment purposes; this past year, we changed rubrics completely; we expect the new rubric to serve us as well, if not better, than the previous rubric.
e. Our CTW assessment now nicely overlaps with our assessment of the BA program, so much so that we do not see any real benefit in doing reports for these separately.

f. Most recently we changed our assessment scoring scale from a 4 point scale to the following:
   0: High School Dropout or below
   1: Low performing High School Graduate, rising College Freshman
   2: High performing High School Graduate, rising College Freshman
   3: Low performing rising College Sophomore
   4: High performing rising College Sophomore
   5: Low performing rising College Junior
   6: High performing rising College Junior
   7: Low performing rising College Senior
   8: High performing rising College Senior
   9: Low performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student
  10: High performing new College Graduate/rising First Year Grad Student
  11: Low performing rising Second Year Grad Student
  12: High performing rising Second Year Grad Student
  13: Low performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS
  14: High performing rising Third Year Grad Student or MA/MS
  15: Low performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student
  16: High performing rising Fourth or Fifth Year Grad Student
  17: Low performing new PhD
  18: High performing new PhD

We use this scale for all assessment, including that of our core classes, our major, our CTW courses, and our MA program.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

The department has learning outcomes for its undergraduate majors related to the main content areas as well as scientific skills (critical thinking, communication, use of technology, etc.). In the content areas the program has set a high goal of averaging 4 out of 5 which represents substantial understanding of the content. We have struggled to meet that high goal. In the scientific skills we have generally met that goal. This success is mainly due to the restructuring of advanced lab and research classes which was done when the CTW Initiative was introduced. The department took the opportunity at that point to combine and redesign smaller, topical lab courses into one comprehensive lab course that was intentional in its instruction of the expected scientific skills. The small numbers of students being assessed each year makes evaluation of trends somewhat difficult, but faculty experience supports the improvements in scientific skills.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

The program underwent a significant restructuring of advanced lab and research classes which was done when the CTW Initiative was introduced. The department took the opportunity at that point to combine and redesign smaller, topical lab courses into one comprehensive lab course that was intentional in its instruction of the expected scientific skills. Particularly significant is the low evaluations for students in written communication prior to the redesign of lab and research courses. For instance, students in the Senior Research course average 3.5 out of 5 in written communication in 2007-2008 while students in both the Senior Research and Research Project course have averaged over 4 out of 5 in the past 3 years.

It should also be noted that comparisons between results from 5 years ago and more recently should be done with great care since there have been large changes in the numbers and nature of the students in the program. The overall number of students in the BS in Physics has doubled in about 4 years and the number of students in the new Advanced Lab course is over twice what was taught in any of the smaller topical lab classes previously offered. This change means that the nature of the students in these courses is also changing.
3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

There has been no major change in our assessment process over the last 5 years. We primarily use instructor evaluations of the learning outcomes performed at the end of the semester. The CTW course also uses evaluation of particular written products which was not done previous to the creation of those courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name: Physics &amp; Astronomy Core</th>
<th>Reporter: Brian Thoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: July 12, 2013</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:bthoms@gsu.edu">bthoms@gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

The department has generally not met the targets we have set for learning outcomes in core physics and astronomy classes in the past five years. A number of significant changes have been made as described below, however, we have not yet seen the improvements expected. Since the university changed the learning outcomes that we are assessing in these courses after 3 years of this five year period, it would be surprising if we were able to show significant improvement in either the old or the new learning outcomes.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

One major change that was made in the core curriculum in the past five years has been the introduction of our “studio” classroom for Phys1111/1112 five years ago. Previous assessment had shown that students in these classes were not meeting our learning expectations. The “studio” physics classes follow the SCALE-UP model which emphasizes active learning, little lecturing, group collaboration, and inquiry-based laboratories. The dedicated classroom features round tables with 3 groups of 3 students at each and is designed to accommodate the integrated lecture/lab studio classes. This model of instruction was developed for calculus-based introductory physics but we have adapted it for algebra-based courses. We now teach almost half of the students in this course sequence in this mode. While learning outcomes have improved in these classes, the gains have been small. We are currently beginning two research projects aimed at identifying the reasons for the limited improvement. One is an internal grant (Provost funded) investigating the use of video and flipping the classroom. The second is an NSF-funded project which is a collaboration with two other universities investigating the factors limiting learning in algebra-based introductory physics courses taught in SCALE-UP format.
The second major change will occur in 2013-2014 and beyond. As part of an externally funded project making GSU a comprehensive site for the Physics Teacher Education Coalition (PhysTEC), we will be making significant changes to our introductory calculus-based physics courses with the aim of implementing research-based instructional strategies to improve student learning and to increase recruitment of students into physics teacher preparation programs. The implementation of redesigned laboratories will begin in Spring 2014 and be complete by Spring 2015.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

Three years into the previous five year period, the university changed the learning outcome structure for core classes. While we assessed critical thinking in science for the first 3 years, for the last two we have been assessing student understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method. In the introductory physics courses we have changed from using common final exam questions to using standard and widely accepted diagnostic tests for the two semester sequences in physics. The introductory astronomy courses have recently completed their new assessment instrument which will be implemented in fall 2013.

Program name: Political Science Core and BA  
Reporter: Rashid Naim  
Date: June 18, 2013  
Email: snaim1@gsu.edu

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Core:
The Department has consistently met the programs learning outcome goals over the past 5 years in both courses in the core (POLs 1101 and POLS 2401) These goals have been met even as the target scores to achieve these goals have been raised over the period in question.
(Spreadsheet Attached)
Numerous changes were made to the pedagogy and contents of both these courses as a result of assessments over the five years.
POLS 2401:
In 2010 the content of the course was overhauled and a student-centered pedagogy was adopted for the course with a new set of learning outcomes. Specific assessment tools were developed to assess substantive knowledge, critical analysis skills as well as communications skills that this course seeks to develop among students. Over the years the assessments have been used to identify areas under the substantive knowledge goal where student leaning outcomes were the weakest. Instructors were alerted to address these issues in greater detail and more carefully in the following years and to develop assignments designed to improve learning outcomes in those areas. In most cases these steps resulted in
higher scores in the following years. The department has a coordinator for the course who ensures that part-time, adjunct and visiting faculty as well as graduate students teaching the course with the learning outcomes as the central focus.

**POLS 1101:**

A set of learning outcomes were developed for the course and serve as the basis for the principle assessment tool for the course. This summer (2013) the department is experimenting in developing non-traditional methods of teaching the course including online content and flipping classes as well as a database of digital contents that can be used for the course. There is a need to carry out an overhaul of the course similar to the one of POLS 2401 but has not been possible because of the lack of funding. The department has a coordinator for the course who ensures that part-time, adjunct and visiting faculty, as well as graduate students teaching the course do so with the learning outcomes as the central focus and participate in the assessment process.

**BA:**

The Department has consistently met the programs learning outcome goals over the past 5 years, even as both the courses and tools used to assess learning outcomes in the BA have changed and the target scores to achieve these goals have been raised over the period in question.

The learning outcome scores for 2008-2010 and 2010-2013 are attached as separate documents. In addition the rubrics used to assess the outcomes since 2010 are also attached.

(Rubrics POLS 4900)
(Rubric POLS 3800)
(Spreadsheet 2008-2010)
(Spreadsheet 2010-2012)

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

The department has made a series of changes in the educational program to reflect the needs identified by the assessment process. These are listed below:

1. The curriculum for POLS 2401 was completely revised and included a revised set of learning outcomes and some new pedagogical tools.
2. The course content for POLS 1101 was also partially reviewed and several pedagogical changes made to better achieve and assess learning outcomes.
3. One challenge in assessing learning outcome in the major was that we have four different concentrations requiring different courses in each. This was overcome by using the two CTW courses introduced in the department for assessment. The assessment is therefore much more uniform across all students.
4. The assessment of courses in the major showed two major areas of weakness in desired learning outcomes; a) Developing a testable hypothesis/research question, and b) integrating other points of view into analysis. Outcome a) above applies to POLS 3800 and POLS 4900 and outcome b) above applies to POLS 4900. Instructors were notified of these weaknesses and
recommendations made to improve these learning outcomes. Scores in subsequent years have shown improvements in these areas.

5. In 2012-13 the department reviewed course offerings, dropping courses not being offered. In addition the department has added approximately 10 new courses over the 5 year period under review.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

The following are the key changes made to the assessment process

1. Starting with the academic year 2010-2011 the department started phasing out the use of grades earned in POLS 2401 and POLS 1101 courses as part of the assessment for learning outcomes for these courses and replaced them with other tools specifically developed to assess learning outcomes. This process was completed for POLS 2401 in the academic year 2010-2011 and for POLS 1101 in the academic year 2011-2012.

2. For courses in the major the department abandoned the use of grades to assess learning outcomes in the academic year 2010-2011. Both the learning outcomes and goals for assessment were changed in that year. In addition the courses used to assess learning outcomes were changed to the two CTW courses that are required of all students in the major. The assessment tools developed to assess the CTW courses then became the tools for assessing learning outcomes in the major. These consisted of rubrics for both the CTW courses (POLS 3800 and POLS 4900) which are attached.

3. The rubric used to assess learning outcomes for POLS 4900 was modified and two alternative rubrics were developed to accommodate different ways to assess learning outcomes for non-quantitative courses and courses in political theory.

---

**Program name: Psychology BA/BS and Core**  
**Reporter: Chris Goode**  
**Date: 6/13/13**  
**Email: cgoode@gsu.edu**

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Looking over our reporting for the past 5 years, we have met some but not all of the targets most years. This suggests that we have selected challenging target levels for most of our learning objectives. The past five years have been a period of explosive growth in our undergraduate majors, increasing from below 1300 to over 2000 in a 5-year period. We are pleased to note that we have maintained our high standards of learning outcomes generally, even during this period of unprecedented growth. We can see this primarily in Goal 1, knowledge base of psychology – we have met or partially met the same target since the 2007-8 reporting cycle.
2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

With the assessment process in mind we redesigned our core quantitative statistics/research methods sequence. We did this in part to address new requirements for Critical Thinking through Writing courses, and have been guided in revising this course sequence by referring to learning outcomes data.

We have also shared our assessment process with Georgia Perimeter College as a part of a Degree Qualifications Profile developed through Project Lumina, funded through a grant to the Provost’s office. We are using our learning outcomes data to track students through GPC’s two-year program, and GSU’s four-year program.

We intend to use our learning outcomes data to compare sections of courses that are taught online, as an in-class/online hybrid, and as a traditional class. We hope to demonstrate that these methods are equally effective.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

The main change in the past five years has been the adoption of the American Psychological Association’s recommended learning outcomes for the undergraduate psychology major (APA, 2007). The APA outlines two groups of five objectives each: knowledge skills and values consistent with the science and application of psychology, and knowledge, skills and values consistent with a liberal arts education that are further developed in psychology. The AAP guidelines have been immensely helpful in the development of our assessment process. We originally measured progress toward all ten of the recommended learning outcomes, and on advice from the undergraduate assessment committee, have recently limited the number of outcomes for which we report data.

References
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? *Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.*

In the 2008-2009 cycle the following were established as future learning outcomes for the B.A. in Religious Studies:

1. Ability to extrapolate a general working knowledge of the great historical religious traditions, e.g., Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto.
2. Ability to understand, contextualise, and explain the thought of major religious thinkers.
3. Ability to think critically and write persuasively within the academic study of religion.
4. Ability to conduct effective research in religious studies.

Targets for these outcomes were established at different points in the five years as follows:

i) In the 2012-2013 cycle for objective 1, at least 80% of the students earn 75% or better on multiple choice questions on the final exam for RELS 3270.

ii) In the 2008-2009 cycle for objective 2, faculty evaluations for historical content rank the student’s work 2.7 or higher.

iii) In the 2008-2009 cycle for objective 3, faculty evaluations for technical skills rank the student’s work 2.7 or higher.

iv) In the 2008-2009 cycle for objective 4, students would score a minimum of 4.0.

Learning outcomes targets:

Outcome 1 was partially met in the 2012-2013 cycle.
Outcome 4: target was met in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. It was partially met in 2008-2009 and 2012-2013. No data is available for 2011-2012.

As data collection has been spotty, it is difficult to determine the extent to which improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes that have made as a result of what has been learned from the assessment process.
2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

In 2008-2009, the Department developed a plan to integrate a research component into at least one of the required CTW courses. In addition there were ongoing conversations about how to expose students to various research methods. In 2011-12 and again in 2012-13, changes were made to the 4000-level CTW class to focus on incorporating research more effectively in writing.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

In 2008-2009 the Assessment Committee modified the existing assessment procedure so that individual measures better matched learning objectives.

In 2009-2010 exit-survey questions were more directly aligned to specific learning outcomes.

In 2012-2013 the measure for the learning outcome of knowledge of religious history was changed for the current assessment cycle to the final exam for RELS 3270 Survey of World Religions. This course is required of all Religious Studies majors and is offered each year. It provides an introduction to the historic and comparative study of the world’s major religious traditions. The final exam included 21-27 multiple choice questions that ask students to demonstrate their knowledge of religious history. The target for this outcome was established as follows: at least 80% of the students earn 75% or better on the questions.

In 2012-2013 the measure for the learning outcome of knowledge of major religious thinkers was changed for future assessment cycles. The final exam for RELS 3270 Survey of World Religions will be used as a measure, since in addition to providing an introduction to religious history, this course also provides an introduction to the work of major religious thinkers. Students' knowledge of major religious thinkers will be assessed through 10 multiple choice questions on the final exam which will ask students to identify religious thinkers in various world religions. The target for this outcome has been established as follows: at least 80% of the students earn 75% or better on the questions.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Student learning outcomes are measured in three areas: understanding, writing, and expansion. In the category of “understanding”, outcomes show varying numbers of students being evaluated and different percentages of students rated “excellent or very good”. In 2009 78% were rated excellent or very good; 2010 64% met this measure; 2011 and 2012 showed 60%. Most recent assessment reports for this measure showed 70%.

Writing: 73% in 2009; 62% in 2010; 57% in 2011 and 2012. Most recent reports showed 72%.

Expansion: 84% in 2009; 61% in 2010; 52% in 2011 and 2012. Most recent reports showed 70%.

The percentage of students who met this measure has decreased over years but is beginning to show a rise; however, my predecessor notes that this may not necessarily reflect a pattern as much as it does isolated factors. In her notes, she writes that “Last year, I suggested that the decline might be attributable to the fact that fewer students were assessed and fewer professors participated in assessment than in the previous year or that our students’ higher levels of success in past years may have been exaggerated. It could also be that the professors who are now participating are simply judging students differently.” Since I have only been in this position for a few months, I do not feel prepared or informed enough to speculate as to whether other issues may also be a factor.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

   a. Our department currently offers a number of Critical Thinking through Writing courses (CTW’s) that directly reflect a specific faculty research specialty. CTW courses are limited to only 25 enrollment seats. This provides our undergraduates an opportunity to work with faculty in an environment that allows for in-depth comments by their instructor on multiple paper drafts throughout the semester.
   
   b. Our department conducts an “annual assessment report” during our introductory courses, intro to sociology and intro to social problems. This report provides data on students’ mastery of core sociological concepts.
   
   c. We are currently in the planning stage for two departmental initiatives. The first is a “research internship” program offered as a class that will count directly towards a sociology degree. This research class will provide an opportunity for students, who perform well academically, to work directly with a
faculty member in relation to specific research conducted by said faculty member. The other initiative under consideration is the offering of additional “Honors” opportunities to sociology majors. Such opportunities could be in the form of honors theses and an increase in the number of sociology courses assigned an Honors designation.

d. During 2012, our department urged several top undergraduates to apply for the National Science Foundation REU intern program. As a result, five of our undergraduates were accepted to this prestigious program due to the encouragement, guidance and support of our faculty members.

3. **Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?**

Learning outcomes have changed twice. In 2009, outcomes were that “professors would evaluate students’ demonstration of their understanding of sociological research/articles/books on a four point scale.” In 2010 and 2011, outcomes were that “professors of CTW courses would evaluate students’ ability to demonstrate an understanding of sociological work in their writing assessments over the course of the semester.” Beginning in 2012, outcomes are now that “students should demonstrate an understanding of sociological work in their writing assignments over the course of the semester.” The onus is now placed more squarely on students’ demonstration of understanding concepts through their writing, as opposed to on professors’ evaluation of students.

Measures continue to include understanding, writing, and expansion—students’ understanding of concepts, quality of writing, and ability to extend analysis in new direction. This has not changed over the past five years.

Targets also remain consistent—to have a majority of students scoring “excellent” or “very good” on the three measures listed above.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Within the last five years, we have worked to improve our assessment of student learning, a process which has been strengthened by our work with CTW. In general, we have found some patterns in terms of areas of improvement. Our learning outcomes are generally split into two goals – acquiring content, and demonstrating critical thinking skills through writing and reading. First, we have found that students tend to perform quite well in terms of demonstrating their understanding of feminist perspectives and applying these perspectives to various social issues/problems. Additionally, students have generally scored well in terms of their ability to demonstrate their critical reading skills. Our continual problem areas involve assessments of student writing, which are substantial areas of emphasis for us. Our learning outcomes focus on such skills as developing new and focused thesis statements, organizing papers clearly, providing sufficient evidence for claims, and writing coherently and clearly; therefore, these are the skills we continue to work to improve in the classroom. One other consistent pattern we have noticed, moreover, is that we are more likely to meet our targets when it comes to developing basic competencies in these skills; however, we are generally not as successful in terms of meeting our targets for excellence.

In general, we have met more of our targets in the 2012-2013 academic year than we have in the past, so that progress seems promising, in that our action plans do seem, in fact, to be working. It is somewhat difficult to discern consistent patterns, since the vagaries of an individual year may complicate any linear progress. Given these caveats, however, here is what we are finding as a result of specific action plans.

In WSt 3010, for instance, we have had an action plan since the 2009-2010 year to increase attention to the shorter papers throughout the semester. This plan does seem to have strengthened student performance in the later papers. While we still have not reached our target, in terms of writing skills on these papers, we are getting closer, which suggests that there is improvement, and that more feedback and even grading do help. While we like the idea of low-stakes papers, it does seem that including grades helps increase student motivation to work harder on their papers. Furthermore, students’ ability to identify main points and arguments of their readings (which is scored on the same measure) does also seem to be improving. We introduced measuring students’ reading ability two years ago; including that learning outcome in the CTW process has given us a clearer picture of the connections between reading and writing skills and also helped us strengthen our action plans for CTW.
In terms of their final paper for 3010, students met the targets in terms of demonstrating their knowledge of appropriate theoretical perspectives, which is an improvement from previous years. I would say, though, that this improvement may be attributed in part to the revisioning of the assignment, which we have not included in an action plan. Last year, the assignment was for students to construct a research question that they could then answer through utilizing a variety of theoretical perspectives covered in class; this assignment did seem to guide students to demonstrate their knowledge of these perspectives clearly.

In terms of the capstone classes, 4920 and 4950, we have found that increasing the amount of time and attention focused on revision has really helped students score well on their learning outcomes. In fact, we find a direct correlation between how seriously students take the revision process and how well they score. In terms of the final paper for the internship, for instance, we have been stressing the significance of the final paper and of the revision of that paper more intensively throughout the semester, including firm deadlines for a draft, which seems to have paid off in terms of their scores on the multiple rubrics that measure writing skills.

We have been able to discern improvements in both a given class and from the entry level to exit level classes, which suggests, yet again, that the CTW initiative is working. In terms of the 3010 class, student performance on the shorter papers in terms of both identifying main points/arguments and writing skills is improving from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester. In terms of the capstone classes, when we compare the scores from the draft to the revised paper, it is quite clear that revision contributes to some degree of improvement in almost all cases. These sorts of direct comparisons do show most students improving in terms of their ability to construct main points, develop arguments, organize their ideas, and express them clearly.

In terms of the relationships between the entry/exit classes, that is harder to show. I do think that, from the perspective of the capstone classes, the emphasis on the process of writing, perhaps the revision process especially, in all our upper level classes, has contributed to the general writing strengths that students are displaying (I address the wider inclusion of revision in our other courses in the next question). While we have never had much trouble with the aspects of our outcomes that emphasize demonstrating theoretical knowledge, there is still some improvement noted. In general, while we have in the past noted that many students are achieving basic competence, but we have had trouble with students excelling, we are now noticing improvements on both levels. I do think that the focus on writing in the 3000 level course is contributing to the success of the students as they get into the upper level capstone classes.

One persistent problem that we encounter involves the ability to contribute to improvement within the time limits of undergraduate careers. We continually find that students who have significant writing problems in our lower-level classes may improve, but they often do not improve as much or as quickly as we would like them to. Similarly, students who are doing really well in the capstone class have generally always been strong writers. We would like to develop more ways to address these disparities, if possible.
2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

Integrating the CTW component into our classes has not been that challenging since they are already so writing intensive. In order to come up with a clear focus for the CTW initiative, we decided to really emphasize instituting a revision component for our classes, since that seems the most productive way to increase student’s writing skills. We have had much success with this process, although we are still working on developing a more effective process. One of the central reasons that we chose the revision process (as well as providing clear instruction) for these issues is because we do think students learn best through concrete feedback on their particular papers; writing is an individual process that requires specific feedback. In terms of the revision process for our introductory CTW course, we have been integrating both peer review and an instructor review process. In terms of the student peer review process, the results (predictably) were mixed. Some groups worked hard to provide clear and useful feedback, whereas others did not. Similarly, some students seemed to really incorporate and address the criticisms, whereas others did not. Students do tend to respond much more carefully to instructor comments than they do to those of their peers. One of the biggest challenges we have had with the revision process is convincing students of its utility. In order to address this challenge, we have been working on instituting clearer guidelines for the assignments, as well as stricter consequences for not paying attention to this aspect of assignments. Having teacher feedback, as well as the pressure of the final assignment, did seem to be fairly effective in terms of convincing students of the importance of actually re-engaging with their papers so that they could substantially rework them into stronger arguments. This process can be quite time-consuming for instructors, so we have been working to find a balance so that we can maximize student improvement without making it impossible for the teacher.

Perhaps the main change that we have made in our program involves the greater integration of the revision component throughout the program. One of our consistent action plans throughout the course of this time period has been to increase early intervention in writing; in order to do so, we have wanted to expand our work with CTW into most of our courses, especially because the revision component has actually been strengthening our students’ writing. I should probably mention that this expansion is truly an expansion, and not a “new” focus; the majority of our courses have always been writing intensive, but we are now trying to keep better track of how we actually go about teaching writing in the classroom. To increase revision throughout the program, we have instituted a number of pilot programs. For instance, in some of the Introductory courses (which are not CTW classes), we have been able, with the help of WAC consultants, to require students to turn in a graded rough draft of their final paper, in order to provide focused individual feedback on their writing. In some of our upper-level courses, for instance Feminism and Queer Theory, we also instituted a graded rough draft for their seminar papers, so that they are required to revise their paper with some seriousness and attention.
Furthermore, in order to provide some consistency in terms of how we go about teaching writing in our upper-level courses, we also compiled a “How to Write a Paper” handout that brought together many of the handouts we individually use in our classes. In so doing, we are trying to identify some of the major writing challenges students have and provide basic strategies for addressing these. I am not sure exactly how effective this hand out is; interestingly, students who are the strongest writers seem to utilize it, whereas students who may face some of these challenges seem to dismiss it.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

In general, we have not changed that much in terms of the assessment process. We have been refining rather than substantially altering our process. For the most part, for instance, we have added measures or shifted the way in which we collect scores. For example, the first year of collecting data for CTW (2009-10), we averaged the scores on various rubrics to provide data for assessment. We realized after that year that it is more useful to look at the percentages of students who score within the basic competence or excellence range in order to provide a clearer picture of their demonstrations of skills. Furthermore, in 2010-11, we began collecting short papers for 3010 in addition to the revised final papers. Although these are mostly ungraded short papers that demonstrate critical reading skills, we have begun in the past year collecting one from the beginning and one from the end of the semester (per student), so that we can look specifically at how their skills are improving throughout the course of the semester. This practice has provided us fairly good results in that it does seem like students are becoming more adept at discovering the main point and major supporting arguments for their readings.

The changes that we have made since last year primarily involve some changes in our action plans. Mainly we streamlined some of our plans to avoid repetition and tried to think through how we would more effectively implement the ones we have, such as peer review and revision in higher level courses. I would like to respond in part here to the report I received on last year's CTW. One recommendation the reviewer made was that I should eliminate the repetition in outcomes, and I would point out that I have it twice because there are two levels of classes. In other words, one "demonstrating knowledge and use of theoretical perspectives" applies to the entry level course, and the other applies to the exit course. That is the only way I can figure out to organize my report, given the limitations of WEAVE. One comment I would make about targets, though, is that even though the target numbers were fairly arbitrary to begin with, we have found that keeping them constant has proved to be effective, in that it allows us to have a constant against which to measure our scores.

In order to think through these issues carefully, we are also having a retreat in August to think through a number of issues about the undergraduate program.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Over the past five years 2008-2013, the ECE BSED Program has reviewed teacher candidate performance scores across all five learning outcomes and they have met or surpassed all identified assessment targets. Improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes made in the course management system, revisions in course design and content, identification of clear goals and learning outcomes, and development of stronger measures including clear and concise rubrics. The following three areas of teacher preparation, associated with goals and learning outcomes, are identified with key changes. Assessment data indicate improvements in student learning across some of the targeted areas: written communication, content knowledge – earth/life science, classroom management, technology, planning and assessment. We will continue to monitor teacher candidates’ growth in these areas and identify ways to improve the ECE BSED Program.

1. **Content knowledge:**
   *Improvement in student learning noted in written communication; we will continue to monitor improvements in earth/life science for results in 2013-2014.

Key changes: 2010-2011 GUMS - Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Style Writing Program; 2011-2012 ISCI 2001 course changes; 2013-2014 will incorporate a new measure, the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards - TAPS

2. **Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions:**
   *Improvement in student learning noted across some performance indicators of classroom management, but we will continue to monitor this area; improvement noted in using technology for student learning

Key changes: revised three-course sequence ECE 3661, ECE 3662, ECE 3663 - Classroom Management; designed new comprehensive lesson plan format; offered multi-media digital media seminars and revised ECE 3602: Digital Composing as Literacy Learning, offered ECE 3021 as a hybrid course; 2013-2014 will incorporate a new measure, the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards - TAPS

3. **Effects on Student learning:**
*Some improvement in student learning noted in the area of assessment; however, we will continue to look at all performance indicators for improvement in planning, implementing and assessing student learning 2013-2014

**Key changes:** 2010-2011 embedded the ESOL Endorsement; incorporated methods of assessment across specific content area course work and added a focus on pupil self-assessment; will incorporate new measure, the edTPA, and signature course assignments across ECE 3021: Child Development, ECE 3661, 3662, 3663 – Classroom Management, ECE 3607: Math Methods, ECE 3601: Reading Methods, ECE 3360: Assessment

2. **Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?**

- The ECE BSED Program **embedded the ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) Endorsement** in the undergraduate Early Childhood Education degree program so that all teacher candidates would be proficient in meeting the needs of all learners, including English Language Learners. The BSE program was revised beginning fall 2010 to require the ESOL Endorsement for all “Traditional – non Dual Certification” Program students. This decision was made in an effort to address the changing demographics and pupil needs in metro Atlanta as noted in the ECE strategic plan and to improve preparation of pre-service teachers in the areas of planning for differentiated instruction and assessment.

- With the addition of the assessment course to the Program of Study in Area G in 2006-2007, teacher candidates are no longer failing in the Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory range of the Final Student Teaching Evaluation on INTASC 8 Assessment of Student Learning. However, results from 2011-2013 data from this assessment and the Observation Field Performance assessment reveal that it is still an area that pre-service teachers struggle with and is typically rated the lowest. The Observation Field Performance assessment shows assessment as one of the lowest scored for a few candidates. The role of instructional assessment as it relates to teaching and learning is a major focus of the Assessment course, ECE 3360, as well as methods for documenting student learning. Candidates examine various teacher-constructed and standardized instruments used to assess student learning and learn strategies for selecting and using assessment methods. A **focus on pupil self-assessment** was added to course instruction around lesson planning. Finally, based on feedback from this data and University Supervisors’ ratings, course instructors have become more intentional in **incorporating methods of assessment across specific content area course work.** In order to continue to be responsive to the climate of accountability for P-5 student learning and to improve our candidates' competencies in assessing P-5 student learning, this is a continued focus in the content area course work.

- We learned from program data, specifically the Observation Field Performance – media communication sub-indicator that teacher candidates are avid users of technology in their
personal lives and for teacher directed instruction; however, they need improvement in using technology for student learning. In response, the program **revised and renamed ECE 3602**: Reading and Language Arts in Early Childhood Education II to **ECE 3602: Digital Composing as Literacy Learning**. One change in course content included a new focus on digital literacy for student learning. Teacher candidates are given opportunities to learn and design multi-media digital literacy compositions themselves and with K-12 students and their teachers. Additionally, in order to give teacher candidates more experience working and communicating in a learning community online, we offered ECE 3021: Child Development as a hybrid course.

- The program **revised the three-course sequence, ECE 3661, ECE 3662, ECE 3663: Classroom Management and Field Experiences I, II, III in Early Childhood Education**, emphasizing lesson plan development and Responsive Classroom Management strategies in order to target classroom management, an area rated as one of the lowest on key assessments across the five years. Classroom Management is an area that is typically a struggle for new teachers.

- Our scores are equal or above the state in all areas on the GACE Content Assessment with the lowest area on test 001: understand the conventions of Standard English grammar, usage, and mechanics was equivalent with the state score. In response to this outcome the program continues to implement **supplemental instruction in grammar, usage, and mechanics, and style (GUMS)** for candidates who have been identified as needing further instruction in this area. We expect to see improvement in teacher candidates’ GACE scores in this area in 2013-2014.

- Our scores on the GACE Content Assessment test 002 are higher than the state except for one area, again the lowest state rated outcome: understand concepts and principles of earth science. The program continues to implement **course changes in ISCI 2001 with an increased emphasis on content development in earth and life sciences**, a collaborative effort by the College of Arts & Sciences and the College of Education faculty who implement co-teaching models of delivery. We expect to see improvement in teacher candidates’ GACE scores in earth science in 2013-2014.

### 3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

In an effort to streamline reporting and review meaningful data as collected for the PSC, NCATE and the university’s WEAVE online system, the BSE faculty revised program learning outcomes to clearly match key assessments, aligned to national standards and the Professional Education Faculty Conceptual Framework, loaded in courses at mid and end of program in the new LiveText Course Management System. The ECE BSED Program will continue to use the LiveText course management system to document, collect, analyze, and report program data. We will maintain the established targets, and we will continue to include disaggregated data across all levels of the key assessment rubrics in order to drill down to specific areas to identify program strength and needs for program focus. In summary, we:

- Moved to an electronic assessment management system, LiveText to collect, analyze and report on learning outcome results
• Revised goals and learning outcomes in order to streamline the process of reporting results for state program approval and national accreditation
• Revised measures to collect meaningful data aligned to the learning outcomes
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1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

The Birth Through Five program is still relatively new (2009) with only three assessment cycles completed. Student learning outcomes have consistently exceeded the target level 85% or above. We believe this is due to a solid curriculum, effective teaching and meaningful, achievable learning outcomes. In the rare instance that multiple learning outcomes were not met, the candidate was not retained in the program and did not graduate. To date, we have not made significant changes tied to improvements in student learning.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

While the process has identified several areas to 'tweak' in the assessment system, data have not revealed areas where significant revisions to curriculum, courses, or course sequence are needed. However, one observation that will be further studied concerns the lower scores on the measure, Evaluation of Field Performance (End of Program). We have noticed that student teaching interns do not consistently score as well on indices of working collaboratively with families, or incorporating family and community into the curriculum or learning process. Either student teachers are not having the opportunity to work as closely with families/community as we had hoped during student teaching or they are not able to maximize these opportunities. After discussing this issue at our B-5 Advisory Committee meetings, the course instructor for BRFV 4400 Family and Community Relations in fall 2012 has agreed to design several assignments that could be more helpful to student teachers in building connections with families/communities. This course will be offered again in fall 2013, and we will be able to compare ratings before and after the course revisions.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

We have made important changes to our learning outcomes and measures in the past five years in order to better align outcomes and measures to state teacher certification assessment processes. Originally,
we had too many outcomes and a few of the measures were less precise. We now have four (4) clear, performance stated outcomes and four (4) measures with descriptive qualitative rubrics. For example, beginning with fall, 2012, we revised the measure used to assess the candidate’s ability to plan effectively for students development and learning. Candidates develop an Individual Educational Plan (IEP) for a learner with a disability. The IEP/IFSP rubric was revised to reflect clearer levels of proficiency and passing scores: Mastery (29-32 points); Accomplished (25-28 points); Developing (24 points); Beginning (23 points or fewer). If a student receives 23 points or fewer, they will need to redo and resubmit the assignment until a passing score is obtained. For other measures, we can report of the number and percentage of candidates that did not meet, met, and exceeded the targets. Because we have meaningful outcomes, measures and targets, the data generated is useful for some analysis and program modifications.
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HPE Student Learning Outcomes

1. Professional Knowledge & Skills:
   • HPE students will identify how individuals learn and develop and can provide developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and opportunities to develop physically educated individuals based on state and national health and physical education standards.
   • HPE students will demonstrate effective task presentations as determined by the following criteria:
     o Teacher uses refinement and extension tasks throughout the lesson to build student skill.
     o Teacher uses application tasks after students have developed adequate skill and performance.
     o Teacher addresses safety concerns or potential problems.
     o Teacher uses multiple teaching strategies for delivering the unit.
     o Teacher generalizes important concepts for the unit to other activities.

2. Planning:
   • HPE students will plan a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated individuals based on state and national standards.
   • Students will demonstrate ability to develop a contextual analysis and rationale for their health and physical education units as determined by the following criteria:
     o Teacher generalizes important concepts for the unit to other activity areas.
     o Teacher shows relationships of activity to those areas with related concepts.
     o Teacher develops a lesson that someone unfamiliar with the lesson could use the plan and know the exact expectations for the students.
Teacher bases lesson modifications on personal research of teaching effectiveness.

- Students will develop goals and learning outcomes as determined by the following criteria:
  - Physical education lesson plan goals are written for a three learning domains.
  - Lesson plan goals demonstrate continuous progress toward reaching unit goals.
  - When appropriate goals specify both process and product.

3. Effects on P-12 Student Learning:
   - HPE students will use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social and emotional development of students in physical activity.
   - HPE students will demonstrate the ability to use assessment data from students to alter lesson emphasis and/or unit plans.

4. Clinical Practice:
   - HPE students will demonstrate reflective practices by evaluating the effects of their actions on others and seek opportunities to grow professionally.
   - HPE students will demonstrate the ability to write reflections based on data obtained from assessments used during the lesson.
   - HPE students’ reflections will focus on the impact their performance had on student learning.
   - HPE students’ reflections will provide suggestions for improving the delivery of lesson content to enhance student learning.

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

Professional Knowledge & Skills:
GACE content knowledge pass rates are used as a measure of content knowledge in Health and Physical Education across the P-12 curriculum. The subscores reported on GACE enable faculty to identify areas of strength and weaknesses compared to completers from across the state. Examination of the results provides information on which content area/s may need additional focus within a specific course, a series of courses, or within the program’s curriculum in general.

The GACE pass rate and subarea scores for the past five years (2007-2012) are evidence that candidates graduating from the HPE program have excellent content knowledge, on par with, and in most cases better than graduates from similar programs across the State. The GSU 2011-2012 scores were significantly higher than GSU scores from the previous three years in every category, except Family and Social Relationships, which was down by one percent. (See Tables 1A and 1B).

Improvement in GACE scores reflect several changes made in the program between 2008-2012. These include the following:
- Scheduling changes were made influencing the sequence of selected courses. HPE faculty reevaluated the sequence of courses and the schedule was adjusted accordingly.
- Changes were made in 2009 to create a more structured cohort. This has resulted in higher GPA scores in 2009 and 2010 and subsequent anticipated improvements in GACE scores for this same time period going forward.
- The addition of KH 3250 and 3700 as required courses in the curriculum for health education can be linked to improved scores in personal health and development, family and social relationships, and to anticipated improvement in scores in the area of disease and health risk prevention.
- The assignment of full time HPE faculty to KH 3030 and 3040 was made in 2009 in response to HPE faculty’s perceptions of inadequate preparation in these content areas due to instruction by part time program faculty.
- As of Fall 2010, HPE 3020 is offered solely for HPE students and is taught by a full time HPE faculty member. This change was made in response to our recognition that HPE students were not getting the necessary content to prepare them for the P-12 setting and for state fitness testing requirements when this class was offered to a combined group of HPE and exercise science students and taught by a part time exercise science faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1A: Pass Rates on GACE Content Knowledge for HPE Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPE Test I #115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1B: GACE Scores by Subarea for HPE Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSU/HPE Program Average (Statewide Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Health and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease and Health Risk Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Social Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Learning and Development and Movement Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Lifetime Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning:
There are three assessments that measure this learning outcome. These include contextual analysis and rationale for the teaching model selected in the respective class, block and lesson plans, and learning goals and outcomes. HPE candidates do very well on these assessments due to the design of the overall program. The design is integrative in nature: HPE candidates start early in their preparation program at GSU in all aspects of planning from curriculum plans to unit plans and daily lesson plans. This is due in large part to the heavy field based series of courses that combine theory and practice starting in the junior year and are completely field based in the senior year. Thus, HPE candidates have multiple opportunities throughout the program to develop their skills in writing effective curriculum plans, unit plans, daily lesson plans, and IEP (Individual Education Plans). These plans are broad in scope across the P-12 curriculum in health, physical education, and adapted physical education.
The 2011-2012 data from Key assessments show that 83% of BSEd students were very good at writing a contextual analysis; which shows a significant improvement from 2010-2011, with only 32% rating very good in this category. Improvement was also seen in students’ ability to develop block and lesson plans, with 80% of the 2010-2011 students rated as very good and 87% of the 2011-2012 students at this rating. The third category of planning, writing learning goals and outcomes, also improved from 2010 to 2012, from 73% of the 2011-2012 candidates rated as very good to 96% of the 2011-2012 students rated as very good. A contributing factor to these improvements was the additional instruction on planning given during the few days of block.

Effects on P-12 Student Learning:
Prior to student teaching, candidates complete a field-based course, KH 4520, that requires them to analyze their ability to positively impact P-12 students’ learning. All candidates in the program complete two instructional models projects during student teaching. The models project is a comprehensive instructional unit that includes pre- and post-assessments of major learning outcomes for P-12 students. By comparing learning gains across the span of the unit, candidates determine and analyze the impact they have on P-12 student learning. It is important to recognize that candidates are at the novice level of understanding and using assessments. In addition, the types, and amount of assessments chosen and used are linked to and differ for by the type of instructional mode selected and the anticipated outcomes for that model.
KH 4520 is the first class students were required to conduct an analysis of student learning. The most recent date (2011-2012) indicate that all students (100%) rated as satisfactory or very good in this category. The 2010-2011 data showed only 71% as satisfactory or very good and 21% as needing improvement. This improvement can be attributed to the adoption of a new textbook for the assessment class (KH 3420), written by the course instructor to specifically address weaknesses in teacher candidates’ ability to assess learning.

Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge):
Lesson reflections are used to determine the degree to which candidates: (a) develop an ability to engage in self-evaluation in assessing strengths as well as areas of need; (b) provide reexamination of personal goals and values in view of the complex demands of teaching and (c) analyze and assess
personal characteristics relate to teaching (e.g., perception of self and others, classroom behaviors, attitudes about children/teenagers and teaching, knowledge and skills), which are deemed prerequisite for becoming a successful teacher.

Lesson reflections were the key assessment to evaluate clinical practice. In 2010-2011 70% of BSEd candidates were ranked very good or outstanding for their lesson reflections prior to student teaching; 86% received a rating of very good or outstanding. In 2011-2012 71% of BSEd candidates received very good or outstanding for their lesson reflections prior to student teaching; 100% of these students were rated as very good or outstanding in this area at the end of student teaching. These numbers suggest that candidates have developed an increased ability to engage in self-evaluation not only on what they do as teachers, but they are strongly aware of the reasons their decisions may or may not have been effective.

2. **Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (i.e., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?**

Over the past five years the following improvements have been made in the HPE BSEd program as a result of the data analysis:

- KH 3420 (Assessment) was moved to the fall semester, so that it can be taught with KH 3200 (Basic Teaching Skills). This allows students to apply content knowledge during the field experiences conducted in KH 3200.

- A revised assessment textbook was written by Dr. Lund. The textbook was written to specifically address weaknesses in the teacher candidates’ ability to assess learning.

- KH 3020 (Fitness), KH 3030 (Team Sports), and KH 3040 (Lifetime Sports) were assigned to full-time faculty, providing a more consistent curriculum.

- Faculty developed a matrix of common terminology to enhance program cohesiveness.

- Students were required to meet all teacher education requirements prior to taking courses in area G.

3. **Over the past five years, what changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?**

Over the past five years, HPE faculty engaged in two in-service trainings on the topics of 1) writing essential questions and 2) writing learning outcomes. In KH 3010, 3020, and 3420 instructors modeled writing essential question prior to lectures. Students were also provided additional practice opportunities in KH 3010 and 3420 to write learning outcomes.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

**CONTENT KNOWLEDGE:**
Since the inception of the BSE MLE Program in 2010, our students have been largely successful in achieving the program’s learning goals. Their success can also be linked to the improvements that were made by the program faculty throughout the years - specifically in the Content Knowledge area. Here is a yearly breakdown:

Data for the key assessment data from Content Knowledge was obtained from the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument and the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument.

**Content Knowledge Findings: 2010-2011**

**Areas of Strength:**
- 94% of students passed this content and curriculum evaluation with all sub-components, scoring a “3: Adequately Demonstrated” or higher.
- 100% of students scored at the higher level “4: “Effectively Demonstrated” in the sub-component “Content Connections.”

**Areas for Improvement:**
- 5% of students scored at an unacceptable level (“2: Partially Demonstrated”) in the subcomponent “Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge.”

As a result of these findings, the program faculty reevaluated their content and methods courses in the BSE MLE Program. The goal for 2011-2012 was for “all students to score a “3” or adequately demonstrated on each rubric section. Furthermore, the amount of content was also reevaluated in each of the courses because of the Partially Demonstrated score received by 5% of the pre-service candidates.
**Content Knowledge Findings: 2011-2012**

**Areas of Strength:**

- In 2011-2012, the number of Pre-service candidates who passed the content and curriculum evaluation with all subcomponents increased by 4 percentage points – up from 94% to 98%.

- Also during this period, 76% of students scored at the higher level (“2: Partially Demonstrated”) in the sub-component “Content Connections”. This was an advancement from the mid program checkpoint.

**Areas for Improvement:**

- One student scored at the unacceptable level (“2: Partially Demonstrated”) in the subcomponent “Instructional Methods.”

As a result of these findings, program faculty felt that the implemented changes did help to move our students in the right content cognitive direction, and we will continue to make improvements as needed.

**PLANNING:**

In 2010-2011, students completed the Action Research Proposal during the semester of their clinical practice (Practicum 1). The student’s Action Research project was assessed by the university supervisor, who gave feedback to the student in the areas of strength and in areas that need improvement.

**Planning Findings 2010-2011:**

**Areas of Strength:**

- 96% of the students were proficient or exemplary in the focus of their action research project.

- 100% of the students were proficient or exemplary in their rationale for the project.

- 91% of the students scored proficient or exemplary in their proposed instructional strategies designed to collect research data aimed at the improvement of the teaching and learning practices in their practicum and student teaching classroom.

**Areas for Improvement:**

- 13% of the students scored only partially proficient in their research methods.

Our findings indicated that we needed to increase instruction with future cohorts.
Planning Findings 2011-2012:

In 2011-2012, we moved to the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) rubric as the key assessment that analyzed students’ planning. We felt that more insight into our students’ ability to plan for instruction could be gained from using the Teacher Work Sample than using the Action Research model. The new TWS assessment allows us to analyze students’ abilities to align learning goals and instruction, their ability to clearly state criteria and standards for performance, and their ability to adapt based on individual needs of the students.

Areas of Strength:

- All but one student scored at the “acceptable” level or above in all areas of the rubric that analyzed planning.

- At least 72% of students scored at the “exemplary” level in all 5 subcategories of the planning rubric.

Areas for Improvement:

- 8% of students scored only “acceptable” in Technical Soundness.

As a result of our findings, we realized that more technical training will have to be embedded in the courses of our next cohort.

CLINICAL PRACTICE:

Students are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contacted in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students’ clinical practice) and the final Teaching Evaluation (taken near the end of students’ clinical practice).

Clinical Practice Findings - Fall 2010:

Areas of Strength:

- All but 1 student (97%) adequately demonstrated knowledge of student development.

- 100% of the students adequately or effectively demonstrated reflection and growth and overall professionalism during the practicum 1 teaching experience.

- 100% of the students adequately or effectively demonstrated classroom management and positive learning environments during practicum 1 teaching experience.

- 100% of the students effectively demonstrated the use of assessment during practicum 1 teaching experience.
Areas for Improvement:

- Although 100% of students demonstrated classroom management either adequate or effectively, only 54% were at the effective level.

Clinical Practice Findings - Spring 2011:

Areas of Strength:

- 100% of students passed knowledge of student development, positive learning environment, assessment, planning and instruction, and professionalism with a score of “2: adequately demonstrated” or “3 effectively demonstrated.”

Areas for Improvement:

- Although 100% of students passed in this domain, each area had at least one student who scored at “2 adequately demonstrated” instead of the highest level of “3: effectively demonstrated.”

Clinical Practice Findings - Fall 2011:

Areas of Strength:

- 98% of all students adequately or effectively demonstrated knowledge of student development.

- 92% of students demonstrated knowledge of planning and instruction in all areas at the adequately or effectively demonstrated level.

Areas for Improvement:

- Only 56% were at the effective level for classroom management.

We decided to add more instruction and seminars related to classroom management prior to practicum 1 to help more students move to the effective level of classroom management.

EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING:

In 2010-2011, the key assessment on Student Learning was contained in the rubric for the Final Action Research Project.

Fall 2010 -2011: Action Research Findings:

Areas of Strength:

- 100% of students scored at the highest level (“3: Exemplary”) in the following sub-categories: focus and rationale.
- 100% of students scored at the passing rate of “2: Proficient” in all areas of the project.

**Areas for Improvement:**

- 9% of students scored below the passing rate on 3 sections: literature review, research methods and results.

**Fall 2011-2012: Teacher Work Sample Findings:**

In 2011-2012, the key assessment on Student learning was contained in the rubric for the Teacher Work Sample. We felt that more insight into our students’ abilities could be obtained from using this model.

**Areas of Strength:**

- 87% of students scored at the highest level (“2: Proficient”) level or above in all areas of analysis of student learning.

**Areas for Improvement:**

- Two students scored below the passing rate on the alignment with learning goals.

**DISPOSITIONS:**

For the BSE MLE program, the Dispositions assessments is completed by the university superior at the end of Practicum 1 and at the end of student teaching.

**Disposition Findings 2011-2012:**

**Fall 2011:**

**Areas of Strength:**

- 92% of our students received a score of acceptable or exceptional in all areas related to professional dispositions.

**Spring 2012:**

- 100% of our students received a score of acceptable or exceptional in all related areas related to professional dispositions during the endpoint evaluation.

**Areas for Improvement:**

- 21% of our students scored acceptable in the areas of “meaningful purpose and vision.”

To address this issue, we examined if there were any additional instructional opportunities in our university coursework that might help teacher candidates to be rated at the exceptional level of this aspect of professional dispositions.
2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

Based on our assessment data from the past five years, we have focused our efforts on improvements in three areas: (1) increased content in methods courses, (2) improved instruction related to action research, and (3) revised course content in EDCI 4640.

Based on results from our student teaching evaluations, we found that some students were lacking in their content knowledge in at least one of their content areas. To address this, we have begun to suggest to methods course instructors to include more content in their courses. This means that in addition to the required 12 hours of content courses, our candidates would also receive additional content instruction in their methods courses during their final year in the program. We have seen slight improvement in content knowledge scores across the past two years and we hope to see continual improvement in years to come.

During the first two years of program reporting we utilized an action research rubric to analyze our candidate’s impact on student learning. Results indicated that we needed to provide more in-depth instruction on how to successfully conduct action research. Many students felt they did not understand the process entirely and we felt that this lack of understanding was negatively impacting our candidates’ ability to analyze their own impact on student learning as well as our ability to analyze candidates’ work in this area. Based on these results, we asked instructors in fall methods courses and instructors of EDCI 4640 in the spring to focus part of their curriculum on understanding and analyzing teacher action research. Most recently, during this current reporting period, we decided to measure our candidates’ impact on student learning through a different project (the Teacher Work Sample) as we felt this project more accurately captured their impact on student learning (see question #3 for more details on this project).

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

One of our goals for our BSE Middle Level Education candidates is that they are “effective educators who impact student learning.” For the first two years of the program we utilized a rubric from an action research project to assess students’ impact on student learning. While this assessment rubric proved to be a good measure in some cases (for example, when a candidate’s action research project focused on analyzing the impact of two different instructional approaches on student learning), it did not always directly inform us of our candidate’s abilities in this area (for example, when a candidate’s action research project focused on classroom management).

To address this issue, we decided to implement a different project and assessment system designed to measure our candidates’ impact on student learning. This new project – a Teacher Work Sample – asked candidates to develop and implement pre-assessments, lesson plans, and post assessments and analyze
results across individual students and groups of students. The associated rubric allowed us to look specifically at how our candidates’ planning and implementation of lessons impacted their students’ learning.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? Over the past 5 years our student learning outcomes have remained relatively stable. Our NCLEX pass rate has consistently been above the target mark. Our students show evidence of novice researchers and incorporate EBP into their care of patients. Students consistently respond that they are comfortable to care for clients incorporating knowledge of self, arts and sciences as evidenced by their comments on their end of program evaluation. What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? See #2 below. Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? As a result of the assessment process, the undergraduate nursing program was able to identify that the summer graduates were less successful on the NCLEX exam. The only real difference in their curriculum was that their capstone class, where more difficult case studies are opened and discussed, was offered in a shortened 7 week semester. There was no attendance policy, and there was only a midterm and final formal exam. After analysis during the assessment process, this summer offering was altered to mimic the intensity of the full fall and spring semesters. The course was increased to a 10 week offering, an attendance policy was put in place and enforced, and a third exam was added.

Another change we initiated as a result of the assessment process is the consequences of taking the end of program exam and the number of times the students take this exam. We noticed that often students did not do well on this exam. They could take it up to 3 times to try to do better, but no consequences if they never passed it. There was no real meat to it. They took this standardized exam, and then regardless of how they did, they graduated, no impact on a grade in any class, no impact on graduation process, nothing. Now, the grade the student receives on this standardized exam is correlated into a grade in the corresponding class. This standardized exam actually counts as an exam grade in the class. Better performance on the standardized exam is transposed into a higher test grade. Additionally, the students can attempt to improve their grade only once, (as opposed to 3 times prior.) If the student passes this test on the first attempt, (pass as determined by the faculty, is equal to 10% higher than the national average,) there is no need to retest. If the student does not pass on the first attempt, they are allowed 1 additional attempt. The grade they receive is based on their highest attempt.
3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)? In actuality, very little change has been made to the assessment process. This year, we are going to tie the assessment process closer to the accreditation process by CCNE, the nursing school’s accrediting body. We will change at this point in time to reinforce what we know we need to be assessing by CCNE. Prior to writing the accrediting report, we were just following what had been set up by the person responsible for this report before. Since writing the CCNE report, we know what we should be assessing, and now is the perfect time to tie these two reports. We will begin using the program outcome learning objectives as the assessment measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name: B.S. Nutrition/ Didactic Program in Dietetics (DPD)</th>
<th>Reporter: Barbara Hopkins, MMSc, RD, LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: June 26, 2013</td>
<td>Email:<a href="mailto:bhopkins@gsu.edu">bhopkins@gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

The procedures for evaluating achievement of learning outcomes for the three of the past five years included four methods:

1. **Comprehensive Exam.** Students took a comprehensive course examination in NUTR 4950 Senior Seminar, the capstone course.
2. **Capstone Project.**
   a. All majors assembled a portfolio composed of materials from their junior and senior level required courses. The portfolio requirement was discontinued in 2009.
   b. The portfolio was replaced with the research paper required for the second Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course – NUTR 4950.
3. **Exit Questionnaire.** Students completed a questionnaire (anonymously).
4. **Alumni Survey.** Alumni questionnaires at one year and three years post graduation were mailed. Information on employment, graduate education, value of DPD education for current position, credentialing as a registered and licensed dietitian, and professional development was collected.

The data collected using these methods provided valuable information; however, not all methods actually measured how the learning outcomes were achieved. After careful review of the measures, we surmised that the exit questionnaire and alumni survey measured student satisfaction and student perception on knowledge attained. In 2010, the DPD implemented the Learning Outcomes established by the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND) and changed the measures and targets. See question 3.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

As a result of the assessment process, the DPD curriculum was revised to:

   a. Incorporate the Nutrition Care Process (standardized model that guides practitioners in providing high quality nutrition care) into several courses in the DPD curriculum, including
Medical Nutrition Therapy I (NUTR 4200) and Medical Nutrition Therapy II (NUTR 4250).

b. Add a quantitative foods (HADM 3401/02) class by forming a partnership with the Hospitality Program in the School of Business.

c. Change Entrepreneurial Nutrition (NUTR 4990) from an elective course to a required course. This provides students the opportunity to create a business plan that includes a budget and a marketing plan.

d. Add a Nutrition Policy course – NUTR 4955. This course addresses public health policy and its approaches to healthy nutrition and physical activity promotion.

e. Add a basic nutrition course (NUTR 2100) as a requirement (Area F) to ensure students who enter junior year are familiar with nutrition terminology and basic nutrition recommendations.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

The DPD learning were developed in 2004 were revised in 2010 to reflect the learning outcomes required by the accreditation agency of the DPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004 Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>2010 Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communicate effectively.</td>
<td>1. Demonstrate how to locate, interpret, evaluate and use professional literature to make ethical evidence-based practice decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate an understanding of the influence of chemical, microbiological, and physiological disciplines as they affect food and nutrition.</td>
<td>2. Use current information technologies to locate and apply evidence-based guidelines and protocols, such as the ADA Evidence Analysis Library, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, National Guideline Clearinghouse Web sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrate psychological, social and economic aspects of the environment and examine how they individually and collectively affect food and nutrition.</td>
<td>3. Demonstrate effective and professional oral and written communication and documentation and use of current information technologies when communicating with individuals, groups and the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Utilize critical thinking skills in the interpretation and application of research methodologies.</td>
<td>4. Demonstrate assertiveness, advocacy and negotiation skills appropriate to the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrate an understanding of the science of food and food policy in promotion of a healthy lifestyle and pleasurable eating in diverse population groups.</td>
<td>5. Demonstrate counseling techniques to facilitate behavior change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate an understanding of the role of nutrients and food in human health, disease prevention, health promotion, and medical nutrition therapy.</td>
<td>6. Locate, understand and apply established guidelines to a professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Apply knowledge of management principles and systems in planning, monitoring, and evaluating dietetic services and practice and implementing of quality improvement programs.</td>
<td>7. Identify and describe the roles of others with whom the Registered Dietitian collaborates in the delivery of food and nutrition services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Describe the impact of laws, regulations, and costs on health care systems and food and nutrition programs.</td>
<td>8. Use the nutrition care process to make decisions, to identify nutrition-related problems and determine and evaluate nutrition interventions, including medical nutrition therapy, disease prevention and health promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Apply knowledge of the role of environment, food and lifestyle choices to develop interventions to affect change and enhance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wellness in diverse individuals and groups
10. Develop an educational session or program/educational strategy for a target population.
11. Apply management and business theories and principles to the development, marketing and delivery of programs or services.
12. Determine costs of services or operations prepare a budget and interpret financial data.
13. Apply the principles of human resource management to different situations.
14. Apply safety principles related to food, personnel and consumers.
15. Develop outcome measures, use informatics principles and technology to collect and analyze data for assessment and evaluate data to use in decision-making.
16. Explain the impact of a public policy position on dietetics practice.
17. Explain the impact of health care policy and administration, different health care delivery systems and current reimbursement issues, policies and regulations on food and nutrition services.

The DPD Assessment Process also included changes in measures and targets. The following table illuminates these changes.

**DPD Assessment Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Course (s)</th>
<th>Individuals Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline for Collecting Data</th>
<th>Timeline for Next Report (5 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate how to locate, interpret, evaluate and use professional literature to make ethical evidence-based practice decisions.</td>
<td>80% of students receive an average grade of 80% or better on the Annotated Bibliography assignment. 90% of students receive a proficient score (80%) on rubric for final draft of research paper.</td>
<td>NUTR 3010 NUTR 4950</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester Spring Semester</td>
<td>Years 1 and 3 Years 2 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to use current information technologies to locate and apply evidence-based guidelines and protocols, such as the ADA Evidence Analysis Library, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, National Guideline Clearinghouse Web sites.</td>
<td>80% students receive an average grade of 80% or better on literature review section of three case study assignments.</td>
<td>NUTR 4200 NUTR 4250</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate effective and professional oral and written communication and documentation and use of current information technologies when communicating with individuals, groups and the public.</td>
<td>85% of students receive 80% or better on grading rubric for recipe modification assignment.</td>
<td>NUTR 3160</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate assertiveness, advocacy and negotiation skills appropriate to the situation.</td>
<td>85% of the students receive at least 80% on the Debate Evaluation</td>
<td>NUTR 4400</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate counseling techniques to facilitate behavior change.</td>
<td>85% of the students receive at least 80% on rubric for Interviewing and Counseling Exercise</td>
<td>NUTR 4300</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to locate, understand and apply established guidelines to a professional practice scenario.</td>
<td>90% of the students receive 85% or better on a renal case study that addresses KDOQI guidelines for nutrition management of renal disease.</td>
<td>NUTR 4250</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to identify and describe the roles of others with whom the Registered Dietitian collaborates in the delivery of food and nutrition services.</td>
<td>95% of the students receive at least 25 points out of 30 on the Professional Profile Assignment</td>
<td>NUTR 3000</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to use the nutrition care process to make decisions, to identify nutrition-related problems and determine and evaluate nutrition interventions, including medical nutrition therapy, disease prevention and health promotion.</td>
<td>90% of the students receive at least an average of 80% on three case study assignments.</td>
<td>NUTR 4200</td>
<td>NUTR 3600</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to apply knowledge of the role of environment, food and lifestyle choices to develop interventions to affect change and enhance wellness in diverse individuals and groups.</td>
<td>90% of the students receive at least 160 points (out of 200) on the rubric for the Cultural Group Report/Teaching Session.</td>
<td>NUTR 4000</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Years 3 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to develop an educational session or program/educational strategy for a target population.</td>
<td>90% of the students receive 85 or greater on grading rubric for intervention project</td>
<td>NUTR 4400</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to apply management and business theories and principles to the development, marketing and delivery of programs or services.</td>
<td>90% of the students receive at least 85% or better on total possible participation points for class discussion on the marketing section of the management case study assignment.</td>
<td>NUTR 4600</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to determine costs of services or operations, prepare a budget and interpret financial data.</td>
<td>80% of students demonstrate proficiency in creating a budget for business plan by receiving at least 85% on the budget component of the business plan assignment.</td>
<td>NUTR 4990</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to apply the principles of human resource management to different situations</td>
<td>90% of the students receive at least 80% or better on the HR case study.</td>
<td>NUTR 4600</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to apply safety principles related to food, personnel and consumers.</td>
<td>100% of the students complete the Kitchen inspection assignment and 90% receive an average of 80% or better on the assignment.</td>
<td>NUTR 3150</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to develop outcome measures, use informatics principles and technology to collect and analyze data for assessment and evaluate data to use in decision-making.</td>
<td>100% students receive 80% or better on the simulated medical record (electronic charting) case study assignment.</td>
<td>NUTR 4250</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to explain the impact of a public policy position on dietetics practice.</td>
<td>90% of the students receive at least 80% on their critique of a current wellness policy.</td>
<td>NUTR 4955</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to explain the impact of health care policy and administration, different health care delivery systems and current reimbursement issues, policies and regulations on food and nutrition services</td>
<td>100% of the students receive at least 85% on their writing letter assignment to legislator or regulatory agency opposing or supporting nutrition related legislation or proposed regulations.</td>
<td>NUTR 4400</td>
<td>Course Instructor Program Director</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved?

Our learning outcomes over the past 5 years have been stable. The NBRC CRT (entry-level) and RRT (advanced practitioner) pass rates have been consistently above the national average and all students have earned the Advanced Practitioner credential by graduation. Our accrediting agency awarded the program “The Distinguished RRT Program Credential” which is a direct reflection of learning outcomes being achieved. Furthermore a student program resource survey, administered at the end of the year identifies program resources including learning resources, instructional support resources and clinical resources. Students consistently rated these areas of the program 4 or greater on a scale of 5.

What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

One change that was made addressed the communication skills of the student by the use of case study presentation. A new rubric was developed that allowed all faculty grading the student to be on the same page. Along with this change each faculty member is assigned a student to discuss the case study prior to student presentation. If the student does not meet with the faculty points are deducted from the case study. Student grades have been consistently higher. Student outcomes show doing the case study for the first time (spring semester of their first year) tend to have lower grades than students doing a case study in the summer and fall semester of that year. We will continue the 2011-2012 action plan.

Also we will discuss allowing students the option of resubmitting their case study after revising based on their graded rubric. Assigned faculty member will review the rubric and case study and upon resubmission the student's case study will be assigned a new grade which will be no more than half of the total points that are available.

Another change addressed clinical thinking skills associated with the NBRC Written Registry Examination in which the target was partially met concerning item III A on the exam that tested over maintaining records and communicating information to the patient. Our students were slightly lower than the national average. Eight mock written exams were made available that allows the student to test over specific areas of the written exam, in this case item IIIA. This area has been reviewed with the students and discussed concerning previous scores on the exam. The students are reminded that although there are few questions related to this specific content to review this section carefully. Overall our students pass rates are much higher than the national average. We will continue with the 2012-2013 action plan.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?
Students had indicated that they would like a course concerning end of life issues. After reviewing the curriculum we found that 1-3 hour course could be reduced to 2 hours and still have enough hours in the course to cover the material. A new 1 hour on line course, End of Life Issues, was developed.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

Very little change has occurred to the assessment process over the past 5 years. There are two areas where we partially met the target that has been addressed as stated above. We will continue to follow the action plan for each of these areas. Taking a closer look at the assessment process has helped identify areas of needed improvement and how important it is to tie the assessment process to our credentialing process. We will continue to tie the NBRC matrix to our outcomes and objectives and make necessary adjustments as needed.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

As shown in the chart below, most findings currently meet the 4.0 target. Based on student experiences and feedback, programming (either a self-paced or in-class course) will return as a requirement. This requirement was dropped from the CIS core in 2008-2009 based on similar analyses and solution development now appearing in the just added information-system-facilitated business process modeling course additions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 Identified User Requirements</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 Specified System Requirements</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 Developed Program Specifications</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 Used Object-Oriented Concepts</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 Developed Architecture</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6 Designed Programs</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7 Coded &amp; developed the designed programs</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 Appropriately used OO programming</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9 Designed user interface</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10 Appropriately used database concepts</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11 Appropriately used business process modeling</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

Please see the comments above regarding the return of a programming requirement. The current CIS curriculum will also return to requiring that no more than one additional CIS course may be taken with the CIS 4980 capstone course. This will ensure that students will have full benefit of the CIS curriculum when they engage in the capstone project.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?
CTW activities have been added to both CIS 4980 Capstone Student Development Projects and CIS 4970 Field Study in CIS. Related measures and findings are now reflected in the BBA CIS assessment. No other major changes have been made in the assessment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name: BBA-Finance / RCB</th>
<th>Reporter: Milind M Shrikhande</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: June 21, 2013</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:mshrikhande@gsu.edu">mshrikhande@gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

As seen within assessment reports over the last five years, the BBA-Finance student learning outcomes have been achieved satisfactorily and consistently. Overall, targets are consistently met over the review period indicating that the course-level, representative-question based assessment has ensured student learning. Further, these course-level, student learning outcomes have mapped well onto program level learning outcomes and program goals. For example, observing some unsatisfactory trends in percentile scores in ETS National Tests during the assessment process, the department communicated to instructors the need to emphasize quantitative skills and knowledge of allied business disciplines in the classroom. As a result, there is an increase in ETS percentile scores over the latest three assessment cycles indicating improvement in student learning outcomes.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

In response to students’ need for practical experience and applied skills a field-studies in finance course has been developed by several faculty members that offers internships under supervision of faculty and mentoring by senior managers at sponsoring organizations. This course has benefited several students over the last five years in furthering their work experience and applied skills, resulting in better job opportunities for these students. A new course in financial modeling has been introduced that builds analytical and software skills using Excel to solve financial problems that the finance industry values greatly. This course has been offered during the last two semesters. A portfolio practicum course is being developed for students who do active portfolio management for GSU as part of a students’ portfolio management group supervised by a faculty member in the finance department. The 7-year Academic Program Review by an external panel recommended we start an undergraduate honors program for advanced learning by the superior students within the program. Accordingly, the program is being initiated during the academic year 2013-2014.
3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)? The assessment process that was carefully thought out and implemented has been consistently providing good feedback on student learning outcomes providing clear guidance in course-level and program-level innovations and changes. One more course that is now being introduced at the undergraduate level from Fall 2013 onwards is Hedge funds, Mutual funds, and Trading strategies. Since the assessment process has worked successfully we have not felt the need to make any significant changes to the assessment process. Training of new instructors who have joined the assessment process is what we have largely focused on for effective implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name:  School of Hospitality</th>
<th>Reporter: Debby Cannon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: June 8, 2013</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:dfcannon@gsu.edu">dfcannon@gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

In reviewing the assessment reports for the last five years, student learning outcomes were achieved by a strong percentage of students typically over 90% of the hospitality majors sampled. The assessment process helped our program delineate not only clearer and higher level programmatic learning outcomes but also improved specific course learning outcomes. All of our syllabi now have the overall programmatic learning outcomes listed as well as specific course learning outcomes. Over the last five years, we have focused our learning outcomes on higher levels of the Bloom’s taxonomy incorporating more analytical skills and critical thinking opportunities.

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

The hospitality curriculum has been improved through course content changes based on the assessment process. The assessment process brought to light, as we were evaluating course objectives and level of these objectives, that knowledge of quantitative material was not being thoroughly integrated in all hospitality courses. The result was an unrealistic burden on two senior courses to cover basic to advanced quantitative financial analytical information.

The result has been to include quantitative material in every major hospitality course. The plan is now to expand from the major hospitality courses (those required) to all elective courses in making sure quantitative information and applications of this information is included. For example, “Perspectives of
the Hospitality Industry,” is typically one of the first required courses taken. In this course, a hotel CFO has been utilized as a guest lecturer in explaining financial data collected by hotels and how these data are analyzed and evaluated for decisions in operating hotels. Students then are questioned on how they would evaluate financial data and what operational decisions they would make. The CFO’s presentation was video taped so that all sections of this course have access to his presentation for consistency of content. Similar course content changes have been made in elective hospitality courses.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

Our programmatic goals and learning outcomes have become more focused over the past five years. For assessment purposes, we have learned to prioritize the learning outcomes and therefore our measures have been more targeted. For example, in 2008-2009 we had seven delineated goals and ten learning objectives. In 2011-2012, we had three programmatic goals and three learning objectives that were supported by every hospitality course. The clear delineation of three focused goals and supporting learning objectives has been important in working with our industry employers. These goals and learning objectives have also been positively accepted by our accrediting body, the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration. We continued the same approach in 2012-2013.

One of the three learning outcomes is: “Students will be able to apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results.” Starting fall 2012, our program was one of the first in the nation to offer an undergraduate certification to students in this area. The Certification in Hospitality Industry Analytics is offered by the American Hotel and Lodging Association and is based on a written examination that covers the application of operational and financial data from primarily the hotel segment. This measure will be incorporated into our assessment plan and will be offered to all senior hospitality majors.

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

1. We have seen significant improvement in measures of some aspects of learning. For example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Baseline Score (% meeting target)</th>
<th>2011-2012 Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Alternative Solutions</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Situation Analysis</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible, Supported Recommendations</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measures included in the table above are those that have remained consistent across several years of assessment.

2. **Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?**

Based on the results of our annual assessments we have made the following changes:

1. Instituted a new course, Marketing Metrics, as a requirement for completion of the BBA in Marketing.
2. As part of our curriculum review, we have encouraged instructors in all courses to include case analysis (for continued training in critical thinking).
3. Adopted the use of rubrics (mostly standardized, but partly customized per case) for grading case analyses in our capstone (Marketing Problems) course.
4. In Spring 2013, we made Marketing Metrics not only a required course, but also a prerequisite for enrolling in our capstone course.

3. **Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?**

   1. As noted above, we have adopted the use of rubrics for case analysis in the capstone course (which is used for assessment). We have also revised several outcomes and measures as we have learned more from each assessment period. For example, we now include measures of clear communication (written and oral), we now measure analytical skills more holistically (i.e. both qualitative and quantitative achievement) as opposed to separately.
1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Over the last five years there has been little change in learning outcomes. Many significant changes have been made in the curriculum with respect to course sequencing and content as a result of the results reported in the WEAVE assessment reports and the larger pool of data that is annually taken from the student exit exams. These changes were taken due to results from measurements of the learning outcomes that were not meeting goals.

Looking specifically at the skills measured and reported in WEAVE, over this time period we regularly observed a high level of variation in performance levels on general skills, i.e. not specifically associated with the student’s major in particular. These are skills in written and oral communications, team contributions and team leadership, and critical thinking. While a steady minority of students exceed on the measures, and a solid plurality are able to meet the level of competence, there remains a disappointingly large percentage of students that were below acceptable levels each year. Importantly, there was no real improvement in either of these percentages in most of the skills.

This static and significant percentage of students that are at low levels of skill is most disappointing. In reporting on skills we have begun to look carefully at skew and kurtosis, which gives us some insight into the skills’ distribution. Kurtosis is relatively flat compared to the steep peak that the rubric’s rating system would produce if a high percentage of students were meeting the standard. As explicitly mentioned in a few of the results reported in WEAVE, we often have a mean that is relatively close to the target, but because of the flatness of the distribution the assessment suggests that in fact a large number of students remain a significant distance from that goal. Those that are missing the goal are missing it by a wide margin in many cases.

Analysis of student patterns in attempting their business communications requirements was undertaken first. This analysis showed that a large number of students, most likely those weakest in communications skills, were delaying their Junior-core business communications class until their penultimate semester. (The class was a pre-requisite for the BBA program’s capstone course.) The Undergraduate Program Council and the Department Chairs agreed to identify a gateway class for each major—a class that would be taken at the start of a student’s elective-course sequence in the major. The practical result was that students needed to complete successfully their business communications course prior to entering their major sequence. This was put in place in 2011.

The data collected and reported in WEAVE show that there has been an improvement in two of the measures for written communications from the 2011-2012 to the 2012-2013 academic years. In the earlier academic year 72.3% of the students writing papers assessed were rated a 3.0 or higher. This
rose to over 81% in the later academic year. This comparison would have caught the first wave of students required to take this courses at the proper stage in their program. It also reflected the increased effectiveness of the new Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) program that was introduced university wide in 2008. Together students were receiving earlier and more regular feedback on written communications skills.

To control to some extent the impact of CTW, papers from CTW classes were used in both years’ assessments. These same CTW papers were also assessed to measure the students’ analytical skills, also a learning outcome with below target scores. While the scores on this measure improved over the same period, they remained will below the target percentage and only showed a percentile improvement of about half that shown in written communications.

Stronger evidence of this course sequencing change on writing skills will be shown if subsequent year’s results continue to show improvement. The College, however, is moving further to address these and the other low scores on key learning outcomes in a more dramatic way starting in the 2013-2014 AY. The college’s first-ever Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs was appointed effective August 1st, 2013. He has indicated that he will emphasize the college’s stated goal in its strategic plan of a truly networked curriculum. This will require a complete integration of the college’s sophomore foundation, junior core and its capstone senior courses. The skills emphasized in each of the college’s learning outcomes will be required elements within each course and the skill development for each outcome will be coordinated across courses.

A second conclusion that was drawn from the assessment results was that prior efforts to revise the business communications course, to introduce core leadership and team skill material, and to encourage more team-based activity in the curriculum seem to be having little impact. Here the concern was that the skills were not being reinforced across the curriculum in subsequent courses. A contrast was made here to the critical thinking traits. These did seem to make steady annual gains. Here the university’s CTW initiative, and the adoption of critical thinking requirements for all undergraduate classes by some departments, are likely causes of the differences in results.

Going forward with the program redesign that is briefly outlined in the Action Plan

2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

For the last eighteen years the college has administered a standardized exit exam to students during their capstone course. In the past this has revealed weakness that the college has addressed in areas such as international business. Two persistent subject matter areas where students in many of the majors scored significantly below the levels exhibited in other areas was in accounting and economics. Over the years the college has worked with the economics faculty, located in a different college, and the accounting faculty to improve these results. The results have been disappointing.
In the last five years data analysis by the University showed a problem that turned out to be related. Students who were not able to complete their degrees in a timely manner, or at all, were analyzed with respect to their performance in foundation classes. These students were showing very weak performance in these areas. Some needed multiple attempts to pass introduction accounting classes with a minimum acceptable grade. They entered the college with dangerously low GPAs as a result and with very weak skills in these areas. This contributed to the students becoming “stuck” in the BBA program. They were unable to complete more demanding courses and/or unable to secure a sufficiently high GPA for graduation.

Clearly, these students that were entering the junior core with weak to very-weak skills in accounting and economics never developed those skills further, although they are required to apply them on an increasingly sophisticated level as they progress through the program. Thus, one of the actions taken in the last three years was to change the entry requirements for the BBA program’s junior core. These requirements go in full force in the fall semester of 2013.

Students will have to produce a B-level GPA (3.0/4.0) in their six Area F courses if they wish to register for junior-level core course. This will go along with the requirement of a minimum grade of “C-“ in each of those classes, which had been place in the catalog a few years earlier. In addition to the B average in Area F, the students will be limited to two attempts at each Area F class while at GSU. So, for example, if a student twice takes Accounting 2001 and fails to reach C- level in their work, they will not be allowed to repeat the course a third time at GSU. The goal here is to assure that students have adequate skills to both understand the material in the junior core and to serve as a foundation for further skill development. Students who are not able to satisfy these requirements can be redirected earlier to better academic fits elsewhere in the university.

The impact of this program will be seen in the graduation rates and time-to-graduation measures in future years. These are not learning outcomes, however there is the anticipation that the redirecting of students who would struggle in the college toward more rewarding academic trajectories will result in some positive impact on the scores in all if the learning outcomes for the BBA.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

In the last five years there has been a significant “maturity” to the processes the RCB has used. In the 2009-2010 cycle there was a high level of frustration about what we were learning from our reported findings. Feedback from the findings to the Undergraduate Program Council and Undergraduate Steering Committee was not helpful in terms of allowing either body to understand where or how to act to address specific problems. Some areas, such as the written communications issues discussed above, did provide some adequate feedback and motivated the changes reported. However, in other areas less helpful data was accompanied by concerns that he correct items were being measured in assessing the outcomes.
In the 2010-2011 cycle many of the assessments were not done. Most of the effort that year went into identifying the specific component skills that need to be assessed and redrafting rubrics to better measure the learning outcomes. In the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 cycles these revised rubrics provided some more helpful results. As mentioned above, for example, added analysis of skew and kurtosis has given better insight into the patterns of performance among the students that are not achieving the desired skill level.

The networked curriculum ideas mentioned above will require a further enrichment of the assessment process. Once these changes are in place assessment of the skills general to all BBAs will likely take place on the sophomore and junior levels as well as the senior level. With those measures we will be able to identify the degree of change being affected by activities on each level. With those results we should be able to more precisely target changes in courses and even specific assignments in response to below target performance.

The overall plan of the Assistant Dean for Academic Programs is to complete the program restructuring, and have all students matriculating through the revised program, by the fall of 2018. If this is achieved, assessment findings should indicate results in the 2018-2019 academic year reports in WEAVE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name: BBA Real Estate</th>
<th>Reporter: Karen Gibler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: June 4, 2013</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:kgibler@gsu.edu">kgibler@gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Over the past five years, to what extent have your program’s student learning outcomes been achieved? What improvements in student learning can be attributed to changes you have made as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process? Please provide supporting evidence and specific examples where possible.

Most of the program’s students learning outcomes have been achieved on a regular basis as measured by examination questions and written projects in required major courses. On occasion, the measures indicated that a satisfactory percentage of the students in a course did not meet the minimum standard on individual objectives. In some cases, the failure is attributed to the specific measure used rather than student learning (such as when students performed poorly on one exam question, but well overall on the exam). In another case, the instructor is reconsidering the emphasis on quantitative versus conceptual content in the course if he is assigned to teach it again. We can attribute the instructor’s review of his course content to help student’s score better on the assessment of that learning outcome to the assessment process.
2. Over the past five years, what improvements have been made in the educational program (e.g., revised curriculum, adding/dropping courses, revising course content, etc.) as a result of what you have learned from the assessment process?

The changes in the curriculum in recent years have been in response to college requirements to add prerequisites to ensure students follow the recommended sequence of core courses, a new course to add the second major CTW requirement, and change in CTW designated course to reduce requests for exceptions and prevent graduation delay. None of these have resulted from what we have learned from the assessment process.

3. Over the past five years, what significant changes have been made in the assessment process (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.)?

I know the assessment process was changed in terms of the measures and targets. We used to report the percentage of students in a course who achieved an acceptable score on a measure compared to a target percentage. Based on feedback, it was changed to a 3-point scale from fails to meet to exceeds minimum standard and the student average reported compared to a target average. Paul created a framework with more specific measures and criteria along with descriptions of what constitutes failing to meet, meeting, or exceeding the standard of 2.0. Then based on different feedback, the percentage who achieve the minimum standard is now reported again much like the earlier percentage achieving an acceptable score.