**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Bachelors of Business Administration, Accountancy Major is to provide the technical and analytical accounting knowledge to become a professional in accounting and to pursue a fifth (graduate) year of professional study.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Technical Accounting Knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22)**

Students demonstrate technical accounting knowledge and skills in financial accounting, auditing, accounting information systems, taxation, and managerial accounting.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 2: Analytical Accounting Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22)**

Students demonstrate analytical accounting skills in financial accounting, auditing, accounting information systems, taxation, and managerial accounting.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Acct 2102: Develop accounting information (O: 1, 2)**

Acct 2102: Translate activities related to business processes into accounting information reflected in the accounting information system.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

65% of students need to correctly answer exam questions related to this measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: **Met**

On average, 68% of the students correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

65% of students need to correctly answer exam questions related to this measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: **Met**

On average, 68% of the students correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure.

**M 2: Acct 2102: Solve operating problems of a business (O: 1, 2)**

Acct 2102: Solve operating problems by identifying relevant information from the accounting system and using appropriate tools.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

65% of students need to correctly answer exam questions related to this measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

On average, 62% of the students correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

65% of students need to correctly answer exam questions related to this measure.
65% of students need to correctly answer exam questions related to this measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
On average, 62% of the students correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure.

**M 3: Acct 2102: Document accounting usefulness (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 2102: Document the usefulness of accounting information to stakeholders making business decisions. Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
65% of students need to correctly answer exam questions related to this measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
On average, 73% of the students correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
65% of students need to correctly answer exam questions related to this measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
On average, 73% of the students correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure.

**M 4: Acct 2101: Interpret financial transaction effects (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 2101: Interpret the financial impact of transactions, including revenue recognition and capitalization; complete steps in the accounting cycle. Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A mean score of 90% on quizzes and exams.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A mean score of 90% on quizzes and exams.

**M 5: Acct 2101: Perform basic accounting calculations (O: 1)**
Acct 2101: Perform basic calculations for allowance accounts, inventory costing, and depreciation of fixed assets. Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A mean score of 84% on quizzes and exams.

**M 6: Acct 2101: Prepare financial statements (O: 1)**

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A mean score of 84% on quizzes and exams.

**M 7: Acct 4210: Develop performance measures (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4210: Develop appropriate financial and non-financial performance measures for effective planning, evaluation, and control of organizations’ business processes. Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A mean score of 79% on quizzes and exams.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</th>
<th>A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>A mean score of 79% on quizzes and exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Acct 4210: Evaluate alternative costing systems (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4210: Evaluate the appropriateness of alternative costing systems and methods by considering the unique context of specific product and service organizations.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</th>
<th>A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>A mean score of 77% on quizzes and exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</th>
<th>A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>A mean score of 77% on quizzes and exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: Acct 4210: Structure and model business problems (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4210: Structure and model business problems to evaluate alternatives, conduct sensitivity analysis on assumptions, and analyze outcomes to determine causes of variances.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</th>
<th>A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>A mean score of 78% on quizzes and exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</th>
<th>A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>A mean score of 78% on quizzes and exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 10: Acct 4310: Query databases (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4310: Query databases to provide insights about business operations and performance.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</th>
<th>Existing norm for set 1 (Warranty Call Center case)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>Students met the established norm on set 1. Performance on a new set (BloomScape case) was below the target performance, mainly due to students’ difficulty in making sense of ambiguous business situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</th>
<th>Existing norm for set 1 (Warranty Call Center case)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>Students met the established norm on set 1. Performance on a new set (BloomScape case) was below the target performance, mainly due to students’ difficulty in making sense of ambiguous business situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 11: Acct 4310: Design business processes (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4310: Design business processes, represent them with documentation tools, and use the representations to make inferences about business processes.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</th>
<th>Mean score of 80% on questions on a new business process case (24-Seven)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>Students met the established norm on set 1. Performance on a new set (BloomScape case) was below the target performance, mainly due to students’ difficulty in making sense of ambiguous business situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students performed below the target level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 80% on questions on a new business process case (24-Seven)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students performed below the target level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Acct 4310: Design and implement databases (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct 4310: Design and implement well-structured databases to enable business processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 80% on questions on a new business process case (BloomScape).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students performed below the target level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 80% on questions on a new business process case (BloomScape).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students performed below the target level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Acct 4310: Evaluate internal control (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct 4310: Evaluate internal control in information systems and design controls to mitigate risks associated with information systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing norm for the X-Oil case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students performed at the target level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing norm for the X-Oil case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students performed at the target level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: Acct 4510: Identify tax issues (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct 4510: Identify tax issues in unique fact patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

A mean score of 70% on exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

A mean score of 70% on exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Acct 4510: Select and apply tax laws (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct 4510: Select and apply appropriate tax laws to unique fact patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

A mean score of 68% on exams.
**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
A mean score of 68% on exams.

**M 16: Acct 4510: Apply tax law to investment decisions (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4510: Make investment decisions requiring knowledge of the tax law and its effect
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
A mean score of 63% on exams.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
A mean score of 63% on exams.

**M 17: Acct 4110: Prepare a financial reporting system (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4110: Prepare a complete financial reporting system for investors and creditors using professional standards and judgment.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A mean score of 78% on exams.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A mean score of 78% on exams.

**M 18: Acct 4110: Develop accounting methods (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4110: Apply accounting theory, professional standards and judgment to develop accounting methods for new situations.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A score of at least 75% on case assignments.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The average score on student group assignments pertaining to this measure was 81%.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A score of at least 75% on case assignments.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The average score on student group assignments pertaining to this measure was 81%.

**M 19: Acct 4110: Make decisions using financial info. (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4110: Make financing, investment and operating decisions using financial accounting information.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The mean score on exam questions pertaining to this measure was 79%.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The means score on exam questions pertaining to this measure was 79%.

### M 20: Acct 4610: Propose and develop assurance services (O: 1, 2)
Acct 4610: Identify control deficiencies and make recommendations to improve those deficiencies for a hypothetical client
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A score of 75% or better for each team on a team project

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All the teams received a score of 75% or better on the project

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A score of 75% or better for each team on a team project

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All the teams received a score of 75% or better on the project

### M 21: Acct 4610: Apply the opinion formulation process (O: 1, 2)
Acct 4610: Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
An average score of at least 75% on final exam questions

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
An average score of 94% on final exam questions

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
An average score of at least 75% on final exam questions

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
An average score of 94% on final exam questions

### M 22: Acct 4610: Use assurance electronic resources (O: 1, 2)
Acct 4610: Identify and use appropriate electronic and other resources in proposing and developing assurance services and applying the opinion formulation process
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A score of 75% or better on a team case presentation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All teams scored 76% or better on the team case presentation

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A score of 75% or better on a team case presentation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All teams scored 76% or better on the team case presentation

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Focused practice for unstructured business process
Give students focused practice in identifying and representing business processes in unstructured situations

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Acct 4310: Design business processes | **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faye Borthick

#### Improve perf. - investm. decisions using tax law
Lecture notes pertaining to them will be refined, the numerical problems discussed in class will be changed, and more class time will
be spent on this learning objective

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Acct 4510: Apply tax law to investment decisions | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Fenn

Improve performance - Select and apply tax laws
Lecture notes pertaining to them will be refined, the numerical problems discussed in class will be changed, and more class time will be spent on this learning objective

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Acct 4510: Select and apply tax laws | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Fenn

More guidance - database design and implementation
For business process cases, give students more guidance in designing and implementing databases

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Acct 4310: Design and implement databases | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Faye Borthick

More time spent - business operating problems
The class schedule will be reworked to devote more class time to solving operating problems of a business. PowerPoint slides will be refined and homework problems adjusted to more extensively cover this area. Peer counseling for weak students.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Acct 2102: Solve operating problems of a business | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark
Additional Resources: Resources for peer counseling. Grant has been applied for and received from Provost’s Retention Plan funds.

Students learn to interpret ambiguous situations
Ensure that students learn how to make sense of ambiguous business situations before attempting to query databases concerning them

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Acct 4310: Query databases | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Faye Borthick

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The strengths of the accounting program seem to be in the financial and auditing areas. Principles of accounting, accounting information systems and taxes are areas that need further attention. When business situations are ambiguous, some students give up too easily. Some students tend to cease looking for process relationships too soon in complex, unstructured materials and neglect to integrate relationships across multiple sources. Some students have difficulty with designing databases for novel settings that they have not previously studied. Although students achieved at the target level, some students have difficulty evaluating internal control in highly automated business situations. In Principles of Accounting students tend to view accounting as a mechanical process of recording transactions. They have difficulty understanding how accounting data can solve the operating problems of a business. While students are good at learning the tax law they have difficulty applying the tax law.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued...
The business situations will need to be staged in ways that engage students long enough for them to succeed. Students will need focused practice in identifying and integrating process relationships in complex, unstructured business situations in order for them to succeed. Students will need to learn to design databases for new situations analogous to those they will encounter on the job. A new case for assessment that incorporates more automated internal control will be needed some time in the future. A continuous focus in each class throughout the semester in Principles of Accounting on how accounting data can solve business problems. An increased focus on applying the tax laws.
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**Mission / Purpose**

RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION: To enhance social well being by developing knowledge and providing education in risk and its management. RMI DEPARTMENT VISION: To be the world’s leader in risk management scholarship and education. Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the selection and design of individual, organizational, and societal strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory (M: 1, 2, 3, 8)**

BBA-AS graduates will demonstrate the technical mastery of life contingencies and risk theory. Under the 2005 actuarial exam structure, the graduate will demonstrate a mastery of actuarial modeling techniques.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 2: Success on professional exams**

Pass rates on professional actuarial science exams C, MLC, and MFE for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8)**

BBA-AS graduates will be able to comprehend the theoretical and technical material in appropriate actuarial journals.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 5: Structure and solve problems (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

BBA-AS graduates will be able to structure and solve actuarial and related business problems with sound analytical techniques.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 4: Relevance to employers (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Employers find the program relevant to their needs.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: AS 4340 Life Contingencies Course (O: 1, 3, 5)

Evaluation of student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course will be completed each May for the prior academic year.

**Target for O1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory**

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the Life Contingencies Course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director reports student performance to be satisfactory in AS 4340, in terms of all class assignments and exams.

**Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials**

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the Life Contingencies Course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director reports student performance to be satisfactory in AS 4340, in terms of all class assignments and exams.

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the Life Contingencies Course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director reports student performance to be satisfactory in AS 4340, in terms of all class assignments and exams.

#### M 2: Graduating Student Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to graduating students (administered as an in-class survey in AS 4340 Life Contingencies). The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for change. This section of the survey asks graduating students to rate the AS program, in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple core business knowledge/skill areas.

**Target for O1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory**

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple core business knowledge/skill areas.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS program above average overall in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business (mean = 3.47 on a 5-point scale). Some core business knowledge/skill areas were rated below average, including computer proficiency, written communication, oral communication, and management of technology. >>survey results

**Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials**

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple core business knowledge/skill areas.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS program above average overall in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business (mean = 3.47 on a 5-point scale). Some core business knowledge/skill areas were rated below average, including computer proficiency, written communication, oral communication, and management of technology. >>survey results

**Target for O4: Relevance to employers**

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business,
Graduating students rated the AS program above average overall in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business (mean = 3.47 on a 5-point scale). Some core business knowledge/skill areas were rated below average, including computer proficiency, written communication, oral communication, and management of technology. 

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple core business knowledge/skill areas.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS program above average overall in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business (mean = 3.47 on a 5-point scale). Some core business knowledge/skill areas were rated below average, including computer proficiency, written communication, oral communication, and management of technology. 

**M 3: Graduating Student Survey - AS Related Knowledge (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to graduating students (administered as an in-class survey in AS 4340 Life Contingencies). The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for change. This section of the survey asks graduating students to rate the AS program, in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of AS related knowledge.

**Target for O1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory**

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS program above average overall in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business (mean = 3.60 on a 5-point scale). Only the "computer skills" area was rated below average.

**Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials**

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS program above average overall in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business (mean = 3.60 on a 5-point scale). Only the "computer skills" area was rated below average.

**Target for O4: Relevance to employers**

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS program above average overall in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business (mean = 3.60 on a 5-point scale). Only the "computer skills" area was rated below average.

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS program above average overall in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business (mean = 3.60 on a 5-point scale). Only the "computer skills" area was rated below average.

**M 4: Graduating Student Survey - Program Services (O: 3, 4, 5)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to graduating students (administered as an in-class survey in AS 4340 Life Contingencies). The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for change. This section of the survey asks graduating students to rate the AS program, in terms of program services across college, university, and department levels.

**Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials**

Graduating students will rate AS program services (at the department, college, and university levels) as above average or high.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Graduating students rated AS program services above average overall (mean = 3.56 on a 5-point scale). 

While "alumni networking" (mean = 3.0) and "computer" services (mean = 3.21) were rated the lowest at the department and college/university level, respectively, both scores were above average.
### Target for O4: Relevance to employers
Graduating students will rate AS program services (at the department, college, and university levels) as above average or high.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students rated AS program services above average overall (mean = 3.56 on a 5-point scale) >> survey results. While "alumni networking" (mean = 3.0) and "computer" services (mean = 3.21) were rated the lowest at the department and college/university level, respectively, both scores were above average.

### Target for O5: Structure and solve problems
Graduating students will rate AS program services (at the department, college, and university levels) as above average or high.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students rated AS program services above average overall (mean = 3.56 on a 5-point scale) >> survey results. While "alumni networking" (mean = 3.0) and "computer" services (mean = 3.21) were rated the lowest at the department and college/university level, respectively, both scores were above average.

### M 5: Alumni Survey - Career Competence (O: 3, 4, 5)
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni, one and two years removed from graduation. The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for change. This section of the survey asks alumni to rate the AS program, in terms of the extent to which the program contributed to career competence, across multiple areas of knowledge.

### Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials
Alumni will report satisfaction (on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni were satisfied (mean = 3.56 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas (survey results).

### Target for O4: Relevance to employers
Alumni will report satisfaction (on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni were satisfied (mean = 3.56 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas (survey results).

### Target for O5: Structure and solve problems
Alumni will report satisfaction (on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni were satisfied (mean = 3.56 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas (survey results).

### M 6: Alumni Survey - Professional Exams (O: 3, 4, 5)
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni, one and two years removed from graduation. The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for change. This section of the survey asks alumni to rate the extent to which the program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams.

### Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials
Alumni will report satisfaction (on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni are satisfied with the extent to which the actuarial science program program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams (mean = 3.67 on a 5-point scale). >> survey results

### Target for O4: Relevance to employers
Alumni will report satisfaction (on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni are satisfied with the extent to which the actuarial science program program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams (mean = 3.67 on a 5-point scale). >> survey results
**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**

Alumni will report satisfaction (on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Alumni are satisfied with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams (mean = 3.67 on a 5-point scale). >>survey results

**M 7: Biennial Industry Panel (O: 4, 5)**

An industry panel will be convened that includes representation from four major areas of actuarial practice: life & health insurance, employee benefit consulting, property/casualty insurance, and finance & risk management. Accordingly, the panel will include a minimum of four members. The Panel will meet once every two years. Their agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the Actuarial Science Program to actuarial education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development.

**Target for O4: Relevance to employers**

Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions with their firms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

The Industry Panel will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair taking place in September 2006.

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**

Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions with their firms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

The Industry Panel will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair taking place in September 2006.

**M 8: Scores on Professional Exams (O: 1, 3, 5)**

Every year, the Program Director will obtain exam pass rates of Georgia State students from the Society of Actuaries. The percentage of our students passing exams C, MLC, and MFE will be compared to the national averages to assess the technical mastery of life contingencies, risk theory, and financial economics. The professional exam structure was changed for the current academic year. The content of Exam C changed slightly, while exam M was replaced by two separate exams: MLC and MFE. Because national averages are not available until July or August, we cannot report findings for this assessment period.

**Target for O1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory**

Exam pass rates of Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national average.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Pass rates for Society of Actuaries Exams M and C were obtained for the past academic year. The pass rates for Georgia State University students for Exams M and C were 65% and 78%, respectively. These marks are very high when compared to the national passing rates of 47% (M) and 55% (C) for the same period. >>results

**Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials**

Exam pass rates of Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national average.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Pass rates for Society of Actuaries Exams M and C were obtained for the past academic year. The pass rates for Georgia State University students for Exams M and C were 65% and 78%, respectively. These marks are very high when compared to the national passing rates of 47% (M) and 55% (C) for the same period. >>results

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**

Exam pass rates of Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national average.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Pass rates for Society of Actuaries Exams M and C were obtained for the past academic year. The pass rates for Georgia State University students for Exams M and C were 65% and 78%, respectively. These marks are very high when compared to the national passing rates of 47% (M) and 55% (C) for the same period. >>results

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Create Industry Panel**

Create an Industry Panel that includes representatives of the four major areas of actuarial practice: life & health insurance, employee benefit consulting, property/casualty insurance, and finance & risk management. Accordingly, the panel will include a minimum of four members. The Panel will meet once every two years, starting in the fall of 2006. Its agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the Actuarial Science Program to actuarial education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development.

*Established in Cycle: 2005-2006*

*Implementation Status: Planned*
Revision of AS 4350 content
Revise the content of AS 4350 to include more Excel-based assignments, include more case studies, and require at least one written report and oral presentation.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduating Student Survey - AS Related Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials
| Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory | Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems
Measure: Graduating Student Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials
| Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory | Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems

Implementation Description: Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 semesters
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The BBA-AS Program has attracted an increased number of students choosing this major. The students are generally pleased with the revised course offerings that have added financial risk modeling components to the curriculum. The students have demonstrated successes in passing professional actuarial exams and in finding well-paying actuarial jobs upon graduation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
There is a need for further strengthening written and oral communication skills and computer skills across the BBA-AS curriculum. We would also like to work more closely with the Robinson College’s Career Services personnel, through the department’s new Director of Student and External Affairs, to increase our student’s placement and internship opportunities.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Actuarial Science MAS
As of: 12/13/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION: To enhance social well being by developing knowledge and providing education in risk and its management. RMI DEPARTMENT VISION: To be the world’s leader in risk management scholarship and education. Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the selection and design of individual, organizational, and societal strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory (M: 10, 12)
The MAS graduate will demonstrate the technical mastery of life contingencies and risk theory. Under the 2005 actuarial exam structure, the graduate will demonstrate a mastery of actuarial modeling techniques.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 2: Success on professional exams (M: 10)
Pass rates on professional actuarial science exams C, MLC, and MFE for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials (M: 10, 11, 12)**
The MAS graduate will be able to comprehend the theoretical and technical material in appropriate actuarial journals.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 4: Explanation of technical concepts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11)**
The MAS graduate will be able to explain technical concepts to non-actuarial associates or clients.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 5: Structure and solve problems (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**
The MAS graduate will be able to structure and solve actuarial and related business problems with sound analytical techniques.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 6: Relevance to employers (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**
Employers find the program relevant to their needs.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.4 External Relations
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Biennial Industry Panel (O: 4, 5, 6)**

An industry panel will be convened that includes representation from four major areas of actuarial practice: life & health insurance, employee benefit consulting, property/casualty insurance, and finance & risk management. Accordingly, the panel will include a minimum of four members. The Panel will meet once every two years. Their agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the Actuarial Science Program to actuarial education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development.

**Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts**
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into high level positions/internships within their firms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
The Industry Panel will not meet until the Fall 2006 semester.

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into high level positions/internships within their firms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
The Industry Panel will not meet until the Fall 2006 semester.

**Target for O6: Relevance to employers**
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into high level positions/internships within their firms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
The Industry Panel will not meet until the Fall 2006 semester.

**M 2: Graduating Student Survey - AS Competency (O: 4, 5, 6)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire/survey will be administered to graduating students (administered as an in-class survey in AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar). The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. This section specifically measures a particular AS course’s contribution to a graduating student’s competency in actuarial science.

**Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts**
Graduating students will be satisfied (average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.42) with the extent to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency. [>>survey results]

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**
Graduating students will be satisfied (average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.42) with the extent to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency. [>>survey results]

**Target for O6: Relevance to employers**
Graduating students will be satisfied (average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.42) with the extent to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency. [>>survey results]

**M 3: Graduating Student Survey - Career Preparation (O: 4, 5, 6)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire/survey will be administered to graduating students (administered as an in-class survey in AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar). The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. This section specifically measures a graduating student’s overall career preparation.

**Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts**
Graduating students will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Graduating students report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall career preparation and enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>survey results

Target for O5: Structure and solve problems
Graduating students will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall career preparation and enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>survey results

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Graduating students report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall career preparation and enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>survey results

Target for O6: Relevance to employers
Graduating students will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall career preparation and enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>survey results

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Graduating students report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall career preparation and enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>survey results

M 4: Graduating Student Survey - Program Attributes (O: 4, 5, 6)
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire/survey will be administered to graduating students (administered as an in-class survey in AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar). The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. This section specifically measures a graduating student’s level of satisfaction with multiple attributes of the program.

Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts
Graduating students will report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across multiple attributes of the program.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students were generally satisfied with the program (mean = 3.51). Several program attributes, however, fell below average: enhancement of written communication skills, enhancement of oral communication skills, coverage of international topics, and use of cases. >>survey results

Target for O5: Structure and solve problems
Graduating students will report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across multiple attributes of the program.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students were generally satisfied with the program (mean = 3.51). Several program attributes, however, fell below average: enhancement of written communication skills, enhancement of oral communication skills, coverage of international topics, and use of cases. >>survey results

Target for O6: Relevance to employers
Graduating students will report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across multiple attributes of the program.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students were generally satisfied with the program (mean = 3.51). Several program attributes, however, fell below average: enhancement of written communication skills, enhancement of oral communication skills, coverage of international topics, and use of cases. >>survey results

M 5: Graduating Student Survey - Program Changes (O: 4, 5, 6)
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire/survey will be administered to graduating students (administered as an in-class survey in AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar). The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. This section specifically measures a graduating student’s opinion regarding possible changes to the MAS program.

Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts
Graduating students will rate several suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top-rated 2 or 3 suggested changes will be considered for implementation.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The highest rated suggested changes to the program were (1) additional emphasis on job placement, (2) increase non-class activities, and (3) activities for alumni. >>survey results

Target for O5: Structure and solve problems
Graduating students will rate several suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top-rated 2 or 3 suggested changes will be considered for implementation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The highest rated suggested changes to the program were (1) additional emphasis on job placement, (2) increase non-class activities, and (3) activities for alumni. >>survey results

**Target for O6: Relevance to employers**
Graduating students will rate several suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top-rated 2 or 3 suggested changes will be considered for implementation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The highest rated suggested changes to the program were (1) additional emphasis on job placement, (2) increase non-class activities, and (3) activities for alumni. >>survey results

**M 6: Alumni Student Survey - AS Competency (O: 4, 5, 6)**
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire will be administered to alumni, one and two years removed from graduation. The questions will survey alumni attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. This section specifically measures a particular course's contribution to an alumnus’s competency in actuarial science.

**Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts**
Alumni will be satisfied (average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.19) with the extent to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency. >>survey results

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**
Alumni will be satisfied (average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.19) with the extent to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency. >>survey results

**Target for O6: Relevance to employers**
Alumni will be satisfied (average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.19) with the extent to which AS courses contributed to their actuarial science competency. >>survey results

**M 7: Alumni Student Survey - Career Preparation (O: 4, 5, 6)**
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire will be administered to alumni, one and two years removed from graduation. The questions will survey alumni attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. This section specifically measures an alumnus’s overall career preparation.

**Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts**
Alumni will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall career preparation and enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni report a high level of satisfaction with the overall career preparation (mean = 4.25) and enhancement of career opportunities (mean = 4.25) provided by the program. >>survey results

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**
Alumni will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall career preparation and enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Alumni report a high level of satisfaction with the overall career preparation (mean = 4.25) and enhancement of career opportunities (mean = 4.25) provided by the program. >>survey results

**Target for O6: Relevance to employers**
Alumni will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the overall career preparation and enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Alumni report a high level of satisfaction with the overall career preparation (mean = 4.25) and enhancement of career opportunities (mean = 4.25) provided by the program. >>survey results

### M 8: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes (O: 4, 5, 6)
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire will be administered to alumni, two and three years removed from graduation. The questions will survey alumni attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. This section specifically measures an alumni’s level of satisfaction with multiple attributes of the program.

**Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts**
Alumni will report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across multiple attributes of the program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Alumni were generally satisfied with the program (mean = 3.33). Several program attributes, however, fell below average: enhancement of oral communication skills and use of cases. >>survey results

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**
Alumni will report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across multiple attributes of the program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Alumni were generally satisfied with the program (mean = 3.33). Several program attributes, however, fell below average: enhancement of oral communication skills and use of cases. >>survey results

**Target for O6: Relevance to employers**
Alumni will report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across multiple attributes of the program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Alumni were generally satisfied with the program (mean = 3.33). Several program attributes, however, fell below average: enhancement of oral communication skills and use of cases. >>survey results

### M 9: Alumni Survey - Program Changes (O: 4, 5, 6)
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire will be administered to alumni, two and three years removed from graduation. The questions will survey alumni attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. This section specifically measures an alumni’s opinion regarding possible changes to the MAS program.

**Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts**
Alumni will rate several suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top-rated 2 or 3 changes will be considered for implementation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The highest rated suggested changes to the program were (1) additional emphasis on job placement, and (2) activities for alumni. >>survey results

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**
Alumni will rate several suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top-rated 2 or 3 changes will be considered for implementation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The highest rated suggested changes to the program were (1) additional emphasis on job placement, and (2) activities for alumni. >>survey results

**Target for O6: Relevance to employers**
Alumni will rate several suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top-rated 2 or 3 changes will be considered for implementation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The highest rated suggested changes to the program were (1) additional emphasis on job placement, and (2) activities for alumni. >>survey results

### M 10: Scores on Professional Exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)
Every year, the Program Director will obtain exam pass rates of Georgia State students from the Society of Actuaries. The percentage of our students passing exams C, MLC, and MFE will be compared to the national averages to assess the technical mastery of life contingencies, risk theory, and financial economics. Another appropriate measurable indicator of GSU student success on professional examinations is the job placement ratio of GSU students compared with that of other peer institutions.

**Target for O1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory**
Exam pass rates for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national average.
Pass rates for Society of Actuaries Exams M and C were obtained for the past academic year. The pass rates for Georgia State University students for Exams M and C were 65% and 78%, respectively. These marks are very high when compared to the national passing rates of 47% (M) and 55% (C) for the same period.

Target for **O2**: Success on professional exams

Exam pass rates for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national average.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Pass rates for Society of Actuaries Exams M and C were obtained for the past academic year. The pass rates for Georgia State University students for Exams M and C were 65% and 78%, respectively. These marks are very high when compared to the national passing rates of 47% (M) and 55% (C) for the same period.

Target for **O3**: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials

Exam pass rates for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national average.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Pass rates for Society of Actuaries Exams M and C were obtained for the past academic year. The pass rates for Georgia State University students for Exams M and C were 65% and 78%, respectively. These marks are very high when compared to the national passing rates of 47% (M) and 55% (C) for the same period.

Target for **O5**: Structure and solve problems

Exam pass rates for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national average.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Pass rates for Society of Actuaries Exams M and C were obtained for the past academic year. The pass rates for Georgia State University students for Exams M and C were 65% and 78%, respectively. These marks are very high when compared to the national passing rates of 47% (M) and 55% (C) for the same period.

**M 11: AS 8810 Graduate Seminar (O: 3, 4, 5)**

Evaluation of student projects, as well as student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar will be completed each May for the prior academic year.

Target for **O3**: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director reports student performance to be satisfactory in AS 8810, in terms of all class assignments and exams.

Target for **O4**: Explanation of technical concepts

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director reports student performance to be satisfactory in AS 8810, in terms of all class assignments and exams.

Target for **O5**: Structure and solve problems

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director reports student performance to be satisfactory in AS 8810, in terms of all class assignments and exams.

**M 12: AS 8340 Life Contingencies Course (O: 1, 3)**

Evaluation of student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8340 Life Contingencies course will be completed each May for the prior academic year.

Target for **O1**: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the Life Contingencies Course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director reports student performance to be satisfactory in AS 8340, in terms of all class assignments and exams.

Target for **O3**: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the Life Contingencies Course.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The Program Director reports student performance to be satisfactory in AS 8340, in terms of all class assignments and exams.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Create Industry Panel
Create an Industry Panel that includes representatives of the four major areas of actuarial practice: life & health insurance, employee benefit consulting, property/casualty insurance, and finance & risk management. Accordingly, the panel will include a minimum of four members. The Panel will meet once every two years, starting in the fall of 2006. Its agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the Actuarial Science Program to actuarial education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Biennial Industry Panel | Outcome/Objective: Explanation of technical concepts
- Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems

Implementation Description: December 1, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Lorilee Schneider

Increase involvement of Dir. of Student Affairs
Increase the involvement of the new Director of Student and External Affairs in all aspects of the AS Job Fair.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Program Changes | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Measure: Graduating Student Survey - Program Changes | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

Revision of AS 8810 content
Revise the content of AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar to include more case studies, expand coverage of relevant international topics, and require several written reports and at least one oral presentation.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Structure and solve problems
- Measure: Graduating Student Survey - Program Attributes | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Structure and solve problems

Implementation Description: Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 semesters
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

Support for the Actuarial Student Association
Increase support for the activities of the Actuarial Student Association.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Program Changes | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Structure and solve problems
- Measure: Graduating Student Survey - Program Changes | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Structure and solve problems

Implementation Description: Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 semesters
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Master of Actuarial Science Program has seen a strong resurgence this year in attracting talented students locally, nationally, and internationally. This is evidenced by the increased number and quality (average GPA, GMAT/GRE scores) of students coming to the MAS program. MAS students have the highest average GMAT score of any department in the Robinson College at 653. MAS students are generally pleased with the revised course offerings that have added financial risk modeling components to the curriculum. The students have demonstrated successes in passing professional actuarial exams and in finding high-level actuarial jobs.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
There is a need for further strengthening written and oral communication skills as well as computer skills across the BBA-AS curriculum. We would also like to work more closely with the Robinson College's Career Services personnel, through the department's new Director of Student and External Affairs, to increase our student's placement and internship opportunities.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 African American Studies BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

The Department of African-American Studies at Georgia State University (GSU) is committed to both the advancement of knowledge of people of African descent and to their empowerment within the local, national and international arena. As an interdisciplinary field of concentration, the GSU African-American Studies Department offers an interdisciplinary approach to the study of African people nationally and globally. The GSU African-American Studies Department provides critiques of knowledge presented within traditional disciplines and professions; scholarly and artistic accounts of the realities of lives of African people; and perspective on social change to empower black people.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Communication Skills (M: 4)**

A. Students develop effective written communication skills

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

#### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 1, 3)**

A. Students demonstrate an ability to understand interdisciplinary scholarship B. Students can apply data to understand the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

7 Critical Thinking--major

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

#### Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Analytical Skills (M: 2, 3)**

A. Students acquire the skills to collect data. B. Students are able to explain and interpret interdisciplinary scholarship.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

7 Critical Thinking--major

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

#### Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Application of Data (O: 2)**

Target for O2: Acquisition of Knowledge

80% of the papers will receive a rating of good on collection of data. The mean rating average of this dimension will be at least 3.0 (good).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The final research papers in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three member assessment committee to determine the students’ mastery of understanding interdisciplinary research. Members of the assessment committee examined the final research paper in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar (N=6) and AAS 3975 N=15) to assess student understanding of interdisciplinary research by employing a five-item scale: 5=excellent; 4=very good; 3=good; 2=fair; 1= poor. The findings showed that 74% of the papers were rated good or better. The mean score was 3.5.

M 2: Collecting Data (O: 3)


Target for O2: Acquisition of Knowledge

80% of the papers will receive a rating of good on collecting data. The mean rating average of this dimension will be at least 3.0 (good).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The final research papers in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three member assessment committee to determine the students’ mastery of understanding interdisciplinary research. Members of the assessment committee examined the final research paper in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar (N=6) and AAS 3975 N=15) to assess student understanding of interdisciplinary research by employing a five-item scale: 5=excellent; 4=very good; 3=good; 2=fair; 1= poor. The data showed that 84% of the papers were rated good or better. The mean score 3.8.

M 3: Interdisciplinary Measure (O: 2, 3)

A rating of excellent (5): Papers reflects the identification, critique and synthesis of literature from at least two disciplines. A rating of very good (4): Paper reflects the identification, critique and synthesis of literature from at least two disciplines but fails to synthesis the literature. A rating of good (3): Papers reflect the identification of at least two disciplines but fails to critique and synthesis the literature. A rating of fair (2): Paper fails to identify literature from two or more disciplines. There is also the absence of critique and synthesis of literature.

Target for O2: Acquisition of Knowledge

80% of the papers will receive a rating of good on understanding interdisciplinary measures. The mean rating average of this dimension will be at least 3.0 (good).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The final research papers in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three member assessment committee to determine the students’ mastery of understanding interdisciplinary research. Members of the assessment committee examined a total of 21 papers (AAS 48980 N=6 and AAS 3975 N=15) to assess student understanding of interdisciplinary research by employing a five-item scale: 5=excellent; 4=very good; 3=good; 2=fair; 1= poor. The findings showed that 75% of the papers were rated good or better. The mean score was 3.5.

Target for O3: Analytical Skills

80% of the papers will receive a rating of good on understanding interdisciplinary measures. The mean rating average of this dimension will be at least 3.0 (good).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The final research papers in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three member assessment committee to determine the students’ mastery of understanding interdisciplinary research. Members of the assessment committee examined a total of 21 papers (AAS 48980 N=6 and AAS 3975 N=15) to assess student understanding of interdisciplinary research by employing a five-item scale: 5=excellent; 4=very good; 3=good; 2=fair; 1= poor. The findings showed that 75% of the papers were rated good or better. The mean score 3.2 indicates that the student demonstrated a good understanding of interdisciplinary research.

M 4: Effective Written Communication Skills (O: 1)

A rating of excellent (5): Paper is clearly written with appropriate punctuation grammar and syntax. Fewer than two mistakes. Reference reflect the appropriate and required style very good. A rating of very good (4): Paper is clearly written with appropriate punctuation grammar and syntax, but has minor (3-5) punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes. A rating of good (3): Paper is clearly written, appropriate, punctuation grammar and syntax with no more than six punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes. A rating of fair (2): Paper lacks clarity and has seven or more, grammatical or syntax mistakes. A rating of poor (1): Paper is confusing lacks structure and has more than 10 punctuation, grammar and syntax mistakes. The paper does not include citations and or references.

Target for O1: Communication Skills

80% of the papers will receive a rating of good on effective written communication skills. The mean rating average of this dimension will be at least 3.0 (good).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The final research papers in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three member assessment committee to determine the students’ mastery of understanding interdisciplinary research. Members of the assessment committee examined a total of 21 papers (AAS 48980 N=6 and AAS 3975 N=15) to assess student understanding of interdisciplinary research by employing a five-item scale: 5=excellent; 4=very good; 3=good; 2=fair; 1= poor. The findings showed that 74% of the papers were rated good or better. The mean score was 3.5.
The final research papers in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three-member assessment committee to determine the mastery of written communication. Members of the assessment committee examined a total of 21 papers (AAS 4980 N=6 and AAS 3975 N=15) to assess written communication skills by employing a five-item scale: 5=excellent; 4=very good; 3=good; 2=fair; 1=poor. The findings showed that 76% of the papers were rated good or better. The mean score was 3.38 which indicates the average paper received a rating of good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AAS 4980 Senior Seminar-WAC Designation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor of the AAS 4980 will attend the annual summer workshop sponsored by Writing-across-the-curriculum(WAC) program to achieve a writing across the curriculum designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Effective Written Communication Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Resources:</strong> None needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase Application of data assignments**
This action entails ensuring that all upper-division AAS elective courses include assignments which require students to analyze and apply data in order to understand the impact of multiple factors on the life chances of people of African descent.

| **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006 |
| **Implementation Status:** Planned |
| **Priority:** High |
| **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** |
| Measure: Application of Data | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge |
| **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Committee |
| **Additional Resources:** None needed |

**Increase Interdisciplinary Assign in AAS coursewk**
This action entails ensuring that all upper-division AAS elective and core coursework has a sufficient number of assignments which facilitate an understanding of interdisciplinary research.

| **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006 |
| **Implementation Status:** Planned |
| **Priority:** High |
| **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** |
| Measure: Interdisciplinary Measure | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge | Analytical Skills |
| **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Committee |
| **Additional Resources:** None needed |

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Our data show that AAS majors have sufficiently mastered the Analytical Skills learning outcome. We meet both target performance levels for the collecting of data dimension. 84% of the papers from AAS 3975 and 4980 were treated good or better. Moreover, the mean average was 3.9. We attribute the success on this measure to the department's two course research sequence. With respect to the interdisciplinary measure the findings were just below the 80% criteria. 76% of the papers received a good or better rating. However, it is important to note that the mean average on the interdisciplinary measure 3.2 did meet the target performance level of 3.0. The department's efforts to strengthen its students' written communication skills are proving successful. Two of the Department's core courses AAS 3120 and AAS 3975 have been designated Writing-across-the-curriculum courses. Moreover, two additional upper-division AAS courses have also received the WAC designation. The mean average of the communication skills measure met the target performance level of 3.0. However, the data on this measure was slightly below (four percentage points) the 80% target performance level. Finally, findings indicate satisfactory progress on mastering the Acquisition of Knowledge outcome. The mean average 3.5 met the target level performance; however, the data were under the 80% threshold by six percentage points.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The data show that our targets were partially met for all three learning outcomes. While the target mean average of good was met on all measures, the data were slightly below the 80% target performance level for three out of four measures. To ensure that the students' performance satisfy both target levels the following three actions will be undertaken: (1) obtain a Writing-across-the-curriculum designated for AAS 4980; (2) increase interdisciplinary assignments in AAS elective course work; and (3) increase application of data assignments in AAS elective coursework.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2005-2006 Anthropology BA**
*As of 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST*
**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Anthropology offers a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology. Its focus is on the holistic and comparative study of humanity across time and space. Undergraduate education is organized on three principles: (1) a holistic understanding of human diversity requires the study of biological, archaeological, social/cultural, and linguistic anthropology; (2) the comparative study of humanity requires qualitative and quantitative research methods; and (3) human problems must be examined and solved within biological, historical, environmental, political-economic, and sociocultural contexts. Accordingly, the faculty is critically engaged in scientific and humanistic research, academic and applied scholarship, student-centered instruction, and public outreach. Undergraduate students are trained in anthropological research strategies, theories, and practices. Topical foci include human evolution, human behavioral ecology, human variation, complex societies, global-local articulations, ideology and power, migrants, immigrants, and refugees in the world system, urban processes and populations, identity politics in multicultural societies, evolution and prevention of disease, and social reform. In this Department we combine academic rigor with anthropological praxis—politically responsible and ethically sound applications of empirical knowledge in professional fields that include medicine, education, environment, forensics, cultural resource management and business. The Department is committed to a comprehensive education of our undergraduates who benefit from our wide repertoire of lower division courses. Undergraduate majors choose from a variety of upper-division courses, and are encouraged to write a senior or honors thesis based on supervised, original research on a topic of interest. Undergraduates also have the option to conduct an internship on their topical concentration with a private or public organization in Atlanta, in another state, or abroad.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Critical thinking in the core (M: 2)**
Three indicators of performance were devised to assess how well students obtain critical thinking skills in this course: (1) understanding and applying the scientific method; (2) the biocultural evolution of humanity; and (3) the (non)biology of race.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
8 Critical Thinking--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Faculty evaluation of student performance (M: 1)**
The undergraduate tool of assessment consisted of faculty evaluations of student performance. The faculty members that taught the two courses required of anthropology majors during the academic year (Theory in Anthropology and Senior Seminar) were asked to rank the learning objectives by examining the grades the students earned during the semester. The evaluation consisted of twenty questions and corresponded to the initial 2004 assessment plan by focusing on analytical skills, critical thinking skills, communication skills, acquisition of knowledge, and the application of knowledge. In addition to key concepts in anthropology, these learning outcomes encapsulate the major themes articulated by the College of Arts and Sciences.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty assessment of student learning outcomes (O: 1)**
The Anthropology Program's Learning Outcomes for undergraduate majors were assessed by comparing data from faculty members who were asked to rate student performance in their courses. This approach avoided identifying students individually and did not involve transferring sensitive information about student grades. There are currently two courses that are required of all of our majors: Theory in Anthropology and the Senior Seminar. These two courses provide students with a strong background in the discipline and include a nexus of major concepts generally used in the field. A t-test of the rankings was performed to evaluate whether differences existed between the faculty evaluators. Means of the rankings were then examined to identify how students performed on each of the learning outcomes. An overall mean was calculated to show how students met the outcomes generally. Faculty were asked to rank the learning objectives on a one to four scale by examining the grades the students earned during the semester. The evaluation
consisted of twenty questions, and included the following items: (1) interpreting causal relationships, (2) use of theory in research
design, (3) identifying major themes in the literature, (4) critiquing the literature, (5) designing and implementing research, (6)
interpreting charts, diagrams and statistical relationships, (7) representing ideas using symbolic notation, (8) translating symbolic
notation of others, (9) utilizing information technology for research, (10) using critical thinking skills to form opinions, (11)
mastering self-reflectivity, (12) understanding cultural relativism, (13) expressing ideas in writing, (14) expressing ideas orally, (15)
collaborating on research projects, (16) developing visual materials to show relationships, (17) understanding the basis of social inequality, (18)
mastering key concepts in anthropology, (19) identifying new insights from their research, (20) understanding how to apply
anthropology to the real world. These twenty questions correspond to the initial 2004 assessment plan in the following way: analytical
skills are evaluated in questions 1-3 and 6-8; critical thinking skills in questions 4, 5 and 10; communication skills in 13-17; acquisition
of knowledge in 11, 12, 18 and 19; and application of knowledge in question 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Faculty evaluation of student performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty ratings of student performance were expected to range between 80-90% depending on the specific learning objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students generally performed extremely well in most of the learning outcomes. The faculty members evaluations (which did
not differ significantly) suggest students excelled at (1) mastering the identification of themes in the literature, (2) designing
and implementing research, (3) understanding cultural relativism, (4) social inequality and key anthropological concepts, and
(5) developing new insights from their research. The students performed adequately in (1) understanding causal
relationships, (2) using theory to develop research questions, (3) obtaining critical thinking skills, (4) interpreting diagrams,
charts and statistical relationships, (5) mastering self-reflectivity, (6) oral communication, and (6) understanding how to apply
anthropology to the real world. The students performed less than adequate in (1) the use of information technology in their
research, (2) collaborating with one another and (3) developing visual materials to show relationships. Both faculty members
did not evaluate the student performance in representing ideas using symbolic notation and interpreting the symbolic notation
of others, and one faculty member also did not rank students in the design and implementation of research, interpretation of
charts, diagrams and statistical relationships and using information technology for research. The overall ranking for all
questions and evaluations suggests that generally the anthropology majors excelled at learning analytical, critical,
communicative skills as well as anthropological thought and practice. The anthropology faculty are currently in the process of
designing instruments that will enhance the attainment of the objectives that were not fully realized in the initial assessment.

**M 2: Assessment of Critical Thinking in a Core Course (O: 2)**

Forty-six students in ANTH 1102 were assessed to evaluate (1) understanding and applying the scientific method--students were
asked to read a paragraph describing the relationship between height and weight and to answer five questions regarding this
relationship (e.g., identify the hypothesis, or postulated relationship between two variables; identify the theory, or the explanation of
why these two variables are related; and what are facts—empirical observations used to test scientific hypotheses). (2) the biocultural
evolution of humanity—An essay question on the first midterm will allow students the opportunity to explain how changes in the
subsistence strategies of ancient humans allowed for biocultural evolution to occur. (3) the (non)biology of race--students were
asked to address, in essay format, three questions to target their critical assessment of the race concept. The rubric for assessing
this outcome was devised during Spring 2006, revised in Summer 2006 and tested in Fall 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Critical thinking in the core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) understanding and applying the scientific method, 90% of students are expected to correctly answer at least four out of five
of the questions. (2) the biocultural evolution of humanity, three-quarters of the students are expected to earn 70% or above on this
equation. (3) At least three-fourths of the students are expected to pass this assignment with a grade of C or better. |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The findings for the assessment of outcome are listed in the measures/findings for 2006-2007 since the rubric was not
launched until Fall 2006. This year was devoted to developing an heuristic tool to measure critical thinking and the
development of a rubric was a specific target of the Department. Ongoing discussion of how to evaluate this learning objective
will undoubtedly initiate changes in future assessments.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Faculty collaboration to improve learning outcomes**

The faculty will work together to improve those aspects of assessment that were not adequately met, such as the use of information
technology in research, collaboration of students with one another and utilizing visual material to show relationships. Objectives that
were only adequately met will also be addressed in future assessments. These outcomes include understanding causal
relationships, using theory to develop research questions, obtaining critical thinking skills, interpreting diagrams, charts and statistical
relationships, mastering self-reflectivity, oral communication, and understanding how to apply anthropology to the real world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Faculty assessment of student learning outcomes | Outcome/Objective: Faculty evaluation of student performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description: December 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of Department of Anthropology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revise rubrics in core**

The results of this evaluation will be presented at the next faculty meeting. The faculty may potentially adopt one or more of the three
rubrics for assessing critical thinking as a permanent feature of Anth 1102: Introduction to Anthropology. In particular, the faculty will
be asked to consider why rubric #3 fared better than assessments #1 and #2. Their comments will be used to refine the questions
posed in assessments #1 and #2. Alternatively, it may be decided to redesign the evaluation of critical thinking in this course. In light of
these results, the faculty will be asked to consider changes to the curriculum and instruction, specifically whether the race concept
should be more formally examined in this introductory course, or whether a new core course should be developed that explicitly
examines the race concept, and other topics that utilize and develop the critical thinking skills of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Assessment of Critical Thinking in a Core Course  
Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking in the core  
Responsible Person/Group: Frank Williams

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Students generally performed extremely well in most of the learning outcomes. The proven strengths of this present assessment include mastering the identification of themes in the literature, designing and implementing research, understanding cultural relativism, understanding social inequality, identifying key anthropological concepts, and developing new insights from their research. However, there are certainly areas that need improvement. The anthropology faculty are currently in the process of designing instruments that will enhance the attainment of the objectives that were not fully realized in the initial assessment.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Improvement is warranted in areas of information technology, statistical representation of ideas and visual representation of data. The anthropology faculty may decide to require an upper-division course that systematically exposes students to these areas, or to introduce a subsection in either the theory course or in the senior seminar that focuses specifically on the areas where students are not meeting their learning outcomes as well as they should. A third possibility is to measure learning outcomes for two primary tracts instead of for the major as a whole. Most of the requirements for the anthropology major can be satisfied by a number of very different courses and the faculty desire such a design because it allows students flexibility in defining their subspecialty. As a consequence, only two upper-division courses are required of every major. Meanwhile, the measurement of learning outcomes is constrained by the need to sample all majors. It may be more accurate to measure learning outcomes in anthropology by defining a limited number of tracts in the major (for example, a cultural and bioarcheology tracts). In this way, student learning outcomes would not be misrepresented by the diversity of courses that can satisfy the requirements for the major.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Anthropology MA
As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Anthropology offers a Master of Arts in Anthropology. Graduate education in anthropology emphasize research and teaching on urban contexts, processes, and populations. Students receive rigorous training in local, regional, and global transformations, quantitative and qualitative research methods, and theories of nature, society, and culture. In addition to intellectual maturity, students gain practical skills, including proposal writing, project development, field research, ethnographic needs-assessments, community development, and program evaluation. Graduate students are trained in theories, methods, topics, and skills within the discipline and each of its sub-fields. They are encouraged to write a thesis based on independent empirical research, or in collaboration with faculty. Alternatively, students may complete a practicum, in a variety of contexts and human service organizations. All students receive a comprehensive education that prepares them to pursue doctoral studies, or to seek employment in the public and private sectors as professional anthropologists. Recent research by faculty in Asia, Africa, Latin America, North America, and Europe enhances graduate education by providing excellent examples for graduate students of basic and applied anthropological inquiry.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Assessment of learning outcomes for MA students (M: 1)
The learning outcomes for the graduate students are encapsulated in the comprehensive examination. This exam is required of all of graduate students, and is normally taken in the third semester of the MA program. The graduate students are assessed individually by their committees, which consist of three regular university faculty members, two of whom must be Department faculty members.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Assessing outcomes using the comprehensive exam (O: 1)
The graduate students are assessed individually by their committees, which consist of three regular university faculty members, two of whom must be Department faculty members. The comprehensive exam is tailored to each graduate student's interest and is written by the student's major advisor. These questions consist of (1) the field of inquiry, (2) theory pertaining to the research, and (3)
The Master's degree in Applied Linguistics integrates the study of linguistic theory with practical applications and focuses on the practical foundational knowledge needed to teach language at the postsecondary level and to progress to doctoral work in applied language acquisition needs of the adult or near-adult learner of an additional language. Students receive the theoretical and linguistic or other language-study or language-teaching related areas.

Adequate preparation for the comprehensive exam may be the most important factor in determining success. This was the second year that we established a standard time frame for students to take the comprehensive exam. We may return to a more flexible schedule to administer the exam, or change the deadline of the exam for earlier in the semester to allow students the opportunity to adequately prepare.

The students were expected to achieve 80-90% of the targeted performance.

Nine graduate students were administered the comprehensive exam during the past academic year. Out of these, six passed their exam outright, while three graduate students were given a “contingent pass” requiring one or more sections of the exam to be rewritten and approved by their advisor. Two-thirds (67.7%) of the graduate students who took the comprehensive exam passed the first time without complications. The three students who were asked to retake parts of the exam passed on their second try. Overall, nine out of nine students (100%) ultimately passed their comprehensive exam.

We will maintain the comprehensive examination as the rubric of choice for assessing student performance on the graduate level. In the future, the faculty may be asked to provide an evaluation of specific learning outcomes of the examination, using a five point scoring system, since an overall pass/fail does not efficiently assess specific learning objectives. By evaluating specific outcomes for each student, it will be possible to identify areas in need of improvement.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Faculty rating of outcomes from comprehensive exam

Nine graduate students were administered the comprehensive exam during the past academic year. Out of these, six passed their exam outright, while three graduate students were given a “contingent pass” requiring one or more sections of the exam to be rewritten and approved by their advisor. Two-thirds (67.7%) of the graduate students who took the comprehensive exam passed the first time without complications. The three students who were asked to retake parts of the exam passed on their second try. Overall, nine out of nine students (100%) ultimately passed their comprehensive exam.

Adequate preparation for the comprehensive exam may be the most important factor in determining success. This was the second year that we established a standard time frame for students to take the comprehensive exam. We may return to a more flexible schedule to administer the exam, or change the deadline of the exam for earlier in the semester to allow students the opportunity to adequately prepare.

The students were expected to achieve 80-90% of the targeted performance.

Nine graduate students were administered the comprehensive exam during the past academic year. Out of these, six passed their exam outright, while three graduate students were given a “contingent pass” requiring one or more sections of the exam to be rewritten and approved by their advisor. Two-thirds (67.7%) of the graduate students who took the comprehensive exam passed the first time without complications. The three students who were asked to retake parts of the exam passed on their second try. Overall, nine out of nine students (100%) ultimately passed their comprehensive exam.

We will maintain the comprehensive examination as the rubric of choice for assessing student performance on the graduate level. In the future, the faculty may be asked to provide an evaluation of specific learning outcomes of the examination, using a five point scoring system, since an overall pass/fail does not efficiently assess specific learning objectives. By evaluating specific outcomes for each student, it will be possible to identify areas in need of improvement.
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Nine graduate students were administered the comprehensive exam during the past academic year. Out of these, six passed their exam outright, while three graduate students were given a “contingent pass” requiring one or more sections of the exam to be rewritten and approved by their advisor. Two-thirds (67.7%) of the graduate students who took the comprehensive exam passed the first time without complications. The three students who were asked to retake parts of the exam passed on their second try. Overall, nine out of nine students (100%) ultimately passed their comprehensive exam.

We will maintain the comprehensive examination as the rubric of choice for assessing student performance on the graduate level. In the future, the faculty may be asked to provide an evaluation of specific learning outcomes of the examination, using a five point scoring system, since an overall pass/fail does not efficiently assess specific learning objectives. By evaluating specific outcomes for each student, it will be possible to identify areas in need of improvement.
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Nine graduate students were administered the comprehensive exam during the past academic year. Out of these, six passed their exam outright, while three graduate students were given a “contingent pass” requiring one or more sections of the exam to be rewritten and approved by their advisor. Two-thirds (67.7%) of the graduate students who took the comprehensive exam passed the first time without complications. The three students who were asked to retake parts of the exam passed on their second try. Overall, nine out of nine students (100%) ultimately passed their comprehensive exam.

We will maintain the comprehensive examination as the rubric of choice for assessing student performance on the graduate level. In the future, the faculty may be asked to provide an evaluation of specific learning outcomes of the examination, using a five point scoring system, since an overall pass/fail does not efficiently assess specific learning objectives. By evaluating specific outcomes for each student, it will be possible to identify areas in need of improvement.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Teaching methodology (M: 2, 6, 7, 8)**
Applies the basic principles of ESL/EFL learning and teaching methodology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Quality professional programs
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Global, cultural perspectives
6. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
7. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
8. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
9. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
10. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3. International Initiatives
6. Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English (M: 7, 8)**
Demonstrates knowledge of the linguistic systems of English phonology, grammar, and discourse

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Quality professional programs
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Global, cultural perspectives
6. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
7. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
8. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
9. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2. Faculty
3. Interdisciplinary Programs
3. International Initiatives
6. Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Cultural knowledge (M: 7, 8)**
Uses cultural knowledge in second language learning and teaching

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Quality professional programs
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Global, cultural perspectives
6. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
7. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
8. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
9. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2. Faculty
3. Interdisciplinary Programs
3. International Initiatives
6. Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Connecting theory and practice (M: 1, 2, 7, 8)**
Analyzes and critiques theory and practice of L2 teaching and learning

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Quality professional programs
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Communication (M: 1, 5, 6, 7, 8)**
Communicates effectively in both written and oral language in English

**SLO 6: Technology (M: 5, 7, 8)**
Uses technology effectively in research and teaching

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 7: Professional development (M: 3, 4, 7)**
Conducts and participates in professional development activities

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Master’s papers (O: 4, 5)**
Two faculty members evaluate each graduating student’s master’s papers in four areas: (a) connecting theory with practice; (b) scholarship; (c) writing; (d) appropriate formatting/referencing.

**Target for O4: Connecting theory and practice**
90% of students will be rated "excellent" or "good" in connecting theory to practice and scholarship (Outcome 4) and in writing and formatting/referencing (Outcome 5).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
10 out of 11 (91%) Master’s papers received grades of "good" or "excellent" in all four areas in which they were evaluated.

**Target for O5: Communication**
90% of students will be rated "excellent" or "good" in connecting theory to practice and scholarship (Outcome 4) and in writing and formatting/referencing (Outcome 5).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
10 out of 11 (91%) Master’s papers received grades of "good" or "excellent" in all four areas in which they were evaluated.

**M 2: Classroom-based experience forms and reflections (O: 1, 4)**
Students are required to complete 90 hours of classroom-based experience (CBE) during their program. Advisors certify that their advisees have completed this requirement by submitting two documents each semester: a form signed by the student’s supervisor certifying that the CBE has been completed, and a reflective essay in which the student draws connections between the CBE and what has been learned in coursework.

**Target for O1: Teaching methodology**
100% of students will complete this requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students graduating between Summer 2005 and Spring 2006 (N=15) completed their CBE requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Connecting theory and practice**
100% of students will complete this requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students graduating between Summer 2005 and Spring 2006 (N=15) completed their CBE requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Professional development activities (O: 7)**
Students are required to participate in two professional development (PD) activities each semester they are in the program. They document this experience by submitting a reflective essay about each PD activity to their advisor.

**Target for O7: Professional development**
100% of students will complete the PD requirement.

**M 4: Number of presentations/publications (O: 7)**
Advisors count the number of conference presentations and/or publications for each student.

**Target for O7: Professional development**
50% of graduating students will have made at least one conference presentation or written at least one published article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of 15 graduating students, 10 (75%) made at least one conference presentation or published one paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Oral presentation of Master’s paper (O: 5, 6)**
During their final semester, students make a formal oral presentation of their Master’s paper. Two faculty members rate the paper for clarity, organization, effective use of visual aids, and overall presentation.

**Target for O5: Communication**
90% of students will score "good" or "excellent" on their presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 students gave oral presentations of their Master’s papers. All 8 scored at least &quot;good&quot; and 6 out of 8 (75%) were given scores of &quot;excellent&quot; by both raters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Technology**
90% of students will score "good" or "excellent" on their presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 students gave oral presentations of their Master’s papers. All 8 scored at least &quot;good&quot; and 6 out of 8 (75%) were given scores of &quot;excellent&quot; by both raters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Teaching performance and videotapes (O: 1, 5)**
Students are videotaped teaching a lesson to their peers in AL 8900: Practicum, a required course in the program. The instructor rates the students on a rubric evaluating teaching effectiveness (outcome 1) and oral communication (outcome 5).

**Target for O1: Teaching methodology**
90% of students will meet or exceed expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 students took the practicum from Summer 2005 through Spring 2006. All 19 (100%) met the criteria for meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Communication**
90% of students will meet or exceed expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 students took the practicum from Summer 2005 through Spring 2006. All 19 (100%) met the criteria for meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students who graduated between Summer 2006 and Spring 2007 were asked to complete a web-based survey investigating their perceptions of how confident they feel about the areas covered in the learning outcomes.

**Target for O1: Teaching methodology**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
13 out of 15 (88%) graduating students completed the survey. The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (last year’s percentages are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 100% (94%) Outcome 2: 100% (83%) Outcome 3: 100% (83%) Outcome 4: 85% (89%) Outcome 5: 84% (100%) Outcome 6: 61% (77%) Outcome 7: 77% (75%)

**Target for O2: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
13 out of 15 (88%) graduating students completed the survey. The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (last year’s percentages are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 100% (94%) Outcome 2: 100% (83%) Outcome 3: 100% (83%) Outcome 4: 85% (89%) Outcome 5: 84% (100%) Outcome 6: 61% (77%) Outcome 7: 77% (75%)

**Target for O3: Cultural knowledge**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
13 out of 15 (88%) graduating students completed the survey. The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (last year’s percentages are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 100% (94%) Outcome 2: 100% (83%) Outcome 3: 100% (83%) Outcome 4: 85% (89%) Outcome 5: 84% (100%) Outcome 6: 61% (77%) Outcome 7: 77% (75%)

**Target for O4: Connecting theory and practice**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
13 out of 15 (88%) graduating students completed the survey. The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (last year’s percentages are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 100% (94%) Outcome 2: 100% (83%) Outcome 3: 100% (83%) Outcome 4: 85% (89%) Outcome 5: 84% (100%) Outcome 6: 61% (77%) Outcome 7: 77% (75%)

**Target for O5: Communication**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
13 out of 15 (88%) graduating students completed the survey. The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (last year’s percentages are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 100% (94%) Outcome 2: 100% (83%) Outcome 3: 100% (83%) Outcome 4: 85% (89%) Outcome 5: 84% (100%) Outcome 6: 61% (77%) Outcome 7: 77% (75%)

**Target for O6: Technology**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
13 out of 15 (88%) graduating students completed the survey. The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (last year’s percentages are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 100% (94%) Outcome 2: 100% (83%) Outcome 3: 100% (83%) Outcome 4: 85% (89%) Outcome 5: 84% (100%) Outcome 6: 61% (77%) Outcome 7: 77% (75%)

**Target for O7: Professional development**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
13 out of 15 (88%) graduating students completed the survey. The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (last year’s percentages are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 100% (94%) Outcome 2: 100% (83%) Outcome 3: 100% (83%) Outcome 4: 85% (89%) Outcome 5: 84% (100%) Outcome 6: 61% (77%) Outcome 7: 77% (75%)

**M 8: Syllabi (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Syllabi for all required courses were collected by the Chair and examined for the presence or absence of specific learning outcomes.
### Target for O1: Teaching methodology
100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All syllabi contained specific learning outcomes and there was 100% coverage of learning outcomes across the required courses

### Target for O2: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English
100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All syllabi contained specific learning outcomes and there was 100% coverage of learning outcomes across the required courses

### Target for O3: Cultural knowledge
100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All syllabi contained specific learning outcomes and there was 100% coverage of learning outcomes across the required courses

### Target for O4: Connecting theory and practice
100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All syllabi contained specific learning outcomes and there was 100% coverage of learning outcomes across the required courses

### Target for O5: Communication
100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All syllabi contained specific learning outcomes and there was 100% coverage of learning outcomes across the required courses

### Target for O6: Technology
100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All syllabi contained specific learning outcomes and there was 100% coverage of learning outcomes across the required courses

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Faculty development seminars**
A series of discussions/seminars related to issues surrounding the use of technology in graduate courses will be offered, and faculty will be encouraged to attend these.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Survey of graduating students
  - Outcome/Objective: Technology
- **Implementation Description:** November 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Pat Byrd

**Student focus groups**
Current students and recent alumni will be invited to one or more focus groups to discuss their perceptions of targeted learning outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Survey of graduating students
  - Outcome/Objective: Communication
  - Outcome/Objective: Connecting theory and practice
  - Outcome/Objective: Professional development
  - Outcome/Objective: Technology
- **Implementation Description:** March 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Sara Weigle
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

This year we made two changes in our outcomes assessment process: we added the MA paper rubric and the oral presentation of the MA paper. The results of these measures demonstrate that the vast majority of our students can communicate effectively orally and in writing and can connect theory with practice. We also offered a course in technology for language teaching during the Maymester, although the outcomes of this course will not be available before next year’s assessment cycle.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

All of our measures indicate that our program is successfully meeting the majority of our learning outcomes, with the exception of the alumni survey. Because our numbers are fairly small, we are not too concerned about fluctuations in responses to the survey, but for two years in a row the outcome “using technology effectively in research and teaching” has received the lowest rating in the student survey. We will continue to explore options for strengthening this component of our program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Applied Linguistics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language at Georgia State University, one of the few departments of its kind in the United States, offers a PhD in applied linguistics to prepare students to conduct research on adult language learning and teaching and to function as graduate-level educators in programs training language education professionals. Students in the program have an opportunity to work with graduate faculty who specialize in various areas of applied linguistics. The faculty are committed to teaching and research productivity, and are especially interested in mentoring and collaborating with novice members of the profession.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics (M: 1, 2, 4)

Graduates of the program will be familiar with the current state of knowledge in applied linguistics, including the numerous questions that remain to be answered

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Research methodology (M: 2, 4)

Graduates will be able to design studies on a range of topics in applied linguistics (e.g. second language acquisition, second language teaching, and English for academic purposes)

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
### SLO 3: Teaching experience (M: 3)
Graduates will be experienced teachers

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Quality professional programs
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Global, cultural perspectives
6. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Teacher mentoring (M: 3)
Graduates will understand the needs of ESL/EFL teachers and have expertise in providing educational opportunities for master's level ESL/EFL teachers

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Quality professional programs
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Global, cultural perspectives
6. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 5: Professional development (M: 4)
Graduates will have begun contributing to the knowledge-base of applied linguistics through presentation of papers at conferences and through publication

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Quality professional programs
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Global, cultural perspectives
6. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Qualifying papers (O: 1)**
The purpose of the Qualifying Paper (QP) is for the PhD candidate to demonstrate strong writing abilities. When reading the
completed QP, faculty should recognize the voice of a scholar-writer who is ready to progress to the next stages of the PhD program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will pass the qualifying paper requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Three students wrote qualifying papers in 2005/06 and all three (100%) passed the requirement.

**M 2: Comprehensive examinations (O: 1, 2)**
The Comprehensive Exam (CE) consists of three examination questions, which the student has two weeks to answer. The questions require the student to address issues in theory, research methodology, research topics of importance in the field, and/or topics related to the student's intended dissertation research. At least one of the topics requires consideration of issues that overlap the boundaries between language, cognition and communication and language teaching and language teacher development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will pass their comprehensive examinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In 2005/06, three students took and passed their comprehensive examinations (100% pass rate).

**Target for O2: Research methodology**

90% of students will pass their comprehensive examinations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In 2005/06, three students took and passed their comprehensive examinations (100% pass rate).

**M 3: Teaching experience (O: 3, 4)**

Students will graduate with substantial teaching experience in the Intensive English Program and in undergraduate courses in Applied Linguistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will teach at least 4 semesters at GSU. 90% of students will teach at least two undergraduate courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The program does not have any graduates as of 05/06. 90% of all current PhD students who have been at GSU at least a year have had teaching experience in either the IEP or the undergraduate program.

**Target for O4: Teacher mentoring**

100% of students will teach at least 4 semesters at GSU. 90% of students will teach at least two undergraduate courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The program does not have any graduates as of 05/06. 90% of all current PhD students who have been at GSU at least a year have had teaching experience in either the IEP or the undergraduate program.

**M 4: Professional development (O: 1, 2, 5)**

Graduate students are expected to begin presenting regularly at conferences and to publish in scholarly journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of graduate students in their second year or beyond will present at least one paper at a conference or publish a scholarly paper annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In 2005/06, 7 of our 9 PhD students past their first year presented papers at conferences and/or published papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of graduate students in their second year or beyond will present at least one paper at a conference or publish a scholarly paper annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In 2005/06, 7 of our 9 PhD students past their first year presented papers at conferences and/or published papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Professional development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of graduate students in their second year or beyond will present at least one paper at a conference or publish a scholarly paper annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In 2005/06, 7 of our 9 PhD students past their first year presented papers at conferences and/or published papers.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Compile data on student teaching
A spreadsheet will be compiled that lists all PhD students and the courses that they have taught, both in the IEP and in the undergraduate program. Any students who are getting close to the dissertation stage without having had the requisite teaching experience will be given appropriate teaching assignments in the coming year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teaching experience | Outcome/Objective: Teaching experience

Implementation Description: October 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Sara Weigle

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our PhD program is relatively new, and we do not yet have any students who have completed the program. However, the assessments that we have in place (the qualifying paper at the end of the first year and the comprehensive examinations) indicate that our students are meeting expectations for PhD level work.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We will continue to monitor students as they progress to the dissertation stage and beyond, particularly as they enter the job market upon completion.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Art Education BFA
(As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Art Education BFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible undergraduate education in the visual arts, art education and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: •Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills •Expand students understanding as visual artists, art educators, scholars and advocates of the visual arts •Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world •Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Written Communication - Sophomore level (M: 3)
Four essays submitted explaining four portfolio pieces from four different aesthetic viewpoints including composition, technical skills and craftsmanship, expressive qualities, meaning and content. A fifth essay on "Why Teach Art?" is required.
Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  1 Written Communication--major
  7 Critical Thinking--major
  9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
  1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
  1.3 Quality professional programs
  1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
  1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
  2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
  3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
  6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Professional Competencies - Sophomore Level (M: 6)
Based on faculty observation of the following: Cooperates/collaborates, Initiative, well organized, punctual - regular attendance, professional appearance, accepts constructive criticism, potential for professional growth, effective oral communication.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills - Sophomore Level (M: 7)**

Reflects constructively and analytically. Demonstrates creative thinking.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 4: Content Knowledge - Sophomore Level (M: 2)**

CD of 12 artworks submitted. Artworks demonstrate knowledge of composition, formal qualities, technical skill, craftsmanship, expressive qualities, meaning and content

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Technology--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 5: Instructional Planning - senior level (M: 8)**

The teacher plans instruction based on knowledge of subject matter, students, community and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Critical Thinking--major  
9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Content Knowledge - Technology -Senior Level (M: 10)**

The teacher understands and uses PowerPoint, WebCT, online discussion group protocol, the software applications of Adobe Suite such as PhotoShop, Illustrator, ExCel, Acrobat and other instructional resources based on Faculty observation.

Relevant Associations: INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 7: Professional Competencies - Senior Level (M: 9)**

Evaluation done prior to student teaching semester. Student demonstrates the following: cooperates, shows initiative, reflects constructively, organized skills, effective verbal communication, professional appearance, punctual and regular attendance, open to constructive criticism, potential for professional growth.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Oral Communication--major  
5 Collaboration--major  
7 Critical Thinking--major  
9 Contemporary Issues--major  
11 Quantitative Skills--major  
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 9: Lesson Planning - Sophomore Level (M: 1)**

The student demonstrates the ability to plan instruction based on knowledge of subject matter, students, community and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major  
7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 11: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level (M: 11)
10 examples of consistently achieved artwork presented according to professional presentations standards from the student’s selected studio art concentration. Artwork demonstrates technical competency, conceptual sophistication, and currency within contemporary art practice.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 12: Written Communication - Senior Level (M: 12)
Four essays submitted explaining four portfolio pieces from four different aesthetic viewpoints including composition, technical skills and craftsmanship, expressive qualities, meaning and content.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 8: Praxis I Score (M: 5)**
Student must take this exam prior to student teaching and must meet minimum scores on state mandated exam of general education competence in order to be certified.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 12 Quantitative Skills--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
- 3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.4 External Relations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**O/O 10: Grade Point Average - prior to admission to major (M: 4)**
A transcript is submitted establishing a minimum GPA of 2.5 overall and 3.0 in art classes is required.

Relevant Associations: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC Standards Conceptual Framework), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC)
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
3. Oral Communication--major
4. Oral Communication--core
5. Collaboration--major
6. Collaboration--core
7. Critical Thinking--major
8. Critical Thinking--core
9. Contemporary Issues--core
10. Quantitative Skills--core
11. Technology--core

### Institutional Priority Associations
1. Quality professional programs
2. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3. Learning-centered environment that supports individual learning
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### Strategic Plan Associations
6. Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Lesson Plan - Sophomore Level (O: 9)
Lesson plan that meets the criteria outlined in AE 4200

**Target for O9: Lesson Planning - Sophomore Level**
Scoring from 0-100. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to major. Students not accepted into the major have the option to reapply or pursue another major or the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 34 students evaluated 76% achieved this goal with a minium score of 90 or above. The average score was 92. The target score goal is 90.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
76% of the students met the goal with the target score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

#### M 2: Portfolio - Sophomore Level (O: 4)
A portfolio on CD of a minimum of 12 artworks

**Target for O4: Content Knowledge - Sophomore Level**
Scoring from 0-100. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to major. Students not accepted into the major have the option to reapply or pursue another BFA degree or the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 34 students evaluated 32% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 90 or above. The average score was 83. The target score goal is 90.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
32% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

#### M 3: Four Written essays (O: 1)
Four essays written about 4 separate artworks from 4 different aesthetic views

**Target for O1: Written Communication - Sophomore level**
Scoring from 0-100. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to major. Students not accepted into the major have the option to reapply or pursue another BFA degree or the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 33 students evaluated 26% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 90 or above. The average score was 81. The target score goal is 90.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
26% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

#### M 4: Grade Point Average - application to major (O: 10)
A minimum GPA of 2.5 in general education courses A minimum GPA of 3.0 in studio courses

**Target for O10: Grade Point Average - prior to admission to major**
Scoring from 0-4. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. Out of the 34 students evaluated 100% achieved the minimum overall GPA requirement of 2.5 and 3.0 in art courses. The average overall GPA was 3.4.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students met the goal with the minimum GPA.

**M 5: Praxis I scores (O: 8)**

Passing scores on Praxis I as determined by State Board of Education

**Target for O8: Praxis I Score**

Scoring from 0-100. The discipline requires that students take this exam before student teaching, however, there is not requirement to pass the exam at that time. Two out of the 16 students had scores for the Praxis I Exam. The scores were: R - 176, W - 175, M - 176 and R - 177, W - 175 and M - 178.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

13% of students reported scores. More accurate reporting of whether the test has been taken in order to meet requirement is the goal.

**M 6: Faculty Observation - Sophomore Level (O: 2)**

Based on faculty observation of the following: Cooperates/collaborates, Initiative, well organized, punctual - regular attendance, professional appearance, accepts constructive criticism, potential for professional growth, effective oral communication.

**Target for O2: Professional Competencies - Sophomore Level**

Scoring from 0-100. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to the majors. Students not accepted into the major have the option to reapply or pursue another BFA degree or the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 34 students evaluated 64% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 90 or above. The average score was 90. The target score goal is 90.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

64% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

**M 7: Portfolio and other course assignments (O: 3)**

A CD of 12 artworks is submitted for review plus essays on 4 artworks included in portfolio.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills - Sophomore Level**

Scoring from 0-100. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to the majors. Students not accepted into the major have the option to reapply or pursue another BFA degree or the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 34 students evaluated 61% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 90. The average score was 92.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

61% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

**M 8: Lesson Plan - Senior Level (O: 5)**

Submit a lesson plan from student’s most recent exam.

**Target for O5: Instructional Planning - senior level**

Scoring from 0-100. Out of the 16 students evaluated 50% submitted lesson plans. Of those 50%, 75% achieved a minimum score of 90 or above. The average score was 92. The target score goal is 90.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

8 students out of 16 turned in a lesson plan for review. Of those 75% met the goal. Area faculty want 100% participation in requirement and stronger performance.

**M 9: Professional Competencies - Senior Level (O: 7)**

Based on faculty observation.

**Target for O7: Professional Competencies - Senior Level**

Scoring from 0-100. Out of the 16 students evaluated 91% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 90 or above. The average score was 95. The target score goal is 90.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

91% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

**M 10: Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level (O: 6)**

The teacher understands and uses PowerPoint, WebCT, Adobe Suite software and other instructional resources.

**Target for O6: Content Knowledge - Technology -Senior Level**

Scoring from 0-100. Out of the 14 students evaluated 84% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 90 or above. The average score was 94. The target score goal is 90.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
84% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

M 11: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level (O: 11)
Portfolio on CD of 10 artworks demonstrating composition, formal qualities, technical skills, craftsmanship, expressive qualities, content and meaning.

Target for O11: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level
Scoring from 0-100. Out of the 15 students evaluated 80% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 90 or above. The average score was 94. The target score goal is 90.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
80% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

M 12: Written Communication - Senior Level (O: 12)
Four Written essays submitted on four different artworks in portfolio.

Target for O12: Written Communication - Senior Level
Scoring from 0-100. Out of the 12 students evaluated 41% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 90 or above. The average score was 91. The target score goal is 90.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
41% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting this goal.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Area meeting/follow up
Area faculty will meet as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level
- Measure: Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level
- Measure: Faculty Observation - Sophomore Level | Outcome/Objective: Professional Competencies - Sophomore Level
- Measure: Grade Point Average - application to major | Outcome/Objective: Grade Point Average - prior to admission to major
- Measure: Lesson Plan - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Instructional Planning - senior level
- Measure: Portfolio - Sophomore Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Sophomore Level
- Measure: Praxis I scores | Outcome/Objective: Praxis I Score
- Measure: Professional Competencies - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Professional Competencies - Senior Level
- Measure: Written Communication - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Senior Level

Implementation Description: Early Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: M. Milbrandt, P. Eubanks, M. Ross
Additional Resources: As yet undetermined. Will have better idea after faculty meetings.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Progress is seen in quality in all areas of student work and effort after courses taken within the major. Student work shows greater maturity from sophomore level work to senior level work. The majority of students exceed goals in most areas of evaluation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Certain areas of evaluation need stronger student performance. Faculty will meet to analysis discuss and devise ways to help students improve.

Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
The Ernest G. Welch school of Art and Design showed strong performance in all areas of evaluation in 2005-2006. Faculty members were active in professional development with a number of exhibitions in major venues, many articles published and numerous conference presentations. Two faculty members received important external grants: Florencia Bazzano – Nelson received a Getty Foundation grant for $20,000. 00; and Ruth Stanford received a Heinz Foundation grant for $27,000.00. Both grants were given to support research. The Gallery was awarded a prestigious Warhol Foundation Grant of $50,000.00 to support “Potentially Harmful: The Art of Censorship” exhibition and related activities. In teaching Maria Gindhart received the Distinguished Honors Professor...
Contributions to the Institution

1. We continue to make progress and submit progress reports to the time safety and maintenance technician for sculpture facility to meet NASAD progress requirements. 6. Response to effectiveness – allowing better and more individual student advisement. Decision pending reclassification request. 5. Proposal put forward to hire full-faculty in interior design and sculpture 4. Proposal put forward to reclassify current staff member as a full-time art academic advisor

Highlights


Challenges

Implementation of New Methods for assessing learning a. The School of Art and Design instituted a new method of collecting data for the Learning Outcomes Assessment project. This new method required each discipline within the School submit an area annual report. Reports were turned in to the Director as of May 15 and are being processed for the School of Art and Design Learning Outcomes Assessment reports due August 1. Reports included input from all area faculty members assessing undergraduates at the entry level to their chosen art program and at graduation. Please refer to Learning Outcomes Assessment Report as of August 1, 2006. Implementation of academic and non-academic process changes a. Requests have been made to reclassify staff to address work load distribution and academic advising needs within the school. This reclassification came about due to the death of Tim Lockwood, an A&D staff member, that has resulted in a staff shortage. This reclassification will provide staff for advising, answering questions, and for superior facilities management. b. A request has been submitted to the College for a new staff member in charge of safety, maintenance and shop procedures for the Sculpture area on Edgewood Avenue 4. Evidence of improvement in specific area as a result of assessment based changes a. The National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), our accreditation organization, required facilities and health and safety improvements in the Arts and Humanities Building. Also, based on student and alumni responses to Self-Study survey questions that became part of the Action Plan, improvements to the facilities were rated highly necessary. 1. State Funding provided $3,560,000. 00 to improve HVAC, elevators, and building infrastructure upgrades to correct unsafe working conditions in the School of Art and Design. Renovations to the A&H Building during the summer and fall of 2005 achieved improved ventilation in areas that were poorly ventilated, noise reduction and studio and lighting configuration improvements. A net square footage gain for the School of Art and Design within the Arts and Humanities Building improves studios and labs for fine arts undergraduate and graduate students and allows for studio spaces for graduate students in the areas of photography, art education, interior design and graphic design for the first time. Currently follow up on unfinished, overlooked and incorrectly completed modifications during the renovation are underway. These are being addressed through complaints filed with the contractors, College assistance and with monies from Art and Design as funds permit. Areas with critical problems due to incorrect renovations are ceramics and photo. 2. After a recommendation from NASAD and a $20,000.00 study assessed major health and safety concerns in the Edgewood facility, $200,000.00 has been allocated from the University to fix ventilation and safety problems in the Sculpture Building on Edgewood Ave. The following list is a summary of progress with this project. a. Downdraft welding and cutting tables are currently being installed in the sculpture facility b. Stop brakes for grinders: one has been installed and is working properly; the other was not working properly and has been reordered. c. Wax working area wall has been built d. Welding curtain has been installed e. Improvements to the ventilation system have not yet begun. Contractor plans to start pre-construction meetings after July 14th f. Additional 220Volt outlets in the general studio - Not yet addressed g. Silica dust venting in the sand molding area - Not yet addressed h. Chemical vent hood for metal patina area - Not yet addressed i. Major findings from self studies and peer reviews regarding institutional effectiveness a. The major findings from the Self Study / peer review included: converting 3 visiting lecturer positions to tenure-track positions, hire 5 additional tenure track faculty members; safety improvements, upgrade ventilation and renovate facilities; improve advising. 2. Please see facilities improvements listed in A. 4. 3. 2005-2006 hired new tenure track faculty in interior design and sculpture 4. Proposal put forward to reclassify current staff member as a full-time art academic advisor allowing more individualized student and advisement. Decision pending reclassification 5. Proposal put forward for hire full-time safety and maintenance technician for sculpture facility to meet NASAD progress requirements. 6. Response to effectiveness – related accreditation requirements established by SACS, etc. 1. We continue to make progress and submit progress reports to NASAD on the items noted in the last NASAD report. Responses to improvements and upgrades to facilities have been very positive.

Teaching Activities

Award and Cheryl Goldsleger received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award. George Beasley was honored with the Phoenix Award from the City of Atlanta. Several faculty members lead Studios Abroad programs to Egypt, France, Ghana, Italy and Russia. Technology integration continues to progress with more students learning new and varied ways to integrate technology into the artistic and academic work. Director Ralph Gilbert was appointed Associate Dean for the Fine Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences as of July 1 and Cheryl Goldsleger was appointed Director of the School of Art and Design as of the same date. Work to complete these changes began in summer of 2005 in the planning stage and, although not completely progressive, progress has been made. All faculty members in the Arts and Humanities Building anticipate a much better facility upon completion and are diligently working toward that end. Work has also begun in the Sculpture Building to improve safety, ventilation and work environment. The Learning Outcomes Assessment process met with greater success this year with all faculty participating. All sophomore level students applying to BFA major disciplines were evaluated and all graduating senior students were evaluated this year. The report should allow for greater insights into curricular issues. On a final note, the Chandler family added an additional $10,000.00 to the endowment fund to support graduate students that they started a few years ago. And, we celebrated the 100th birthday of Ernest G. Welch on May 3rd with an enjoyable luncheon party.
a. Craig Dongoski 1. Faculty, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy b. Melinda Hartwig 1. Study Abroad Course, “Egypt in the Age of the Pharaohs” at sites in Cairo, Luxor, Aswan, Egypt, May 2005 c. Pam Longobardi 1. Program Director, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy 2. Host, Brian Reffin Smith, Visiting Artist/Scholar, UK d. Melody Milbrandt 1. Led Study Abroad Program to Russia, Summer 2005 e. Teresa Brammlette-Reeves 1. Faculty, Univ. of West Georgia 2. Study Abroad in France, Fall 2005.
International Activities
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Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Art Education MFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible graduate education in the visual arts, art education and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills •Expand students understanding as visual artists, art educators, scholars and advocates of the visual arts •Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world •Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Professional Commitment (M: 1)

Educators are committed to students and their learning/development.

Relevant Associations: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication--major
2. Critical Thinking--major
3. Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Quality professional programs
3. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
4. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
5. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
6. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Expertise in Field (M: 2)

The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

Relevant Associations: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3. Quality professional programs
1.4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5. Global, cultural perspectives
1.6. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3. Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Ability to mentor (M: 3)
The educator is responsible for managing and mentoring student learning/development.
Relevant Associations: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
5. Collaboration--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3. Quality professional programs
2.1. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3. Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Professional Development (M: 4)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.
Relevant Associations: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3. Quality professional programs
2.1. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3. Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 5: Partnerships with Learning Communities (M: 5)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities
Relevant Associations: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
9. Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.1 Recruitment
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Thesis Paper - Part I (O: 1)**
Part I of the thesis proposal includes a ‘Review of Literature’ that provides scholarly background information that should include a theoretical justification, purpose and need for the study. The ‘Review of Literature’ is intended to be narrowly focused but comprehensive enough to sufficiently cover the topic. In the proposal the student also provides an outline of the methodology to be used, a description of the participants, foreseeable limitations, and a timeline for completion.

**Target for O1: Professional Commitment**
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 8 students who were evaluated 88% met the minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.65. The target score is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
88% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting the target score.

**M 2: Thesis Paper - Part I (O: 2)**
Part I of the thesis proposal includes a ‘Review of Literature’ that provides scholarly background information that should include a theoretical justification, purpose and need for the study. The ‘Review of Literature’ is intended to be narrowly focused but comprehensive enough to sufficiently cover the topic.

**Target for O2: Expertise in Field**
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 8 students who were evaluated 88% met the minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.5. The target score is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
88% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting the target score.

**M 3: Interview and Observation (O: 3)**
An interview and observation is held to determine mentoring capabilities.

**Target for O3: Ability to mentor**
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 8 students who were evaluated 88% met the minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.65. The target score is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
88% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting the target score.

**M 4: Thesis Paper - Part II (O: 4)**
Part II of the thesis paper is to implement the research project, collect and analyze data, discuss and synthesize conclusions, and present recommendations for further research. Once the research is complete then the student must write up the findings in the correct APA format and have the final Thesis approved by their Thesis Committee, Graduate Office etc.

**Target for O4: Professional Development**
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 8 students who were evaluated 88% met the minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.65. The target score is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
88% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek a higher percentage of students meeting the target score.

**M 5: Interview (O: 5)**
Interview is held between faculty member and student.

**Target for O5: Partnerships with Learning Communities**
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 8 students who were evaluated 88% met the minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.4. The target
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Area Meeting /Follow Up**
Area faculty will meet as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Interview | Outcome/Objective: Partnerships with Learning Communities
- Measure: Interview and Observation | Outcome/Objective: Ability to mentor
- Measure: Thesis Paper - Part I | Outcome/Objective: Expertise in Field
- Measure: Thesis Paper - Part II | Outcome/Objective: Professional Development

**Implementation Description:** Early Spring 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** M. Milbrandt, P. Eubanks, M. Ross

**Additional Resources:** As yet to be determined. Will have a better idea after faculty meetings.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

The large majority of students exceed minimum goals and meet target goals set by faculty.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

A small minority of students do not meet minimum standards for graduate level work.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Executive Summary**

The Ernest G. Welch school of Art and Design showed strong performance in all areas of evaluation in 2005-2006. Faculty members were active in professional development with a number of exhibitions in major venues, many articles published and numerous conference presentations. Two faculty members received important external grants: Florencia Bazzano – Nelson received a Getty Foundation grant for $20,000.00; and Ruth Stanford received a Heinz Foundation grant for $27,000.00. Both grants were given to support research. The Gallery was awarded a prestigious Warhol Foundation Grant of $50,000.00 to support “Potentially Harmful: The Art of Censorship” exhibition and related activities. In teaching Maria Gindhart received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award and Cheryl Goldsleger received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award. George Beasley was honored with the Phoenix Award from the City of Atlanta. Several faculty members lead Studies Abroad programs to Egypt, France, Ghana, Italy and Russia. Technology integration continues to progress with more students learning new and varied ways to integrate technology into the artistic and academic work. Director Ralph Gilbert was appointed Associate Dean for the Fine Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences as of July 1 and Cheryl Goldsleger was appointed Director of the School of Art and Design as of the same date. Work to complete the renovations begun in the summer of 2005 is still underway and, although not complete, progress has been made. All faculty members in the Arts and Humanities Building anticipate a much better facility upon completion and are diligently working toward that end. Work has also begun in the Sculpture Building to improve safety, ventilation and work environment. The Learning Outcomes Assessment process met with greater success this year with all faculty participating. All sophomore level students applying to BFA major disciplines were evaluated and all graduating senior students were evaluated this year. The report should allow for greater insights into curricular issues. On a final note, the Chandler family added an additional $10,000.00 to the endowment fund to support graduate students that they started a few years ago. And, we celebrated the 100th birthday of Ernest G. Welch on May 3rd with an enjoyable luncheon party.

**Contributions to the Institution**


**Highlights**

- a. Stan Anderson 1. Nominee, University Instructional Innovation Award, the Center for Teaching and Learning, GSU b. Florencia Bazzano-Nelson 1. J. Paul Getty Postdoctoral Research Fellowship in History of Arts and Humanities c. George Beasley 1. Phoenix Award, City of Atlanta, Shirley Franklin, Mayor of Atlanta, Feb. 4, 2005 (for education and professionalism in Sculpture) 2. Recognition Award, Sloss National Historic Landmark, Birmingham, AL, April 7, 2005 (for co-founding Metal Arts Program) d. Craig Dongoski 1. CENCIA (Collaborative) Grant, ($4,200.00) from College of Arts and Sciences, GSU – biofeedback machine to use collaboratively to produce soundtracks for two performances and to use in classes exploring how the act of drawing affects brainwaves e. Paula Eubanks 1. CENCIA grant ($4500) with Michael White and Richard Laub for a project involving Plum Orchard on Cumberland Island e. Maria Gindhart 1. Received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award, 2005 2. Awarded Writing Across the Curriculum grant f. Cheryl Goldsleger 1. Received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award, GSU g. Melinda Hartwig 1. 2005 Nominee for Outstanding Junior Faculty h. Melody Milbrandt 1. Division Director – Elect, Higher Education Division, National Art Education Association i. Kathy King 1. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005.
Challenges

Implementation of New Methods for assessing learning a. The School of Art and Design instituted a new method of collecting data for the Learning Outcomes Assessment project. This new method required each discipline within the School submit an area annual report. Reports were turned in to the Director as of May 15 and are being processed for the School of Art and Design Learning Outcomes Assessments report due August 1. Reports included input from all area faculty members assessing undergraduates at the end of their chosen art program and at graduation. Please refer to Learning Outcomes Assessment Report as of August 1, 2005 for a list of academic programs. Requests have been made to redesign academic programs and re-structure work load distribution and academic advising needs within the School. This reclassification came about due to the death of Tim Lodzinski, an A&D staff member, this past year. This reclassification will provide staff for excellence in academic advising in art and for superior facilities management. b. A request has been submitted to the College for a new staff member in charge of safety, maintenance and shop procedures for the Sculpture area on Edgewood Avenue 4. Evidence of improvement in specific area as a result of assessment based changes a. The National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), our accreditation organization, required facilities and health and safety improvements in the Arts and Humanities Building. Also, based on student and alumni responses to Self-Study survey questions that became part of the Action Plan, improvements to the facilities were rated highly necessary. 1. State Funding provided $3,560,000.00 to improve HVAC, elevators, and building infrastructure upgrades to correct unsafe working conditions in the School of Art and Design. Renovations to the A&D Building during the summer and fall of 2005 achieved ventilation in areas that were poorly ventilated, improved lighting and energy efficiency. Improvements to the facility have enabled us to finish the renovation in record time.

Teaching Activities

h. Timothy Flowers 1. Artists Paint Their Pets, Swan Coach House Gallery, Atlanta i. Nancy Floyd 1. Game Face, Jacksonville
Egypt 2. A Vignette Concerning the Deification of Thutmose in Digging into Egyptology m. Kathy King 1. American Masters, Santa Fe
Clay Gallery, Santa Fe, NM – 2005 2. Body Language- The Figure in Clay, Lucinda Gallery, Baltimore, MD 2005 NCECA Conference
n. Amy Landesberg 1. Commission: Center for Health and Rehabilitation, Fulton County Arts Council, Atlanta, GA 2. Photographic
Installation at Rhodes Center, Atlanta, GA 3. Mason Murer Projects, 4500 sq. ft. interior design project 4. Power Wrap, enclosure for
new Georgia Tech / Georgia Power electrical substation, Northside Drive, Atlanta. In design phase. o. Pam Longobardi 1. New
Kusokuzeshiki Shikisokuzeku: Junco Sato Pollack Art Textile Installation, Consulate General of Japan, Atlanta, Atlanta, GA 2.Kuanos
Art Biennial Textile 05, curator Jon Riis, Keiko Kawashima, and Silja Puranen, M. Zilinskas Art Gallery and Kaunas Picture Gallery,
Kaunas, Lithuaine, 3. The 11th International Lace Biennial: Contemporary Art, competition and exhibition, Spitze im Textilmuseum
1. VSA Educational Symposium: Art for Empowerment and Healing, Atlanta u. Ruth Stanford 1. Hidden in Plain Sight/The Forest in
the City, Three Rivers Arts, Pittsburgh, PA 2. Musee de Monoian, New York, NY v. Matthew Sugarman 1. Another View 11: Selected
Works from Contemporary Printmakers in conjunction with LAPS (Los Angeles Printmaking Society) 18th National Exhibition (National
Juried), Saddleback College Art Gallery, Mission Viejo, California 2. Envision the Place, Montana State University, Mountain West
Contemporary Art Exhibition and Auction, Gallatin Gateway. 3. Bird 2005 International Art Award (Open Invitational - Juried by Awards
Panel), Beijing Natural Culture Center, Gufang Gallery, P.R. China. - August w. Conne Thalken 1. ReFresh Print Biennial I, Eric Dean
Gallery, Wabash College Crawfordsville, Indiana and Nohr Gallery, Univ. of Wisconsin, Platteville, Wisconsin 2. Photography,
Museum of Contemporary Art of Georgia, Sun Trust Gallery, Atlanta, Georgia 3. Game Face, Jacksonville Museum of Modern Art,
Design Research accepted for publication in Design Studies: Theory and Research in Graphic Design, Audrey Bennet Ed. Princeton
Architectural Press 2005 (for publication in 2006) y. Michael White 1. Completed Phase I for Medium Blue, a high tech start up in
Atlanta. 5000 sq. ft. interior design

Public/Community Service
a. Stan Anderson 1. Field trip for students to Claxton Printers one of the southeast's oldest printers b. Florencia Bazzano – Nelson
and Maria Gindhart 1. Served as juror for the Arts and Crafts show at Inman Park Festival, Atlanta c. George Beasley 1. Adjunct
Faculty Member, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH (Honoree, no remuneration) Member of Kim Bissett's Thesis
Committee 2. Casting Demonstration for art MERGE, Keely Harris, Director. The Museum of Contemporary Art of Georgia, at the
Art of American Censorship. Collaborations with: a. 7 Stages Theater, Atlanta b. Youth Art Connection, Atlanta c. Grady High School,
Atlanta d. Georgia Lawyers for the Arts, Atlanta e. IMAGE Film and Video Center f. Woodruff Arts Center, Atlanta g. National Coalition
Against Censorship h. Free Expression Policy Project i. African American Studies Department j. Jan Beer Blumenfeld Center for
Ethics k. Women's Studies Department e. Nancy Floyd 1. Member, Board of Directors, The Atlanta Contemporary Arts Center f.
Melinda Hartwig 1. Served as co-host and speaker for CAA/Metropolitan Museum of Art Fellows Reception at the Michael C. Carlos
Museum, Atlanta, April 2005 g. Kathy King 1. Organizer, Empty Bowls Project, donated $500.00 to Atlanta Community Food Bank
through Empty Bowls Project (part of Art Student Union) 2. Representative, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts,
Baltimore, MD, March 2005.Developed and supervised Georgia State University Table in Exhibitors Hall for the duration of the
conference. Designed, produced and distributed over 200 informational packets on the GSU Ceramics and Sculpture program
featuring student and faculty work. h. Amy Landesberg 1. Co-Chair of the Metropolitan Public Art Committee, developed and
participated in lecture series i. Melody Milbrandt 1. Developing Internship program with High Museum Educational Specialists for GSU
art ed students to serve as guides for I See Literacy Program 2. Collaborated with Youth Art Connection and Atlanta M etro Boys and
Girls Club to host Russian Museum and Art Educators 3. Panelist with Russian Art Educators on Georgia Public Broadcasting j.
Workshop/Demonstration, copper painting process, High Museum Grand Opening, Atlanta l. Joe Peragine 1. Member, Governing
Board, Gallery Committee and Promotions Committee, Atlanta Contemporary Art Center, Atlanta m. Miriama Ross 1. Co-curator, Art
from Sierra Leone Civil War, VSA Gallery, Atlanta 2. Served on I See Literacy committee, High Museum, Atlanta n. Conne Thalken 1.
Biennial AIDS survival Project Art Exhibition and Auction, with ExLucis, student photo organization 2. Co-Coordinator, Atlanta College
of Art and GSU Joint Juried Student Exhibition at Woodruff Arts Center o. Liz Throop 1. Field trip for students to Ant Farm Interactive
2. Students created websites for: GSU Emeriti Association and Central Outreach and Advocacy (organization for homeless) 3.
Students designed promotional materials for GSU FASA smoking-cessation program

International Activities
a. Florencia Bazzano – Nelson 1. Delivered a paper entitled Malice in Wonderland at the 3rd Congreso Internacionalde Teoria E
Historia at the Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina 2. Presented a paper entitled Marta Traba: In Defenase de la critica de arte at
the symposium The Conundra of Vision: Reflexivity in Latin American Visual Culture at Cambridge University, United Kingdom 3.
Interviewee for documentary film on on Marta Traba entitled Un tigre de papel b. George Beasley 1. Development and
Implementation of Studies Abroad Course “Issues of the Landscape in Northeast Scotland”, graduate and undergraduate, 3-8 credit
2. Board of Directors, Scottish Sculpture Workshop, Lumsden, Aberdeenshire, Scotland 3. Chair – International Committee, Scottish
Sculpture Workshop, Lumsden, Aberdeenshire, Scotland c. Craig Dongoski 1. Presenter, Altered States: Transformation of
Perception, Place and Performance, Planetary Collegium, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK 2. Visiting Artist/Lecturer, American
University in Sharjah, United Arab Emirates 3. Faculty, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy d.
Melinda Hartwig 1. Served as a member of the Nynetjer Excavation, Deutsches Archaogisches Institut in Saqqara, Egypt 2. Guest
lecture entitled”Tombs, sacred space, and the negotiation of identity”at Universite de Liege, Belgium, March 2005 3. Study Abroad
Course, “Egypt in the Age of the Pharohs” at sites in Cairo, Luxor, Aswan, Egypt. May 2005 e. Amy Landesberg 1. Convergence,
group exhibition, Bejing, China f. Pam Longobardi 1. Program Director, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art,
Florence, Italy 2. Host, Brian Reffin Smith, Visiting Artist/Scholar, UK g. Melody Milbrandt 1. Paper accepted, A Collaborative Model
for Art Education teacher Preparation, International Society for Education through the Arts, Visnu, Portugal and at UNESCO's World
Conference on Arts Education, Building Creative Capacities for the 21st Century, Lisbon, Portugal 2. Led Study Abroad Program to
Russia, Summer 2005 i. Teresa Bramlette-Reeves 1. Faculty, Univ. of West Georgia Study Abroad in France, Bayeux and Paris,
France j. Miriama Ross 1. Program Director, Ghana Study Abroad Program, Summer Semester, GSU k. Matthew Sugarman 1.
Honorable Mention, Bird 2005 International Award, Beijing China 2. Work acquired by the Beijing Natural Culture Center, China
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Art History BA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible undergraduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: •Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills •Expand students understanding as scholars and advocates of the visual arts •Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world •Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of Content (M: 1)
Applies broad knowledge of content with regard to world art history
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Knowledge of Specialized Content (M: 2)
Demonstrates evidence of depth of art history knowledge in area of special interest
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 3, 8)
Demonstrates analytical skills related to art history based on research and criticism
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity  

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 4: Research Skills (M: 4)

Utilizes knowledge of research practices, criteria and standards in art history  
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: Written Communication Skills (M: 5)

Demonstrates evidence of excellence in all aspects of writing with regard to art history  
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 6: Competence in a Foreign Language (M: 6)

Demonstrates evidence of proficiency in written and verbal communication in a foreign language  
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 7: Practice in Studio Art (M: 7)

Applies broad knowledge of studio practices as they relate to art history  
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Oral Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priority Associations

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6. Undergraduate Experience

SLO 8: Critical Thinking Skills in Core Courses

1. Students formulate pertinent questions relevant to the evaluation of a work of art or an art historical problem.
2. Students discern differences and similarities between works of art through the application of aesthetic, contextual and historical knowledge.
3. Students formulate informed opinions about the value of an art historical interpretation.
4. Students apply knowledge read in their course book and learned in class to solve art-historical problems associated with material not explicitly covered in lectures.

Relevant Associations: NASAD

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

8 Critical Thinking--core

Institutional Priority Associations

1. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2. Global, cultural perspectives
3. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6. Recruitment
7. Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: AH 1700, AH 1750, AH 1850 (O: 1)

Analysis of performance based on tests in AH 1700, AH 1750, AH 1850

**Target for O1: Knowledge of Content**

Scoring 1-5. Out of 8 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.6. Target level average score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Although all students met the goal with above average scores, the area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 2: Exam in upper-level AH course (O: 2)

Review of representative test from an upper-level Art History course.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of Specialized Content**

Scoring 1-5. Out of the 6 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.5. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Although all students met the goal with above average scores, the area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 3: Exam essay questions and writing project (O: 3)

Review of test essay questions and the submitted writing project.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills**

Scoring 1-5. Out of the 6 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4. The target score goal is 4.5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Although all students met the goal with above average scores, the area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 4: Research based exam questions and writing project (O: 4)

Review of any research based exam questions and submitted writing project.

**Target for O4: Research Skills**

Scoring 1-5. Out of the 5 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.2. The target score goal is 4.5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, the area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 5: Exam essay questions and writing project (O: 5)
Review of exam essay questions and a submitted writing project

Target for O5: Written Communication Skills
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 5 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.8. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, the area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 6: Language course sequence (O: 6)
Analysis of performance in required language course sequence.

Target for O6: Competence in a Foreign Language
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 8 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, the area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 7: Studio Art Practice (O: 7)
Analysis of performance in required studio courses.

Target for O7: Practice in Studio Art
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 6 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.7. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students exceeded target score goals.

M 8: Critical Thinking Skills in Core (O: 3)
Analysis of critical thinking skills in AH 1700, 1750 & 1850

Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills
Students should score at least 70% on critical thinking assignments.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The median correct response for all critical thinking questions on the test was 63%. The median test score was 77%, with a range from 48% to 96%.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Area faculty meeting/follow up
Area faculty will meet as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: AH 1700, AH 1750, AH 1850 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Content
- Measure: Exam essay questions and writing project | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
- Measure: Written Communication Skills
- Measure: Exam in upper-level AH course | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Specialized Content
- Measure: Language course sequence | Outcome/Objective: Competence in a Foreign Language
- Measure: Research based exam questions and writing project | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills

Implementation Description: Spring Semester 2007
Responsible Person/Group: G. Gunnhouse, M. Gindhart, M. Hartwig, S. Richmond
Additional Resources: As yet undetermined. Will have better idea after discussion of area faculty.

Improve critical thinking in core
Meet with Art History faculty. Review assessment measures. Increase the number of students who are assessed. Rotate the critical thinking evaluation to a different instructor’s class. Set target of 75% for next year’s measure of performance. Implement the following instructional changes: greater use of digital technology (e.g. powerpoint presentations; study images online via Artstor database).

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Susan Richmond
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

All students met or exceeded minimum goals established.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Overall stronger performance is desired.

Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary

The Ernest G. Welch school of Art and Design showed strong performance in all areas of evaluation in 2005-2006. Faculty members were active in professional development, number of exhibitions in major venues, many articles published and numerous conference presentations. Two faculty members received important external grants: Florencia Bazzano – Nelson received a Getty Foundation grant for $20,000. 00; and Ruth Stanford received a Heinz Foundation grant for $27,000.00. Both grants were given to support research. The Gallery was awarded a prestigious Warhol Foundation Grant of $50,000.00 to support "Potentially Harmful: The Art of Censorship" exhibition and related activities. In teaching Maria Gindhart received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award and Cheryl Goldsleger received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award. George Beasley was honored with the Phoenix Award from the City of Atlanta. Several faculty members lead Studies Abroad programs to Egypt, France, Ghana, Italy and Russia. Technology integration continues to progress with more students learning new and varied ways to integrate technology into the artistic and academic work. Director Ralph Gilbert was appointed Associate Dean for the Fine Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences as of July 1 and Cheryl Goldsleger was appointed Director of the School of Art and Design as of the same date. Work to complete the renovations begun in the summer of 2005 is still underway and, although not complete, progress has been made. All faculty members in the Arts and Humanities Building anticipate a much better facility upon completion and are diligently working toward that end. Work has also begun in the Sculpture Building to improve safety, ventilation and work environment. The Learning Outcomes Assessment process met with greater success this year with all faculty participating. All sophomore level students applying to BFA major disciplines were evaluated and all graduating senior students were evaluated this year. The report should allow for greater insights into curricular issues. On a final note, the Chandler family added an additional $10,000.00 to the endowment fund to support graduate students that they started a few years ago. And, we celebrated the 100th birthday of Ernest G. Welch on May 3rd with an enjoyable luncheon party.

Contributions to the Institution


Highlights

a. Stan Anderson 1. Nominee, University Instructional Innovation Award, the Center for Teaching and Learning, GSU b. Florencia Bazzano-Nelson 1. J. Paul Getty Postdoctoral Research Fellowship in History of Arts and Humanities c. George Beasley 1. Phoenix Award, City of Atlanta, Shirley Franklin, Mayor of Atlanta, Feb. 4, 2005 (for education and professionalism in Sculpture) 2. Recognition Award, Sloss National Historic Landmark, Birmingham, AL, April 7, 2005 (for co-founding Metal Arts Program) d. Craig Dongoski 1. CENCIA (Collaborative) Grant, ($4,200.00) from College of Arts and Sciences, GSU – biofeedback machine to use collaboratively to produce soundtracks for two performances and to use in classes exploring how the act of drawing affects brainwaves e. Paula Eubanks 1. CENCIA grant ($4500) with Michael White and Richard Laub for a project involving Plum Orchard on Cumberland Island e. Maria Gindhart 1. Received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award, 2005 2. Awarded Writing Across the Curriculum grant f. Cheryl Goldsleger 1. Received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award, GSU g. Melinda Hartweg 1. 2005 Nominee for Outstanding Junior Faculty h. Melody Mbrantid 1. Division Director – Elect, Higher Education Division, National Art Education Association i. Kathy King 1. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Denmark. 2. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Hungary. 3. Residency Recipient, Haystack Mountain School of Crafts, Deer Isle, Maine, Fall 2005 j. Pam Longobardi 1. Commission, Benziger Winery, Benziger Winery Museum, Sonoma, CA 2. Commission, Lyn Kocen Architect, Richmond, VA k. Joe Peragine 1. Nomination, Louis Comfort Tiffany Foundation Award l. Ruth Stanford 1. Artist Residency Grant, Heinz Foundation, Creative Heights with the Mattress Factory Museum, Pittsburgh, PA m. Matthew Sugarman 1. Honorable Mention, Bird 2005 International Award, 2. Work acquired by the Beijing Natural Culture Center, China n. Conne Thalken 1. Outstanding Teaching Award Nominee, College of Arts and Sciences, GSU College Development a. $10,000.00 donation from the Winnie Chandler Foundation, Atlanta Alumni Relations a. Celebrated 100th birthday with a party for Ernest G. Welch, alumni and benefactor of the School of Art and Design, May 3, 2006

Challenges

Implementation of New Methods for assessing learning a. The School of Art and Design instituted a new method of collecting data for the Learning Outcomes Assessment project. This new method required each discipline within the School submit an area annual report. Reports were turned in to the Director as of May 15 and are being processed for the School of Art and Design Learning Outcomes Assessments report due August 1. Reports included input from all area faculty members assessing undergraduates at the entry level to their chosen art program and at graduation. Please refer to Learning Outcomes Assessment Report as of August 1, 2006. Implementation of academic and non-academic process changes a. Requests have been made to reclassify staff to address work load distribution and academic advising needs within the school. This reclassification came about due to the death of Tim Lodoznik, an A&D staff member, this past year. This reclassification will provide staff for excellence in academic advising in art and for superior facilities management. b. A request has been submitted to the College for a new staff member in charge of safety, maintenance and shop procedures for the Sculpture area on Edgewood Avenue 4. Evidence of improvement in specific area as a result of assessment based changes a. The National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), our accreditation organization, required facilities and health and safety improvements in the Arts and Humanities Building. Also, based on student and alumni responses to Self-Study survey questions that became part of the Action Plan, improvements to the facilities were rated highly necessary. 1. State Funding provided $3,560,000. 00 to improve HVAC, elevators, and building infrastructure upgrades to correct unsafe working conditions in the School of Art and Design. Renovations to the A&H Building during the summer and fall of 2005
achieved improved ventilation in areas that were poorly ventilated, noise reduction and studio and lighting configuration improvements. A net square footage gain for the School of Art and Design within the Arts and Humanities Building improves studios and labs for visual arts undergraduate and graduate students and allows for studio spaces for graduate students in the areas of photography, art education, interior design and graphic design for the first time. Currently follow up on unfinished, overlooked and incorrectly completed modifications during the renovation are underway. These are being addressed through complaints filed with the contractors, College assistants and with funds from Art and Arts Council. Additional 220 Volt outlets in the general studio - Not yet addressed g. Silica dust venting in the sand molding area - Not yet addressed h. Chemical vent hood for metal patina area - Not yet addressed 5. Major findings from self-studies and peer reviews regarding institutional effectiveness a. The major findings from the Self Study / peer review included: converting 3 visiting lecturer positions to tenure-track positions, hire 5 additional tenure track faculty members; safety improvements, upgrade ventilation and lighting, improve advising services. 2005-2006 hire 5 new full-time tenure track faculty in interior design and sculpture 4. Proposal put forward to reclassify current staff member as a full-time art academic advisor allowing better and more individual student advisement. Decision pending preclassification request. 5. Proposal put forward to hire full-time safety and maintenance technician for studio facility to meet NASA progress requirements. 6. Response to effectiveness related accreditation requirements established by SACS, etc. 1. We continue to make progress and submit related progress reports to NASA on the items noted in last NASA report. Responses to improvements and upgrades to facilities have been very positive.

Teaching Activities

a. Craig Dongoski 1. Faculty, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy b. Melinda Hartwig 1. Study Abroad Course, "Egypt in the Age of the Pharaohs" at sites in Cairo, Luxor, Aswan, Egypt. May 2005 c. Pam Longobardi 1. Program Director, Santa Reparata, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy 2. Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, SAR, China 3. University of the Arts, Philadelphia, PA 4. Parsons School of Design, New York, NY d. Melody Milbrandt 1. Led Study Abroad Program to Russia, Summer 2005 e. Teresa Bramlette-Reeves 1. Faculty, Univ. of West Georgia Study Abroad in France, Bayeux and Paris, France f. Miriama Ross 1. Program Director, Georgia State University Study Abroad, Summer Semester, GSU Technology for Instruction a. Art Education 1. Initiated use of I-Earn, a commercial educational website, designed to link teachers globally. b. Art History 1. Doubled use of ARTstor image database funded by Student Technology fee - $12,500.00 renewal for upcoming year. 2. Increased use of web pages for dissemination of digital images related to courses 3. Developed and improved digital databases and library guides to provide software equipment for storage, distribution, and presentation of images and scholarly material. $23,747.00 c. Ceramics 1. CER 4200: Form and Surface. Introduction and innovative use of digital technology with Photoshop and digital imaging techniques for ceramic decor production and application techniques. d. Drawing, Painting and Printmaking 1. DP 4000: Special Topics – Animation Impulse, introduced students to Photoshop, Flash and Movie software e. Graphic Design 1. Liz Throop was the primary investigator for 2005 Technology fee grant, $111,500.00 awarded 2. Taught GRD 4310 students Flash MX04 software f. Interior Design 1. Developed and applied for Student Technology Fee Grant for GSU IDEAS lab (Interior Design Electronically Assisted Studio) including AutoCAD instruction. Received 75% of funding requested: $221,000. Designed all aspects of lab for Spring 2006 realization. a. Undergraduate: 16 student computer stations, 1 instructor station 2. Developed a new graduate tech lab as part of redesign of east end of A&B 3rd floor b. Graduate: 4 computer stations dedicated to grad students g. Creative Media Center 1. Received Student Tech Grant for updating shared resources for media center. Includes upgrades for hardware and software $190,366.00. h. 751 Rooms 211 upgrades. 1 Upgrade software in lab rooms.

Research and Scholarly Activities


**Public/Community Service**


**International Activities**


---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Art History MA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST*

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Art History MA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible graduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: •Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills •Expand students understanding as scholars and advocates of the visual arts •Prepare students to be articulate of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: •Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of Content (M: 1)**

Broad knowledge of world art history

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)
**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: Knowledge of Methods and Theories (M: 2)**
Knowledge of methods and theories of art history based on exposure to substantive scholarship and research
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 3: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills (M: 3)**
Acquisition of analytical and critical thinking skills relevant to art historical ideas, issues and provenance and scholarship
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 4: Research Skills (M: 4)**
The ability to gather relevant art historical evidence
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Analytical Research Skills (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in critical analysis of research evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Written Communication Skills (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of excellence in all aspects of writing with regard to art history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Oral Communication (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of excellence in all aspects of oral presentation with regard to art history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3. Oral Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major
13. Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Competence in a Foreign Language (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of proficiency in written and oral communication in a foreign language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Part 1 of Comprehensive Exam (O: 1)
Analysis of review of part 1 of comprehensive exam

Target for O1: Knowledge of Content
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 2 students evaluated 50% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
50% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 2: Part 2 of Comprehensive Exam and AH 8010 (O: 2)
Review of part 2 of comprehensive exam and performance in AH 8010.

Target for O2: Knowledge of Methods and Theories
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 2 students evaluated 50% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
50% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 3: Part 2 of Comprehensive Exam (O: 3)
Review of part 2 of comprehensive exam

Target for O3: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 2 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.5. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
100% of the students met the goal with the slightly better than average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 4: Thesis (O: 4)
Review of thesis

Target for O4: Research Skills
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 5 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.2. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
100% of the students met the goal with a better than average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 5: Thesis (O: 5)
Review of thesis.

Target for O5: Analytical Research Skills
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 5 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.8. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
100% of the students met the goal with a better than average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.
M 6: Thesis (O: 6)
Review of thesis

Target for O6: Written Communication Skills
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 5 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.8. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
100% of the students met the goal with a better than average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 7: Seminars and/or Student Symposium (O: 7)
Performance in seminar courses and / or Student Symposium

Target for O7: Oral Communication
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 1 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
100% of the students met the goal with a better than average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 8: Foreign Language Exam or Course grades (O: 8)
Results of foreign language test or course grades

Target for O8: Competence in a Foreign Language
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 2 students evaluated 50% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 1. The average score was 1.5. The target score goal is 2.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
100% of the students met the goal with a better than average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Area faculty meeting/follow up
Area faculty will meet as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Foreign Language Exam or Course grades | Outcome/Objective: Competence in a Foreign Language
- Measure: Part 1 of Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Content
- Measure: Part 2 of Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills
- Measure: Part 2 of Comprehensive Exam and AH 8010 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Methods and Theories
- Measure: Seminars and/or Student Symposium | Outcome/Objective: Oral Communication
- Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Research Sckills
- | Research Skills | Written Communication Skills

Implementation Description: Early Spring Semester 2007
Responsible Person/Group: G. Gunnhouse, M. Gindhart, M. Hartwig, S. Richmond
Additional Resources: As yet undetermined. Will have better idea after area faculty meeting.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
As the art history faculty members begin to stabilize student success rates improve.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Not all students met minimum performance goals. It should be noted that there has been a high rate of turnover in art history faculty in the last 5 years. Stability in this area will greatly enhance student success rate.

Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
The Ernest G. Welch school of Art and Design showed strong performance in all areas of evaluation in 2005-2006. Faculty members were active in professional development with a number of exhibitions in major venues, many articles published and numerous conference presentations. Two faculty members received important external grants: Florencia Bazzano – Nelson received a Getty Foundation grant for $20,000. 00; and Ruth Stanford received a Heinz Foundation grant for $27,000.00. Both grants were given to support research. The Gallery was awarded a prestigious Warhol Foundation Grant of $50,000.00 to support "Potentially Harmful: The Art of Censorship" exhibition and related activities. In teaching Maria Gindhart received the Distinguished Honors Professor
Award and Cheryl Goldsleger received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award. George Beasley was honored with the Phoenix Award from the City of Atlanta. Several faculty members lead Studies Abroad programs to Egypt, France, Ghana, and Russia. Technology integration continues to progress with more students learning new and varied ways to integrate technology into the artistic and academic work. Director Ralph Gilbert was appointed Associate Dean for the Fine Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences as of July 1 and Cheryl Goldsleger was appointed Director of the School of Art and Design as of the same date. Work to improve facilities began in summer 2005 and, although not completely completed, progress in 2006 is underway. All faculty members in the Arts and Humanities Building anticipate a much better facility upon completion and are diligently working toward that end. Work has also begun in the Sculpture Building to improve safety, ventilation and work environment. The Learning Outcomes Assessment process met with greater success this year with all faculty participating. All sophomore level students applying to BFA major disciplines were evaluated and all graduating senior students were evaluated this year. The report should allow for greater insights into curricular issues. On a final note, the Chandler family added an additional $10,000.00 to the endowment fund to support graduate students that they started a few years ago. And, we celebrated the 100th birthday of Ernest G. Welsh on May 3rd with an enjoyable luncheon party.

**Contributions to the Institution**


**Highlights**

a. Stan Anderson 1. Nominee, University Instructional Innovation Award, the Center for Teaching and Learning, GSU b. Florencia Bazzano-Nelson 1. J. Paul Getty Postdoctoral Research Fellowship in History of Art and Humanities c. George Beasley 1. Phoenix Award d. Shirley Franklin 1. For Academic Achievement in Sculpture, Foundation of Atlanta, February 2005 e. Michel Bazzano-Nelson 1. Recognition Award, Sloss National Historic Landmark, Birmingham, AL, April 7, 2005 (for co-founding Metal Arts Program) d. Craig Dongoski 1. CENCIA (Collaborative) Grant, ($4,200.00) from College of Arts and Sciences, GSU – biofeedback machine to use to communicate social behaviors for two performances and to use in classes exploring how the act of drawing affects brainwaves e. Paula Eubanks 1. CENCIA grant ($4500) with Michael White and Richard Laub for a project involving Plum Orchard on Cumberland Island f. Cheryl Goldsleger 1. Received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award, 2005 2. Awarded Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Award 3. Cheryl Goldsleger Outstanding Faculty Award 4. University Outstanding Faculty Award, GSU g. Melinda Hartwig 1. 2005 Nominee for Outstanding Junior Faculty h. Melody Mibrandt 1. Division Director – Elect, Higher Education Division, National Art Education Association i. Kathy King 1. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Denmark. 2. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Hungary. 3. Bethany Johnson 1. Outstanding Teaching Award Nominee, College of Arts and Sciences College Development a. $10,000.00 donation from the Winnie present Foundation, Atlanta, GA b. Kari Foy 1. Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Hungary. 2. University Outstanding Faculty Award, City of Atlanta, Shirley Franklin, Mayor of Atlanta, Feb. 4, 2005 (for education and professionalism in Sculpture) 2. Bureau of Cultural Affairs, Atlanta for Potentially Harmful: The Art of American Censorship, $50,000.00 c. Cheryl Goldsleger 1. The Getty Foundation, “Art Criticism and Inter-American Relations,” $20,000.00 2. Bureau of Cultural Affairs, Atlanta for Potentially Harmful: The Art of American Censorship, $1,500.00

**Challenges**

Implementation of New Methods for assessing learning a. The School of Art and Design instituted a new method of collecting data for the Learning Outcomes Assessment project. This new method required each discipline within the School submit an area annual report. Reports were turned in to the Director as of May 15 and are being processed for the School of Art and Design Learning Outcomes Assessment report due August 1. Reports included input from all area faculty members assessing undergraduates at the entry level to their chosen art program and at graduation. Please refer to Learning Outcomes Assessment Report as of August 1, 2006. Implementation of academic and non-academic process changes a. Requests have been made to reclassify staff to address work load distribution and academic advising needs within the school. This reclassification came about due to the death of Tim Louchen and the departure of an A&D staff member, thus reclassification will provide staff for administrative office work and for superior facilities management. b. A request has been submitted to the College for a new staff member in charge of safety, maintenance and shop procedures for the Sculpture area on Edgewood Avenue 4. Evidence of improvement in specific area as a result of assessment based changes a. The National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), our accreditation organization, required facilities and health and safety improvements in the Arts and Humanities Building. Also, based on student and alumni responses to Self-Study survey questions that became part of the Action Plan, improvements to the facilities were rated highly necessary. 1. State Funding provided $3,560,000. 00 to improve HVAC, elevators, and building infrastructure upgrades to correct unsafer working conditions in the School of Art and Design. Renovations to the A&H Building during the summer and fall of 2005 achieved improved ventilation in areas that were poorly ventilated, noise reduction and studio and lighting configuration improvements. A net square footage gain for the School of Art and Design within the Arts and Humanities Building improves studios and labs for undergraduate and graduate students and allows for studio spaces for graduate students in the areas of photography, art education, interior design and graphic design for the first time. Currently follow up on unfinished, overlooked and incorrectly completed modifications during the renovation are underway. These are being addressed through complaints filed with the contractors, College assistance and with monies from Art and Design as funds permit. Areas with critical problems due to incorrect renovations are ceramics and photo. 2. After a recommendation from NASAD and a $20,000.00 study assessed major health and safety concerns in the Edgewood facility. $200,000.00 has been allocated from the University to fix ventilation and safety problems in the Sculpture Building on Edgewood Ave. The following list is a summary of progress with this project. a. Downdraft welding and cutting areas are currently being installed in the sculpture facility b. Stop brakes for grinders: one has been installed and is working properly; the other was not working properly and has been reordered. c. Wax working area wall has been built. d. Welding curtain has been installed e. Improvements to the ventilation system have not yet begun. Contractor plans to start pre-construction meetings after July 14th f. Additional 220Volt outlets in the general studio - Not yet addressed g. Silica dust venting in the sand molding area - Not yet addressed h. Chemical vent hood for metal patina area - Not yet addressed i. Major findings from self studies and peer reviews regarding institutional effectiveness a. The major findings from the Self Study / peer review included: converting 3 visiting lecturer positions to tenure-track positions, hire 5 additional tenure track faculty members; safety improvements, upgrade ventilation and renovate facilities; improve advising. 2. Please see facilities improvements listed in A. 4. 3. 2005-2006 hired new tenure track faculty in interior design and sculpture 4. Proposal put forward to reclassify current staff member as a full-time art academic advisor allowing for more individual student advising 5. Proposal put forward hiring full-time safety and maintenance technician for sculpture facility to meet NASAD progress requirements. 6. Response to effectiveness – related accreditation requirements established by SACS, etc. 1. We continue to make progress and submit progress reports to NASAD on the items noted in the last NASAD report. Responses to improvements and upgrades to facilities have been positive.

**Teaching Activities**
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

Mission / Purpose
The department is an integral part of the University mission of education, research, and public service. In particular, the department's mission in these three areas is Education: To provide our students with the skills and knowledge to be successful practitioners and leaders in their field. To prepare students for long-term success in fast-changing areas of research and technological development. Research: To extend our current understanding in a variety of sub-fields of physics and astronomy by performing state-of-the-art research. To collaborate with other departments and institutions in cutting edge research. To prepare students to perform and direct state-of-the-art research in individual and collaborative environments. Service: To support other programs within the university through training in physics and astronomy. To work with local, state, and national communities in communicating the roles and benefits of physics and astronomy in our lives.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Collaboration (M: 3)
Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 1, 4)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

SLO 3: Formulate Research Questions (M: 1, 4)
Students develop research questions appropriate for research.

SLO 4: Data Collection (M: 1, 4)
Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.

SLO 5: Data Analysis (M: 1, 4)
Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.

SLO 6: Future Research (M: 1, 4)
Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

SLO 7: Oral Communication (M: 1, 3)
Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research, such as a scientific meeting, conference, or colloquium.

International Activities

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Astronomy PhD
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
**SLO 8: Written Communication (M: 3, 4)**
Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research, such as scientific journals.

**SLO 9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles (M: 1, 2, 4)**
Astronomy Ph.D. students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge. Areas of required knowledge are: i. at least two of the core physics areas, classical mechanics, advanced electromagnet theory, advanced quantum mechanics, and advanced statistical mechanics. ii. fundamental astrophysics and astronomical instrumentation and techniques. iii. stellar atmospheres, stellar structure and evolution, the interstellar medium, extragalactic astronomy, and relativistic astrophysics and cosmology.

**SLO 10: Math Skills and Application (M: 1, 2, 4)**
All Ph.D. students shall be able to demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and tensor analysis, Fourier series and boundary value problems, and complex analysis.

**SLO 11: Computer Skills (M: 3)**
Students effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing.

**SLO 12: Specialized Equipment (M: 3)**
Students effectively use appropriate specialized equipment for experimental or theoretical research.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Dissertation Presentation and Defense (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10)**
In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the oral presentation and defense, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, oral communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 16 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O3: Formulate Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 16 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O4: Data Collection**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 16 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 16 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>4.3 out of 5.0</th>
<th>Outcome 5, Data Analysis</th>
<th>4.4 out of 5.0</th>
<th>Outcome 6, Future Research</th>
<th>4.1 out of 5.0</th>
<th>Outcome 7, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</th>
<th>4.1 out of 5.0</th>
<th>Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application</th>
<th>4.3 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O6: Future Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 16 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.

**Target for O7: Oral Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 16 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.

**Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by the exam committee after completing Qualifying Exam 2. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.

**Target for O10: Math Skills and Application**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by the exam committee after completing Qualifying Exam 2. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.

**M 2: Qualifying Exam 2 (O: 9, 10)**
As part of the M.S. program, each astronomy graduate student takes a first qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on the broad scope of astronomy and astrophysics and the essential skills required to apply the relevant physical and mathematical reasoning. Students are counseled at this point on their preparedness for further study. Each Ph.D. student takes a second qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on graduate level astronomy and astrophysics, followed by an oral exam with a committee of four faculty members. Students are advised on their degree progress, and for Ph.D. students, on their preparedness for independent research. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by the exam committee after completing Qualifying Exam 2. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.

**Target for O10: Math Skills and Application**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four students were rated by the exam committee after completing Qualifying Exam 2. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.
**M 3: Research Advisor (O: 1, 7, 8, 11, 12)**

The students work in close collaboration with their research advisor throughout the course of their Ph.D. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student’s progress in collaboration and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the research advisor following the student’s successful dissertation defense. The advisor rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O1: Collaboration**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 5.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O7: Oral Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 5.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O8: Written Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 5.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O11: Computer Skills**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 5.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O12: Specialized Equipment**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 5.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

**M 4: Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10)**

In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the written dissertation, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, written communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0
### Target for O3: Formulate Research Questions

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0

### Target for O4: Data Collection

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0

### Target for O5: Data Analysis

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0

### Target for O6: Future Research

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0

### Target for O8: Written Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0

### Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0

### Target for O10: Math Skills and Application

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0
as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.4 out of 5.0

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Over the assessment period (2005/2006 academic year), 4 students received Ph.D. degrees in Astronomy. Since we have small numbers of students involved at each assessment point, accurate measures of student learning outcomes will required averaging over several years. In addition, progress can not be measured yet since this is the first year of the assessment. But given those caveats, the Astronomy Ph.D. program shows strength across the board in the areas assessed. Particular strength was measured in areas related to scientific data collection and analysis and computer skills.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The areas of weakest performance were in written and oral communication, although these were still at or near target levels.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Behavior and Learning Disabilities Certification**

*As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST*

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

Through a focus on teacher education as an area of excellence and research, the BLD Program in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education is committed to preparing special educators who can make decisions that enable them to provide high quality instruction and support services consistent with the diverse needs and abilities of individuals with disabilities and their families. Because there is a critical shortage of teachers for students with mild disabilities in Georgia, the members of the BLD Faculty are committed to attracting and retaining highly qualified students who will become new special education teachers. The members of the BLD Faculty recognize that the personnel we prepare must have the flexibility to adapt to the changing role of the special educator, the changing patterns regarding how special education services are delivered, and the changing social and economic context in which individuals with disabilities will live. The growing availability of technology tools, improvements in field-based learning experiences, implementation of research-supported practices in special education, a focus on effective communication, and working collaboratively with other special educators, general educators, parents, and support personnel all have bearing on the enhancement of student learning. The BLD certification program is a post-baccalaureate program giving students initial teacher certification in Special Education General Curriculum:Consultative. A new program plan was developed and approved during 05-06 for this certification. During 05-06 the BLD certification program had approximately 16 students in the certification program.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Understands student development regarding learning (M: 2)**

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)**

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 4)**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC
**O/O 4: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)**
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**O/O 5: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)**
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**O/O 6: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 7)**
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**O/O 7: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 8)**
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**O/O 8: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)**
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**O/O 9: Involves school and community in learning (M: 10)**
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC
**O/O 10: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 1)**

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

### M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 10)

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O10: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 1)

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O1: Understands student development regarding learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 2)

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

**Target for O2: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 3)

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance at the final practicum rating are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

**Target for O3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 4)

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor.
supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

88% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 5)**

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6.

**Target for O5: Uses communication skills and technology**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

89% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 6)**

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.

**Target for O6: Can effectively plan for instruction**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

88% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 7)**

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.

**Target for O7: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

87% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 8)**

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9.

**Target for O8: Practices professional reflection**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

87% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 9)**

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.

**Target for O9: Involves school and community in learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

88% of students were rated at or above the expected level.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Monitor Data in New Program
The EPSE graduate program faculty in BLD will implement the new approved highly qualified programs, monitor the STARS data collection process, assess whether or not the new program data collection process matches the new program, and make recommendations for appropriate changes as needed.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: June 2007
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Indicators are positive in all areas. Students continue to meet the program learning outcomes.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Behavior and Learning Disabilities MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Through a focus on teacher education as an area of excellence and research, the BLD Program in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education is committed to preparing special educators who can make decisions that enable them to provide high quality instruction and support services consistent with the diverse needs and abilities of individuals with disabilities and their families. Because there is a critical shortage of teachers for students with mild disabilities in Georgia, the members of the BLD Faculty are committed to attracting and retaining highly qualified students who will become new special education teachers. The members of the BLD Faculty recognize that the personnel we prepare must have the flexibility to adapt to the changing role of the special educator, the changing patterns regarding how special education services are delivered, and the changing social and economic context in which individuals with disabilities will live. The growing availability of technology tools, improvements in field-based learning experiences, implementation of research-supported practices in special education, a focus on effective communication, and working collaboratively with other special educators, general educators, parents, and support personnel all have bearing on the enhancement of student learning. The BLD Master's program is a graduate program giving students teacher certification in Special Education General Curriculum: Consultative. A new program plan was developed and approved during 05-06 for this degree. During 05-06 the BLD Master's program had approximately 50 students in the program, with 25 students completing the Master's program.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 1)

Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

Institutional Priority Associations

Strategic Plan Associations

O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 2)

The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

Institutional Priority Associations

Strategic Plan Associations

O/O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 3)

The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

Institutional Priority Associations
O/O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 4)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.
Relevant Associations: NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Participates in profession’s learning communities (M: 5)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.
Relevant Associations: NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 2)
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.
M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

Target for O5: Participates in profession’s learning communities

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Monitor Data
The EPSE graduate program faculty in BLD will implement the new approved highly qualified programs, monitor the STARS data collection process, assess whether or not the new program data collection process matches the new program, and make recommendations for appropriate changes as needed.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: June 2007
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Indicators are positive in all areas. Students continue to meet the program learning outcomes.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2005-2006 Biology BS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Biology is firmly committed to the twin goals of Excellence and Distinctiveness set forth in the University's Strategic Plan. The Mission of the Department is: a. to provide students with a basic core of scientific literacy in biology that is essential for success in the society of tomorrow; b. to increase the understanding of biological processes through cutting edge research programs, thereby providing students with the opportunity to explore exciting new frontiers through biological research; and c. to work with others in the University system and the state of Georgia in reaching out to the public and communicating the many ways in which new discoveries in biology impact our daily lives and affect the future of our community.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Scientific Inquiry (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12)
Students will be able to: 1) ask scientific questions and construct reasonable hypotheses; 2) design and conduct investigations; 3) perform laboratory skills and procedures; 4) understand and analyze results; 5) formulate and defend alternative explanations and models on the basis of evidence; and 6) solve problems addressing biological questions

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16)
Students will be able to a) communicate effectively in oral and written form; b) read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature for content; c) critique and analyze claims of others in a scientific context; 4) demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology; and 5) work effectively in group situations

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
**SLO 3: History, Nature and Impact of Biology (M: 10, 11, 13)**

Students will be able to: 1) discuss historical changes in biological theories over time; 2) analyze how the political, social, economic and cultural influences exert an impact on biological concepts.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**SLO 4: Content in Biology (M: 2, 3, 4, 12, 14, 15, 16)**

Students will be able to: 1) apply knowledge from other scientific disciplines to the understanding of fundamental biological principles; 2) demonstrate knowledge of the following general principles of biology, including their applications and relationships: a) molecular processes, b) cell structure and function, c) reproduction and heredity, d) evolution and diversity, e) organismal form and function, and f) interdependence of organisms and their environment.

**SLO 5: Critical thinking**

Students appropriately evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses. Students use the results of analysis to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new questions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 8 Critical Thinking--core

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Examination score on critical thinking examination (O: 1)**

Students are given three questions involving the analysis of data and requiring the formulation of hypotheses.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

At least 75% of students must receive a score of 66.7% on the examination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

85% received a score that met or exceeded the expectations.

**M 2: Retrieval of data from databases (O: 1, 2, 4)**

Students in BIOL2800 use online protein sequence databases to ask and answer evolutionary questions.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

70% of students score 80% or better on the assignment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

80% of students scored 80% or better on this assignment.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

70% of students score 80% or better on the assignment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

80% of students scored 80% or better on this assignment.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**

70% of students score 80% or better on the assignment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

80% of students scored 80% or better on this assignment.

**M 3: Analyze experimental data (O: 1, 4)**

Students in BIOL3810 are given a picture of an SDS-PAGE gel and they must interpret the band pattern.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

70% of students will correctly answer the questions.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

85% of students correctly answered the question on the exam about the SDS-PAGE gel.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**

70% of students will correctly answer the questions.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
85% of students correctly answered the question on the exam about the SDS-PAGE gel.

**M 4: Genetics (O: 4)**

Students in BIOL3900 were asked an exam question regarding genetic crossover.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**

70% of students should score 75% or better on this question.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

50% of students scored 75% or better on this question.

**M 5: Using computers and databases (O: 1, 2)**

In BIOL2108, students used PubMed and other online resources to write a comprehensive review paper on plant physiology.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

70% of student should correctly use databases and cite sources.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met

98% of students correctly used the database and cited sources.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

70% of student should correctly use databases and cite sources.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met

98% of students correctly used the database and cited sources.

**M 6: Interpretation of Graphical Information (O: 1)**

Students in Biol 3810 will interpret a graph on enzyme kinetics.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

70% of students construct logical interpretations.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met

By the end of the semester, 88% of students could logically interpret graphical data.

**M 7: Construct Hypothesis (O: 1)**

Students in Biol 2108K were asked to construct a hypothesis involving the effects of hormones on plant growth, design and undertake experiments to test it, and then interpret the results in terms of the original hypothesis. Evaluation was based on a 5-page laboratory report.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

70% of students should develop a reasonable hypothesis.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met

86% of students developed a reasonable hypothesis.

**M 8: Conduct investigations (O: 1, 2)**

Students in Biol 3810 and 3250 develop approaches to answering biological questions.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

70% of students should score 75% or better

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met

86% of students score better than 75% on their lab notebook.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

70% of students should score 75% or better

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met

86% of students score better than 75% on their lab notebook.

**M 9: Writing Lab Reports (O: 2)**

BIOL3810 students write formal lab reports for an experiment involving protein isolation and identification.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

70% of students earn 75% or better on the lab report.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students scored an average of 85% on the lab report.

#### M 10: Critical analysis of primary literature (O: 2, 3)
Students in Biol 2108 will prepare one comprehensive review papers during the semester and will be using PubMed and library sources to cite references properly. Data are reported as % of students who cite refs properly.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**
75% of students can score 75% or better on the exam question.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
98% of students had the correct answer.

**Target for O3: History, Nature and Impact of Biology**
75% of students can score 75% or better on the exam question.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
98% of students had the correct answer.

#### M 11: Students will work well in groups (O: 2, 3)
Students in BIOL2107K worked in groups on specific projects as outreach programs.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**
75% of students will participate in the class discussions.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
88% of students participated in the class discussions.

**Target for O3: History, Nature and Impact of Biology**
75% of students will participate in the class discussions.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
88% of students participated in the class discussions.

#### M 12: Analysis of data (O: 1, 4)
Students in BIOL3250 will analyze their results from 8 physiological experiments performed throughout the semester. Some formats will include class discussion, while others will be formal written reports. Results from class discussions will be reported as % of students participating in discussion. Results from written reports are reported as % students who interpreted results correctly.

Students in BIOL3240 will be asked on an exam or in-class case study session to read a patient history and clinical data and derive a differential diagnosis. Students were taught throughout the semester how to read patient cases and use their knowledge on physiology to solve problems. This task entailed critical thinking and group interactions. Data are expressed as % students with correct answer. By the end of the semester, students were proficient in solving a variety of patient case studies.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**
75% of students will score 70% or better on these exam questions.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
45% of students answered the question correctly on the exam.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**
75% of students will score 70% or better on these exam questions.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
45% of students answered the question correctly on the exam.

#### M 13: Relate course material to Current Events (O: 3)
Students will be assigned chapters from The Last Hours of Ancient Sunlight by Thom Hartmann. This book deals with the issues of oil production and consumption, the hoarding mentality of unsuccessful cultures, and their inevitable demise. It also offers solutions to confronting the oil crisis and culture wars. Topics such as, carbon cycle, deforestation, extinction, climate change, human culture evolution, social structure, the use of media and television, and use of technology will be covered each week. Students will be "tested" each exam by offering their opinion of the assigned chapters. Results are presented on % students answering the question indicating their opinion of the topic. Questions will be phrased so that students who have not read the assignment will not be able to answer the question.

**Target for O3: History, Nature and Impact of Biology**
75% of students should score 80% or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
70% of students score 80% or better on this essay.
**M 14: Molecular Processes (O: 4)**

Students demonstrate the function of memory cells of the immune system.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**

70% of students correctly answer the exam question.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

73% of students got the exam question on memory cells correct.

**M 15: Evolution and Diversity (O: 4)**

Open-ended exam questions in BIOL3840 address whether students understand the concept of evolution and its role in diversity of life.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**

70% of students score 75% or better on this question.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

85% of students scored 75% or better on this question.

**M 16: Glucose regulation (O: 2, 4)**

Students in BIOL2107 were asked an essay exam question about glucose regulation in the blood stream.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

75% of students score 80% or better on this question.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

82% of students scored 80% or better on this question.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**

75% of students score 80% or better on this question.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

82% of students scored 80% or better on this question.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Improve content knowledge and utilization**

The test measuring content knowledge in genetics revealed a deficiency in student mastery, while students taking the test in molecular processes, although meeting the target level, were marginally proficient. We believe that performance in these areas (and all content areas) would benefit if students were given the opportunity to solve additional problems and take part in other exercises where they use the information rather than relying on last-minute memorization. A pilot Supplemental Instruction program (where graduate students and undergraduates provide peer-assisted study sessions) is meeting with success in our non-majors biology courses. We will expand the numbers of SI sessions to include introductory majors’ courses (Biol 2107/2108) and the upper division gateway course (Biol 3800).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Evolution and Diversity | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
  - Measure: Genetics | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
  - Measure: Glucose regulation | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
  - Measure: Molecular Processes | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The instructors of SI courses and the SI director for the University
- **Additional Resources:** Funds will be required to pay the SI leaders for the additional classes.

**Improve Data Analysis Skills**

Only 45% of students in an upper division course successfully answered a question requiring analysis of data, a number that falls short of our target goal of 70%. Faculty will incorporate additional activities that involve data analysis at the introductory levels and in the gateway courses (Biol 3800 and Biol 3810).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Analysis of data | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Inquiry
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty teaching introductory courses and the gateway course, along with laboratory coordinators
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Biology MS
As of 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Biology is firmly committed to the twin goals of Excellence and Distinctiveness set forth in the University’s Strategic Plan. The Mission of the Department is: a. to provide students with a basic core of scientific literacy in biology that is essential for success in the society of tomorrow; b. to increase the understanding of biological processes through cutting edge research programs, thereby providing students with the opportunity to explore exciting new frontiers through biological research; and c. to work with others in the University system and the state of Georgia in reaching out to the public and communicating the many ways in which new discoveries in biology impact our daily lives and affect the future of our community.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Scientific Inquiry (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1) form hypotheses, design experiments, collect data, and evaluate results; 2) comprehend the current scientific literature; 3) place reports of new discoveries into the context of previous scientific progress; and 4) develop an understanding of the impact of these discoveries on science and society.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

SLO 2: Scientific Communication (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and/or oral formats.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major

SLO 3: Scientific Content (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Non-thesis Report (O: 1, 2, 3)
1) Students enroll in Biol 8888, the capstone course for the MS non-thesis track. 2) Students submit a 20-page non-thesis paper (either a critical review of a defined topic or a description of a research project) to their faculty advisor, who offers constructive criticism. 3) After addressing comments from advisors, students submit the corrected copy to a 2-member faculty committee, who also critique the paper. 3) Students submit a final copy that is then graded by the joint committee as Excellent (A), Satisfactory (B), or Unsatisfactory (C or below).

Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry
80% of students on the non-thesis MS track complete the non-thesis paper with a Satisfactory rating or above.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the 2005-2006 academic year, a total of 67 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 non-thesis MS capstone course. 37 of the students (55%) completed the course requirements in time to receive a grade by the end of the semester in which they enrolled. Of these, 100% met the target performance level, with 29 (78%) receiving an “excellent” ranking and 8 (22%) receiving a “satisfactory” ranking. Of the remaining 30 students, 2 withdrew, and the other 28 received an I (Incomplete). Thus, although 100% of the students completing the capstone performed satisfactorily, only 55% of those initially enrolled in the class successfully met the requirements during the semester in which they enrolled in the capstone course. Update for 2006: All 28 students who received an Incomplete subsequently completed their course requirements and received an evaluation. Of these, 11 (39%) received an “excellent” ranking, 12 (42%) received a “satisfactory” ranking, and 5 (18%) received an “unsatisfactory” ranking. Combining these results with the initial evaluation, the total rankings are: “Excellent” – 40
(60%); “Satisfactory” – 20 (30%); “Unsatisfactory” – 5 (8%). Therefore, the target goal of 80% meeting or exceeding the “Satisfactory” ranking has now been met.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

80% of students on the non-thesis MS track complete the non-thesis paper with a Satisfactory rating or above.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the 2005-2006 academic year, a total of 67 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 non-thesis MS capstone course. 37 of the students (55%) completed the course requirements in time to receive a grade by the end of the semester in which they enrolled. Of these, 100% met the target performance level, with 29 (78%) receiving an “excellent” ranking and 8 (22%) receiving a “satisfactory” ranking. Of the remaining 30 students, 2 withdrew, and the other 28 received an I (Incomplete). Thus, although 100% of the students completing the capstone performed satisfactorily, only 55% of those initially enrolled in the class successfully met the requirements during the semester in which they enrolled in the capstone course. Update for 2006: All 28 students who received an Incomplete subsequently completed their course requirements and received an evaluation. Of these, 11 (39%) received an “excellent” ranking, 12 (42%) received a “satisfactory” ranking, and 5 (18%) received an “unsatisfactory” ranking. Combining these results with the initial evaluation, the total rankings are: “Excellent” – 40 (60%); “Satisfactory” – 20 (30%); “Unsatisfactory” – 5 (8%). Therefore, the target goal of 80% meeting or exceeding the “Satisfactory” ranking has now been met.

**Target for O3: Scientific Content**

80% of students on the non-thesis MS track complete the non-thesis paper with a Satisfactory rating or above.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the 2005-2006 academic year, a total of 67 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 non-thesis MS capstone course. 37 of the students (55%) completed the course requirements in time to receive a grade by the end of the semester in which they enrolled. Of these, 100% met the target performance level, with 29 (78%) receiving an “excellent” ranking and 8 (22%) receiving a “satisfactory” ranking. Of the remaining 30 students, 2 withdrew, and the other 28 received an I (Incomplete). Thus, although 100% of the students completing the capstone performed satisfactorily, only 55% of those initially enrolled in the class successfully met the requirements during the semester in which they enrolled in the capstone course. Update for 2006: All 28 students who received an Incomplete subsequently completed their course requirements and received an evaluation. Of these, 11 (39%) received an “excellent” ranking, 12 (42%) received a “satisfactory” ranking, and 5 (18%) received an “unsatisfactory” ranking. Combining these results with the initial evaluation, the total rankings are: “Excellent” – 40 (60%); “Satisfactory” – 20 (30%); “Unsatisfactory” – 5 (8%). Therefore, the target goal of 80% meeting or exceeding the “Satisfactory” ranking has now been met.

**M 2: Thesis Report (O: 1, 2, 3)**

1) Students prepare a thesis proposal, that is reviewed by a committee of at least three faculty members. Upon approval of the proposal, students undertake their thesis research. 2) Students complete the thesis and present an oral defense before the 3-member faculty committee and a general audience consisting of interested faculty and students.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Three students submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on the thesis track.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Three students submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on the thesis track.

**Target for O3: Scientific Content**

80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Three students submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on the thesis track.

**M 3: Time for completion of MS degree (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students should complete the MS degree in a timely fashion.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

60% of students should complete their MS degree within 3 years.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

61 students completed their M.S. degree during the 2005-2006 year. Of these, 69% completed their degree within three years. The average time to completion of degree was 2.74 years, and the median time was 2.33 years.
Target for O2: Scientific Communication
60% of students should complete their MS degree within 3 years.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
61 students completed their M.S. degree during the 2005-2006 year. Of these, 69% completed their degree within three years. The average time to completion of degree was 2.74 years, and the median time was 2.33 years.

Target for O3: Scientific Content
60% of students should complete their MS degree within 3 years.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
61 students completed their M.S. degree during the 2005-2006 year. Of these, 69% completed their degree within three years. The average time to completion of degree was 2.74 years, and the median time was 2.33 years.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Improve efficiency in completing research paper
Although the numbers of students completing the capstone research paper who achieve the criteria for success (Excellent or Satisfactory) meet the target performance level, there is large contingent of students who take more than one semester to finish the paper and therefore receive an I in the Biol 8888 capstone course. Students will be strongly encouraged to begin their non-thesis research at least one semester before they enroll in Biol 8888 so they can stay on track to graduate. In addition, faculty committee members will be asked to make corrections to student drafts in a timely fashion.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director plus all faculty members on non-thesis MS committees

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Of those students who completed their non-thesis papers, the overwhelming majority (93%) submitted Satisfactory or Excellent assignments.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We interpret the large number of Incompletes (29%) to be an artifact of the non-thesis mentoring process. Each non-thesis paper is evaluated and corrected three times by the student’s advisor and two times by the other members of the faculty committee. Many students typically need more than one semester to incorporate all faculty suggestions and make necessary revisions on their paper. We believe that the advantages of continuous mentorship and feedback counterbalance the time taken to complete the papers. Therefore, we will encourage students to enroll in Biol 8888 two semesters before they plan to graduate, in case they need to make substantial revisions to their submissions. We note that of the 28 students who received incompletes in Biol 8888, 81% completed their non-thesis papers with a grade of Satisfactory or higher during the following year. This brings the total number of students who achieved an acceptable outcome to 92%.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Biology PhD
(Acknowledged: 2006-12-12 02:40 EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Biology Department is firmly committed to the dual goals of Excellence and Distinctiveness set forth in the University’s Strategic Plan. The mission of the Biology Department is: a) to provide students with the basic core of scientific literacy in biology that is essential for success in the society of tomorrow; b) to increase the understanding of biological processes through cutting edge research programs, thereby providing students with the opportunity to explore exciting new frontiers through biological research; and c) to work with others in the University system and the state of Georgia in reaching out to the public and communicating the many ways in which new discoveries in biology impact our daily lives and affect the future of our community.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Scientific Inquiry (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1) form hypotheses, design experiments, collect data, and evaluate results; 2) comprehend the current scientific literature; 3) place reports of new discoveries into the context of previous scientific progress; and 4) develop an
understanding of the impact of these discoveries on science and society.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

**SLO 2: Scientific Communication (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and oral formats.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major

**SLO 3: Scientific Content (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Time to receipt of degree (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students are expected to complete their degrees in a timely fashion. The current median time to receipt of degree in the biological disciplines that form the research focus in our department is approximately 6-6.5 years.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the department during the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 5 (45%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the department during the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 5 (45%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less.

**Target for O3: Scientific Content**

50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the department during the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 5 (45%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less.

**M 2: Ph.D. Qualifying Examination (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students must prepare, submit and orally defend an NIH-style research proposal. The examination process follows a specific timeline. 1) Students must submit a pre-proposal in which they state the nature of the problem, present their hypothesis, and briefly describe their experimental design. The pre-proposal is evaluated by a 3-member faculty committee who either grant their approval or make suggestions. 2) After the pre-proposal or a revised pre-proposal has been approved, students have two months to complete the full proposal. During this time period, they receive mentoring from their Committee in the form of 1-2 meetings in which they present their progress on developing the proposal and receive suggestions from the Committee. 3) Students submit their completed proposals and orally defend them before their Committees. The Committee then makes one of the following assessments of student performance: a) Pass (satisfactory performance on both the written and oral parts of the examination); b) Qualified Pass (satisfactory performance on the written proposal, but deficiencies noted in the oral defense); c) Conditional Pass (certain parts of the written proposal must be revised); or Fail (unsatisfactory performance on both the proposal and the oral defense). Students who Fail the examination two times are subject to expulsion from the Ph.D. program.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

75% of students are expected to receive a Pass on their first attempt, and 90% are expected to receive a Pass, Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending. Of those who receive a Qualified Pass or a Conditional Pass, 80% are expected to meet the conditions stipulated by their Committee within six months.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Eighteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 15 (83%) received a Pass, and 17/18 (94%) received a Pass, Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending. Both of the two who received a Qualified Pass met the conditions of their qualified status within six months.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

75% of students are expected to receive a Pass on their first attempt, and 90% are expected to receive a Pass, Qualified Pass, or
Decision Pending. Of those who receive a Qualified Pass or a Conditional Pass, 80% are expected to meet the conditions stipulated by their Committee within six months.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Eighteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 15 (83%) received a Pass, and 17/18 (94%) received a Pass, Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending. Both of the two who received a Qualified Pass met the conditions of their qualified status within six months.

Target for O3: 3. Scientific Content

75% of students are expected to receive a Pass on their first attempt, and 90% are expected to receive a Pass, Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending. Of those who receive a Qualified Pass or a Conditional Pass, 80% are expected to meet the conditions stipulated by their Committee within six months.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Eighteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 15 (83%) received a Pass, and 17/18 (94%) received a Pass, Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending. Both of the two who received a Qualified Pass met the conditions of their qualified status within six months.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Implementation of advisement procedures

Improvements in advisement will continue to be implemented to ensure that students complete their course work and take their qualifying exams in a timely fashion. Also, yearly meetings with the students' dissertation committees will be used to monitor the degree to which the students are on track to graduate.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Time to receipt of degree | Outcome/Objective: 3. Scientific Content
  | Scientific Communication | Scientific Inquiry
Implementation Description: Fall, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate directors for the subdisciplines

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The number of years required to complete the Ph.D. in our department has been decreasing over the past several years. This is in part, however, to an increase in the number of traditional, fellowship-supported students in our doctoral programs and a decrease in the number of part-time students. We note that, during the current cycle, the target was missed by "one-half" of a student. The actual median time to degree was 6.7 years, which is just above our target of 6.5 years.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Business Analysis MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The business analysis MS provides expertise for analytically oriented careers in business with an emphasis on applications of information technology. Potential career paths include business development, market analysis and research, financial planning, data analysis, and strategic planning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Modeling Skills (M: 1)
Students are able to build mathematical models to analyze a business situation, incorporate forecasting techniques, and provide recommendations for decision making.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
4 Oral Communication--core
5 Collaboration--major

Institutional Priority Associations
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 2: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (M: 2)

Students should be able to qualitatively state the key issues clearly and accurately the issues in a business problem.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core

### Institutional Priority Associations

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Problem Solving Processes (M: 3)

Students understand the process of individual and group problem solving. They demonstrate the ability to analyze risk using decision trees.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core

### Institutional Priority Associations

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### Measures, Targets, and Findings

##### M 1: Modeling Skills (O: 1)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student ability in Business Intelligence and Modeling a) Draw influence diagrams; build mathematical models to analyze a business situation. b) Incorporate Time Series Analysis and Forecasting techniques in the models. c) Make recommendations for Decision Making, and create a Decision Support System d) Demonstrate understanding of the BI framework, and apply concepts to a real situation.

**Target for O1: Modeling Skills**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Not Met

None yet.

##### M 2: Application of Statistical Tools (O: 2)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student ability in the Application of Statistical Tools a) Use Multivariate Statistical Techniques for Segmentation and Forecasting. b) Use Heuristic Techniques for Segmentation and Forecasting. c) Analyze large data sets to support decision making.

**Target for O2: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Not Met

None yet.

##### M 3: Decision Process Skills (O: 3)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student ability in Problem Solving and Risk Benefit Analysis a) Demonstrate an understanding of individual and group problem solving processes. b) Draw Decision Trees and analyze payoff and risk associated with various alternatives and make appropriate recommendations.

**Target for O3: Problem Solving Processes**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Development of Measures

Develop measures for the learning objectives set out in this document. Implement the assessment using these measures in the 2006-2007 Academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Application of Statistical Tools | Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation
- Decision Process Skills | Problem Solving Processes
- Modeling Skills | Modeling Skills

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: BA Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Chemistry BS

As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The chemistry department has long supported the University mission. We work to create an environment that provides for the education of students from all walks of life, traditional, non-traditional and people of all races, creeds and genders without bias. We adhere to the principle of liberal arts education with our faculty interacting with our students both inside and outside the classroom on a routine basis. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instructional program both at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare our students for productive careers in post-graduate studies and the job market. We endeavor to have both our faculty and our students participate actively in scholarly pursuits, including oral presentations, submission of grant proposals, internships, graduate and undergraduate stipends, and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful our teaching is. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and at regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of our association with the ACS are the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge, we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with development of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level. The program currently has 263 B.S. students and last year, 29 B.S. degrees were awarded.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
### SLO 1: Critical thinking (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to:
1. Construct reasonable hypotheses while asking scientific questions.
2. Design and conduct investigations about a variety of chemical problems.
3. Understand and analyze experimental results.
4. Formulate and defend explanations of theory in chemistry.
5. Solve unique problems based on learned factual matter.
6. Effectively perform laboratory operations to collect appropriate experimental evidence in conjunction with 2.1 - 2.5.

Relevant Associations: ACS

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 2: Technology (M: 1, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to:
1. Use computer graphics.
2. Access chemical databases.
3. Access chemical literature.
4. Conduct molecular modeling of chemical structures.
5. Use normal word processing skills.
6. Use state of the art instrumentation in order to solve novel problems in chemistry.

Relevant Associations: ACS

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 3: Quantitative skills (M: 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to:
1. Use mathematical skills from algebra, trigonometry and calculus to solve problems and understand theory in chemistry.
2. Understand error analysis to validate experimental results.
3. Translate problem situations into symbolic representations for the purpose of solving problems.

Relevant Associations: ACS

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 4: Contemporary Issues (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to:
1. Know how chemistry can help solve problems in society.
2. Understand safety and waste control - impact on society.

Relevant Associations: ACS

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: Communication skills (M: 1, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to:
1. Communicate effectively in written and oral forms.
2. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature for content.
3. Critically analyze claims made in the scientific literature.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology.
5. Work effectively in group situations.
Relevant Associations: ACS

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Laboratory Reports (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)
Reports are evaluated by the instructor and committees devoted to the different areas of our program with respect to standards. This is started in our area D courses and continued throughout the curriculum culminating in our capstone courses Chem 4160, 4170. These capstone courses are also assessed based on oral presentations usually by formal presentations of the students’ research in front of a committee of faculty members and fellow students. The final evaluation (grade) is based on the laboratory report. All reports from the capstone courses are further evaluated by the department director of undergraduate studies. Each instructor will keep all lab reports for all classes. The department then compiles a representative sample from across different section for further comparison. Statistically relevant samples of these reports will be evaluated by the director of undergraduate studies in conjunction with our area committees using the criteria in stated in the departmental learning outcomes rubric. The reports are given a 1-6 in communication, technology, contemporary issues and critical thinking.

**Target for O1: Critical thinking**
All laboratory courses are expected to have a minimum value of 3 in each of the 4 learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Laboratory reports in general chemistry, organic chemistry and the three physical/analytical courses all exceed departmental goals. One committee member did express concern over the 4010 critical thinking section. The concern was mostly attributed to malfunctioning equipment.

**Target for O2: Technology**
All laboratory courses are expected to have a minimum value of 3 in each of the 4 learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Laboratory reports in general chemistry, organic chemistry and the three physical/analytical courses all exceed departmental goals. One committee member did express concern over the 4010 critical thinking section. The concern was mostly attributed to malfunctioning equipment.

**Target for O4: Contemporary Issues**
All laboratory courses are expected to have a minimum value of 3 in each of the 4 learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Laboratory reports in general chemistry, organic chemistry and the three physical/analytical courses all exceed departmental goals. One committee member did express concern over the 4010 critical thinking section. The concern was mostly attributed to malfunctioning equipment.

**Target for O5: Communication skills**
All laboratory courses are expected to have a minimum value of 3 in each of the 4 learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Laboratory reports in general chemistry, organic chemistry and the three physical/analytical courses all exceed departmental goals. One committee member did express concern over the 4010 critical thinking section. The concern was mostly attributed to malfunctioning equipment.

#### M 2: Content/concept assessment (O: 1, 3, 4)
The department emphasizes the use of ACS exit exams for comparison to national norms to assess how our students compare to the national averages in terms of standard 2, and standard 4. We also use traditional in-house exams, quizzes and homework to assess student progress throughout the course. We are currently using a standardized entrance exam in area D for comparison of the initial student ability to what they have as a final outcome. Standard 3 is introduced early in area D with the use of web-CT and in the lab component of each class.

**Target for O1: Critical thinking**
The departmental goal is at least the 50th percentile on all ACS exit exams

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Organic, biochemistry and the two physical chemistry ACS exams were well above departmental goals. The students averaged the 45th percentile in the general chemistry exit exam and the 34th percentile in the inorganic exit exam.

**Target for O3: Quantitative skills**
The departmental goal is at least the 50th percentile on all ACS exit exams

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Organic, biochemistry and the two physical chemistry ACS exams were well above departmental goals. The students averaged the 45th percentile in the general chemistry exit exam and the 34th percentile in the inorganic exit exam.

**Target for O4: Contemporary Issues**

The departmental goal is at least the 50th percentile on all ACS exit exams

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Organic, biochemistry and the two physical chemistry ACS exams were well above departmental goals. The students averaged the 45th percentile in the general chemistry exit exam and the 34th percentile in the inorganic exit exam.

**M 3: Miscellaneous assessments (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Additional parameters that will be assessed include retention rates for majors, student's perceptions of the program's quality, and students career goals. To address standard 5 we have a major focus on research for assessment purposes. We also are careful in choosing textbooks that not only have the appropriate content, but have focus areas in each chapter that relate to how chemistry is affecting society. Research is a critical component for a student to learn how chemistry helps solve problems in society. Students study how particular problems in medicine, agriculture, materials, etc. have been solved or are in need of a solution. Students often work under a Professor who has received a peer reviewed grant dealing with a particular set of problems. The student studies the problem, does the lab research, then writes a paper for the course. These papers are reviewed by the advisor. If the work is suitable the paper is published in a peer reviewed journal. The peer review process provides a fine assessment tool.

**Target for O1: Critical thinking**

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The 3 year retention rate exceeds the departmental goals. In the core courses the non-major laboratory, general chemistry laboratory, organic lecture, organic laboratory and upper division lecture all exceed the departmental goal. The non-major lecture (3.8), general chemistry lecture (3.9) and upper division laboratory (4.1) do not meet departmental goals.

**Target for O2: Technology**

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The 3 year retention rate exceeds the departmental goals. In the core courses the non-major laboratory, general chemistry laboratory, organic lecture, organic laboratory and upper division lecture all exceed the departmental goal. The non-major lecture (3.8), general chemistry lecture (3.9) and upper division laboratory (4.1) do not meet departmental goals.

**Target for O3: Quantitative skills**

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The 3 year retention rate exceeds the departmental goals. In the core courses the non-major laboratory, general chemistry laboratory, organic lecture, organic laboratory and upper division lecture all exceed the departmental goal. The non-major lecture (3.8), general chemistry lecture (3.9) and upper division laboratory (4.1) do not meet departmental goals.

**Target for O4: Contemporary Issues**

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The 3 year retention rate exceeds the departmental goals. In the core courses the non-major laboratory, general chemistry laboratory, organic lecture, organic laboratory and upper division lecture all exceed the departmental goal. The non-major lecture (3.8), general chemistry lecture (3.9) and upper division laboratory (4.1) do not meet departmental goals.

**Target for O5: Communication skills**

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The 3 year retention rate exceeds the departmental goals. In the core courses the non-major laboratory, general chemistry laboratory, organic lecture, organic laboratory and upper division lecture all exceed the departmental goal. The non-major lecture (3.8), general chemistry lecture (3.9) and upper division laboratory (4.1) do not meet departmental goals.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Additional Support for Inorganic Chemistry**

Most institutions cover the material contained on the ACS exam in 2 semesters. At Georgia state inorganic chemistry is a one semester course and as such many topics that appear on the ACS are not covered or are not covered in sufficient detail. An additional teaching assistant is needed to help with accessing student progress through the grading of homework.
Early Advisement

Students lack knowledge of the difficulties and approaches required to be successful as Chemistry/Pre-Med focused majors. Specific early advisement and interactions with faculty Chemistry/Pre-Med advisors and successful peers are needed. With better prepared students, one would expect a substantial reduction in the current Fall DFW rate from ~33% to around 20%

Entrance Exams for General Chemistry

Students will be required to pass a chemistry high school equivalency placement exam before taking General Chemistry I. The major goal is to improve the success rate in Chem 1211K to keep a large cohort of the best prepared students on track to graduate in a timely manner. Student background and preparation will be screened by use of a nationally accepted placement exam. Students who score at random or below (vide infra) on the placement exam will be given advisement before being placed in a preparation course, with peer-led tutorial support, that must be passed before advancing to Chem 1211K the next term. We have found that at least an above random score on the placement exam (California Diagnostic Exam used to measure H.S. level knowledge with nationally accepted norms) or an AP Advanced Chemistry score of 2 are necessary to pass.

More training for teaching assistants

The recent growth in the department will allow us to assign more teaching assistants in courses where student perceptions are low. This action will allow the department to have older more experienced graduate students mentor the younger graduate students all under the direction of an instructor.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

This year’s assessment of the undergraduate program demonstrates both the strengths and areas that need to be improved in the department. The laboratory portion of every course meets or exceeds the departmental goals set forth. This portion of the curriculum is vital for it is here that students learn to use critical thinking skills to solve problems using the theories discussed in the lecture courses. It is also here where most of the communication skills are learned by students and most of the modern technology which is vital to a chemist is experienced.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The content/concept assessment areas are below departmental standards in two areas general chemistry and inorganic chemistry. We believe that much of the problems in general chemistry have to due with growing pains. The department has grown from producing 9 B.S. degrees in 1996 to producing 28 B.S. degrees in 2006. We believe that with the addition of the placement examinations, more peer led tutorials and early advisement that we can reach the goals that we have set for ourselves. Student perceptions are slightly lower than we’d like in several areas. We believe that better trained, more experienced teaching assistants will allow for more one-on-one interactions which will improve perceptions.
Mission / Purpose
The chemistry department has long supported the University mission. We work to create an environment that provides for the education of qualified students from all walks of life, traditional, non-traditional and people of all races, creeds and genders without bias. We adhere to the principle of liberal arts education with our faculty interacting with our students both inside and outside the classroom on a routine basis. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instruction program both at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare our students for a productive career in post-graduate studies and for the job market. We endeavor to have both our faculty and our students to participate actively in scholarly pursuits, including oral presentations, submission of grant proposals/internships/graduate and undergraduate stipends and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful is our teaching. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and the regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of association with the ACS is the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with devolvement of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Comunication (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Communicate effectively in written and oral forms. 2. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature for content 3. Critically analyze claims made in the scientific literature. 4. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology 5. Work effectively in group situations 6. Students in the masters program must perform research and write a thesis or a non thesis paper detailing their work

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major

SLO 2: critical thinking (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Construct reasonable hypotheses while asking scientific questions. 2. Design and conduct investigations about a variety of chemical problems. 3. Understand and analyze experimental results Formulate and defend explanations of theory in chemistry 4. Solve unique problems based on learned factual matter. 5. Effectively perform laboratory operations to collect appropriate experimental evidence in conjunction with 2.1 - 2.5 6. Students will be able to apply theory learned in lecture courses to original research performed under the supervision of a faculty member.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major

SLO 3: Technology (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Use computer graphics 2. Access chemical databases 3. Access chemical literature 4. Molecular modeling of chemical structures 5. Use normal word processing skills 6. Use state of the art instrumentation in order to solve novel problems in chemistry.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

SLO 4: Quantitative skills (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Use mathematical skills from algebra, trigonometry and calculus to solve problems and understand theory in chemistry 2. Understand error analysis to validate experimental results. 3. Translate problem situations into symbolic representations for the purpose of solving problems

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
11 Quantitative Skills--major
### SLO 5: Contemporary Issues (M: 1, 2)

Students will demonstrate the ability to:
1. Know how chemistry can help solve problems in society.
2. Safety and waste control - impact on society.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: general exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

All masters students are required to pass a general exam. This can be done via coursework or through testing.

**Target for O1: Communication**
80% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students passed general exam.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking**
80% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students passed general exam.

**Target for O3: Technology**
80% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students passed general exam.

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**
80% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students passed general exam.

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
80% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students passed general exam.

#### M 2: thesis/paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

All students in the masters program must write and defend a thesis or write and pass a non-thesis report based on research performed.

**Target for O1: Communication**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students successfully defended a thesis or wrote an acceptable research paper.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students successfully defended a thesis or wrote an acceptable research paper.

**Target for O3: Technology**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students successfully defended a thesis or wrote an acceptable research paper.

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students successfully defended a thesis or wrote an acceptable research paper.

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
16 students successfully defended a thesis or wrote an acceptable research paper.
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
16 students successfully defended a thesis or wrote an acceptable research paper

Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
16 students successfully defended a thesis or wrote an acceptable research paper

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
continued quality and growth
The masters plan meets all our objectives. Our plan is to continue this excellence with continued growth.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thesis/paper</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>critical thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responsible Person/Group: Mark Germann, Al Baumstark

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
All areas of the masters program meet departmental standards.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
None

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Chemistry PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The chemistry department has long supported the University mission. We work to create an environment that provides for the education of students from all walks of life, traditional, non-traditional and people of all races, creeds and genders without bias. We adhere to the principle of liberal arts education with our faculty interacting with our students both inside and outside the classroom on a routine basis. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instructional program both at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare our students for productive careers in post-graduate studies and the job market. We endeavor to have both our faculty and our students participate actively in scholarly pursuits, including oral presentations, submission of grant proposals, internships, graduate and undergraduate stipends, and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful our teaching is. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and at regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of our association with the ACS are the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge, we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with devolvement of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level. 57
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Communication Skills (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Communicate effectively in written and oral forms. 2. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature for content 3. Critically analyze claims made in the scientific literature. 4. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology 5. Work effectively in group situations. 6. Students must perform and analyze and be able to relate experiments which address a current problem in the chemical sciences.

Relevant Associations: The undergraduate program is ACS certified and the same writing style is used in all graduate programs.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Construct reasonable hypotheses while asking scientific questions. 2. Design and conduct investigations about a variety of chemical problems. 3. Understand and analyze experimental results Formulate and defend explanations of theory in chemistry 4. Solve unique problems based on learned factual matter. 5. Effectively perform laboratory operations to collect appropriate experimental evidence in conjunction with 2.1 - 2.5.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Technology (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Use computer graphics 2. Access chemical databases 3. Access chemical literature. 4. Conduct molecular modeling of chemical structures 5. Use normal word processing skills. 6. Use state of the art instrumentation in order to solve novel problems in chemistry.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Quantitative Skills (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Use mathematical skills from algebra, trigonometry and calculus to solve problems and understand theory in chemistry. 2. Understand error analysis to validate experimental results. 3. Translate problem situations into symbolic representations for the purpose of solving problems.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 5: Contemporary Issues (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to:
1. Know how chemistry can help solve problems in society.
2. Understand safety and waste control impact on society.
3. Students must perform and analyze experiments which address a current problem in the chemical sciences.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

### Institutional Priority Associations

- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M1: Seminar Course (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

All Ph.D. students are required to take a course which teaches students to give a seminar including how to prepare slides or power point presentations, how to speak to an audience of peers, how to address questions from an audience, how to convey information obtained through original research to an audience.

**Target for O1: Communication Skills**

90% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students passed fall 05

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking**

90% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students passed fall 05

**Target for O3: Technology**

90% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students passed fall 05

**Target for O4: Quantitative Skills**

90% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students passed fall 05

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**

90% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students passed fall 05

---

#### M2: Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

All Ph.D. students must take a written and an oral qualifying exam at least 1 year before graduation. The written exam is produced by the faculty in the student’s major ie. Organic chemistry, biochemistry, physical chemistry. The exam is graded by the faculty on a pass fail basis. Once the written exam is complete a committee is formed consisting of two faculty members from the student’s major and 1 from outside the major. The student gives a brief presentation of research and the committee asks questions which may be general in nature or related to the student’s research.

**Target for O1: Communication Skills**

80% pass

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The written general exam was given 20 times with 3 failures. This is an 85% pass rate. The oral general exam was given 8 times with no student failing.
## Target for O2: Critical Thinking

80% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The written general exam was given 20 times with 3 failures. This is an 85% pass rate. The oral general exam was given 8 times with no student failing.

## Target for O3: Technology

80% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The written general exam was given 20 times with 3 failures. This is an 85% pass rate. The oral general exam was given 8 times with no student failing.

## Target for O4: Quantitative Skills

80% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The written general exam was given 20 times with 3 failures. This is an 85% pass rate. The oral general exam was given 8 times with no student failing.

## Target for O5: Contemporary Issues

80% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The written general exam was given 20 times with 3 failures. This is an 85% pass rate. The oral general exam was given 8 times with no student failing.

### M 3: Dissertation Defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
All Ph.D. students are required to write and defend a dissertation of original cutting edge research which they have performed under the direction of a faculty member.

## Target for O1: Communication Skills

95% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
No student failed to defend their dissertation.

## Target for O2: Critical Thinking

95% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
No student failed to defend their dissertation.

## Target for O3: Technology

95% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
No student failed to defend their dissertation.

## Target for O4: Quantitative Skills

95% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
No student failed to defend their dissertation.

## Target for O5: Contemporary Issues

95% pass

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
No student failed to defend their dissertation.
Our goal is to continue excellence with our program’s growth.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Dissertation Defense | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
- Measure: Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
- Measure: Seminar Course | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

Implementation Description: Fall 06
Responsible Person/Group: Mark German

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Ph.D. program continues to grow and the quality of the program has continued.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
none

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Communication Disorders MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Communication Disorders Program, a unit of the Educational Psychology & Special Education Department, provides an intensive field-based master’s degree program that prepares graduate students in speech-language pathology to implement the best practices in the profession, to communicate effectively with colleagues and clients, to work collaboratively with other professionals who serve individuals with communication disorders and their families, and to pursue opportunities for advanced degrees. There are 36 students enrolled in the program and 9 students graduated during the 2005-06 academic year.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The student demonstrates knowledge of linguistic and cultural issues related to communication and swallowing disorders and adapts treatment, assessment, and prevention plans and procedures to meet the individual needs as well as the linguistic and cultural differences of each client.

Relevant Associations:
- Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
- Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
- NCATE
- PSC
- Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

O/O 2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The student can discuss the principles and methods of prevention, assessment, and intervention for people with communication and swallowing disorders including consideration of anatomic/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates.

Relevant Associations:
- Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
- Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
- NCATE
- PSC
- Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

O/O 3: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The student can discuss and apply the standards of ethical conduct.

Relevant Associations:
- Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
- Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
- NCATE
- PSC
- Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 4: Evaluate Research Relevance (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student can critically evaluate published theory and research to determine its relevance and application to clinical practice in communication disorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student can describe and discuss contemporary professional issues related to clinical standards and practice guidelines, federal and state regulations, site-specific rules, service delivery models, and practice management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 6: Outline Professional Credentials (M: 1, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student can outline the requirements for state and national certification, specialty recognition, and licensure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 7: Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills (M: 1, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates oral and written communication skills appropriate to professional practice in communication disorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 8: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment (M: 1, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student accurately assesses clients with communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders using formal and informal assessment procedures (including screening, prevention, and evaluation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 9: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention (M: 1, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student develops and implements intervention programs that are functional, logical in sequence, and effective in changing client behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 10: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities (M: 1, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates appropriate collaborative and interpersonal skills and ethical behavior with clients, family members, and other professionals and is able to self-evaluate clinical performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

O/O 11: Apply Technology (M: 1, 3, 4)
The student uses appropriate technology for clinical assessment and intervention and for professional productivity.

Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

O/O 12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The student can apply the basic principles of biological science, physical science, and the behavioral/social sciences to communication sciences and disorders.

Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

O/O 13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The student can discuss the etiologies and characteristics of speech, language, hearing, and communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders including their etiologies, characteristics, anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates.

Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

O/O 14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The student can describe normal communication and swallowing processes and behaviors including their biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases.

Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of the knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD program.

Target for O1: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity
85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.

Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.

Target for O3: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct
85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Evaluation of Research Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Outline Professional Credentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Apply Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Apply Prerequisite Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Discuss Communication &amp; Swallowing Disorders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.

**Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes**

85% of students will complete their portfolio within three submissions to their portfolio review team.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

All 9 students who graduated during the past year successfully completed their portfolio; however, only 4 completed it in 3 submissions (44%). The remaining 5 students required 4 submissions.

**M 2: Praxis II Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14)**

All students take the Praxis II Exam in speech-language pathology for national certification and state licensure prior to graduation.

**Target for O1: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity**

95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 9 students (100%) who graduated this past year passed the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**

95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 9 students (100%) who graduated this past year passed the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Target for O3: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct**

95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 9 students (100%) who graduated this past year passed the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Target for O4: Evaluate Research Relevance**

95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 9 students (100%) who graduated this past year passed the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Target for O5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues**

95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 9 students (100%) who graduated this past year passed the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Target for O12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge**

95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 9 students (100%) who graduated this past year passed the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**

95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 9 students (100%) who graduated this past year passed the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes**

95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 9 students (100%) who graduated this past year passed the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**M 3: Survey of Alumni (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)**
Program alumni are surveyed 6 months to one year following graduation regarding their preparation for their employment setting (based on the program’s learning outcomes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1</strong></td>
<td>Understand Linguistic &amp; Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O2</strong></td>
<td>Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3</strong></td>
<td>Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4</strong></td>
<td>Evaluate Research Relevance</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5</strong></td>
<td>Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6</strong></td>
<td>Outline Professional Credentials</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O8</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O9</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O10</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O11</strong></td>
<td>Apply Technology</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).

**Target for O12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).

**Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The average rating for all outcomes was 4.0 or higher (range 4.33-4.83). The return rate for the surveys was low (44%).

**M 4: Survey of Employers (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)**
The employers of program alumni who graduated in the past 6 months to one year are surveyed regarding our graduates’ preparation for their employment setting (based on the program’s learning outcomes).

**Target for O1: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

**Target for O3: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

**Target for O4: Evaluate Research Relevance**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

**Target for O5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

**Target for O6: Outline Professional Credentials**
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).
### Target for O7: Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

### Target for O8: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

### Target for O9: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

### Target for O10: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

### Target for O11: Apply Technology
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

### Target for O12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

### Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

### Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes
The average rating for all outcomes will be 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point Likert Scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The average rating for all outcomes except one (Knowledge of etiologies and characteristics of disorders - rating 3.75) was 4.0 or higher (range 4.00-4.75). The return rate for the surveys was low (31%).

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Alumni and Employer Surveys
Faculty will discuss strategies to improve the return rate on alumni and employer surveys and implement them for the surveys done spring 2007.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Survey of Alumni
- **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Prerequisite Knowledge
Portfolio completion in 3 submissions.
Faculty review teams and the Program Coordinator will encourage students to complete their portfolios in 3 submissions rather than 4 to expedite meeting this program requirement.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge
  - Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct
  - Apply Technology
  - Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills
  - Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities
  - Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment
  - Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention
  - Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes
  - Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
  - Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
  - Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
  - Evaluate Research Relevance
  - Outline Professional Credentials
  - Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty and Program Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our students continue to successfully meet the program learning outcomes as demonstrated in their portfolios, Praxis II Exam scores, and alumni and employer surveys.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although students complete their portfolios in 4 submissions, the faculty believe that more of them are capable of completing it in 3 submissions (saving time and work for both the students and the faculty). The faculty need to work closely with students to ensure this happens. Also the low return rate of alumni and employer surveys is a concern and faculty will discuss strategies to improve it. Based on feedback from alumni and the CD Advisory Committee, the program has added a thesis option to encourage greater participation in research by our master’s degree students. Faculty will need to encourage students to take advantage of this option.
### SLO 2: Oral and written competencies (M: 2)

The student’s research proposal should pose a significant research problem, should evidence awareness of historical and theoretical contexts surrounding the question, and should deploy appropriate methodologies for addressing the question. In the oral defense, the student should be able to articulately engage the questions of the committee members. Proposals for creative projects in film/video should go beyond the technical-logistical, and should present in detail the aesthetic sources and traditions out of which the student’s work is operating.

Relevant Associations: NCA

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Knowledge development

Sufficient demonstration of the students' development of knowledge in his/her area of concentration

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Understanding key concepts (M: 1)

To establish the level of student understanding of key theoretical concepts in the field

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 5: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 3)

This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Theory Exam (O: 4)

Final theory paper for our required Issues and Perspectives in Communication course (Comm 6010)

**Target for O4: Understanding key concepts**

Score of 80 to 100% on final theory papers

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

In the last academic year, 32 out of 36 students completed their final theory papers with a score of 80% or above. This is just below an 89% success rate.

#### M 2: Oral thesis proposals and thesis defenses (O: 2)

Successfully defending both orally and in writing the thesis proposal and thesis

**Target for O2: Oral and written competencies**

100% success in prospectus and thesis defense

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Last year 100% of students who attempted to defend their thesis prospectus (20) were successful (4 in fall, 14 in spring, 2 in summer).

#### M 3: Quality of thesis content (O: 5)

The successfully defended thesis shows a sufficient display of knowledge to be judged as "high quality."
### Target for O5: Outcome/Objective Not Specified
Theses should be judged as meeting at least a criterion of 4 out of 5 (5=high achievement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of theses defended last year met this criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Research Proposals (O: 1)
The quality, based on grade, of final research proposal for our required Research Methods in Communication courses (Comm 6030)

#### Target for O1: Understand research methods
A score of 80 to 100% on the final research proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 38 MA students who completed the research methods course, 33 received scores of 80% or above. Our success rate was just below 87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 5: Research Theses (O: 1)
Successfully defended MA research theses

#### Target for O1: Understand research methods
100% success in thesis defenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All MA students who attempted to defend their theses in the last academic year (23) were successful (8 in fall, 9 in spring, 6 in summer).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Continue revision of MA curriculum
This year we will continue to revise our MA curriculum to meet the changing needs of our student population, particularly working to more carefully balance the needs of our Ph.D. bound students with our applied/production students.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Research Proposals | Outcome/Objective: Understand research methods
- Measure: Theory Exam | Outcome/Objective: Understanding key concepts

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee in conjunction with the Chair

#### Development of Applied program non-thesis option
To consider the possibilities for the development of an applied program to meet the needs of MA students seeking additional skills training, rather than training for advanced research.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee in conjunction with the Chair

#### Monitor graduate level oral competency
Students continue to struggle in their oral defense capabilities. Our goal is to consider ways to enhance the opportunities for students to practice their oral argumentation skills in graduate level courses.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Oral thesis proposals and thesis defenses | Outcome/Objective: Oral and written competencies

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee in conjunction with the Chair

#### Stress the importance of advanced research methods
Stress was placed in the past on the foreign language exam, but this reflected pre-Ph.D. thinking in our program. Adjustments continue to be made in advising and orientation materials to address this issue.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Theory Exam | Outcome/Objective: Understanding key concepts

**Implementation Description:** Already underway and continuing
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The masters program continues to be strong. While our admission numbers are slightly down, the quality of students continues to improve. We are already making significant progress in getting students to form their committees earlier (by their 7th course in the program), and this is having a positive impact on student learning (especially in the area of advanced research methods). We also continue to increase the theoretical and methodological rigor in our MA offerings.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We need to work harder to streamline curriculum to meet the divergent needs of applied/production and pre-Ph.D. students; however, this has proven difficult for structural/administrative reasons. Our pressing goals include: addressing needed curriculum reforms and providing more opportunities for oral argumentation in our graduate classrooms. We need to do a better job in helping students design their prospectuses with a full committee in place, while simultaneously working to develop a non-thesis option for applied/production students. We also need to develop a better system for tracking failed prospectus defenses at the MA level.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Communication Studies PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The Graduate Program in Communication offers its students a multi-disciplinary curriculum leading to the Ph.D. degree. The program is designed to prepare students for research and teaching in one of two primary areas of emphasis: public communication and moving images studies. The curriculum is designed to provide students with in depth training in communication pedagogy and the professional expectations of the discipline, as well as mentored experiences in both teaching and research.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Research proficiency (M: 1)**
Proven ability to engage is high quality independent research, evidencing competence in a broad range of methodologies (textual analysis, historical research, ethnographic data, etc., as appropriate to the context).
Relevant Associations: NCA

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Pedagogical proficiency (M: 2)**
Demonstrated excellence in teaching courses in both the introductory courses in the field and in the student’s areas of specialization.
Relevant Associations: NCA

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Proficiency in communication theory (M: 1)**
Demonstrated ability to comprehend and engage with the full range of communication theories in the student’s area (public communication or moving image studies), including an understanding of the intellectual contexts in which these theories evolved, and the specific problems they attempt to address.
Relevant Associations: NCA

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Oral and written communication competency (M: 1)**
Proven ability to engage, both orally and in writing, with the major academic issues central to the discipline. This includes the ability to thoughtfully interrogate the work of others in the field.

Relevant Associations: NCA

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Professional development competency (M: 3)**
Students are expected to regularly present their work at the professional conferences in the field, and to regularly submit written work for publication.

Relevant Associations: NCA

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive doctoral examinations (O: 1, 3, 4)**
After approval by the advisory committee of the reading lists in four areas related to the student’s research project (including one theoretical area), the members of the advisory committee draft questions which the student answers in writing, in four-hour sessions per area. Committee members grade each area of the exam as High pass, Pass, Low pass, or Fail; and make a detailed list of questions based on the student’s written responses. Assuming the student has not failed more than one area, an oral defense is arranged, in which the student is expected not only to clarify and expand upon the responses written, but also to range across the entire reading lists in answering questions posed. Upon successful completion of the oral defense, one grade is assigned to the entire exam.

**Target for O1: Research proficiency**
Our goal is for 100% of students to successfully pass their comprehensive doctoral examinations

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Partially Met
6 out of 7 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams.

**Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory**
Our goal is for 100% of students to successfully pass their comprehensive doctoral examinations

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Partially Met
6 out of 7 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams.

**Target for O4: Oral and written communication competency**
Our goal is for 100% of students to successfully pass their comprehensive doctoral examinations

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Partially Met
6 out of 7 students successfully completed their comprehensive exams.

**M 2: Student teacher evaluations (O: 2)**
Graduate Students are evaluated on their teaching each year according to student evaluations, quality of syllabi, and grade distribution

**Target for O2: Pedagogical proficiency**
Students are expected to receive student evaluations of at least 4 out of 5, to create quality syllabi, and have grade distributions appropriate for their course (usually 2.7 to 3.1 on a 4.0 scale)

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Met
Out of 32 student teachers, 27 received teacher evaluation scores of 4.0 or above on question 17. 13 of these students scores above 4.5. Given the large number of student teachers and the range of courses they are responsible for, we consider these results to be excellent.

**M 3: Publications and convention papers (O: 5)**
Students are expected regularly to present conference papers at both the international professional organizational conferences in
their area, and at smaller, boutique conference related to their specific line of research. They are expected to have published essays in peer-reviewed journals or collections by the time they have finished the dissertation. In our annual review meetings we now do an annual credential check, requiring CV submission, and that those are carefully discussed so that ongoing plans of study are matching actual accomplishment.

**Target for O5: Professional development competency**

Students are minimally expected to present one conference paper a year after their first year in the program and have at least one essay accepted for publication before graduating.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

No students were placed on probation this year for failing to meet our minimum expectations for professional development. Our students presented dozens of conventions papers and, according to our best account, published over ten essays and/or book chapters.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

Create more opportunities for oral argumentation

Because our students continue to struggle in oral defenses, we will continue to assess our graduate curriculum to identify ways to enhance student opportunities for engaging in oral argumentation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Comprehensive doctoral examinations
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Oral and written communication competency

- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee in conjunction with chair and graduate faculty

Implement better reporting on failed defenses

We need to do a better job reporting failed prospectus defenses, failed oral examinations, and failed dissertations. Faculty will be instructed this year on the importance of providing written feedback to our Administrative Assistant so that the reasons for failure and the remedy (if any) are on file.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Comprehensive doctoral examinations
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Oral and written communication competency

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director, Graduate Faculty, Administrative Assistant for the Graduate Program

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

While the number of applications in our program remain stable, the quality of applicants continues to improve. Our new and highly developed Ph.D. curriculum is now almost fully in operation, and the coherence of our offerings is now well developed. Student teaching is excellent overall, and professional development is also up to our established standards.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

We still need to work harder to provide our students with opportunities for orally defending their intellectual positions in the classroom. We also need to do a better job reporting failed comprehensive exams and failed dissertation defenses. While we can boast one of the most diverse Ph.D. student bodies in the country (almost 50% of our students are minority or international students), we want to considerably enhance our diversity efforts. We continue to see a need to develop a stronger academic focus in Media & Globalization and Audience Studies, we need to engage in stronger recruiting of doctoral students, and these internal initiatives, while unrelated to the quality of our instruction, will have a positive impact on what our program is able to offer the field in the future.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2005-2006 Computer Information Systems BBA

As of: 12/12/2016 02:40 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The application of information technology to organizational functions has shifted from supplanting basic operational tasks to the evolution of an intelligent information infrastructure which supports knowledge-workers within the organization as well as customers of the organization. Underlying these changes is an ever more rapidly developing technology with dramatically changing economics, pushing the envelope of what is possible and desirable. In this environment of dynamic and pervasive technology development and diffusion, the mission of the BBA-CIS program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business and technical knowledge with the latest software development tools and techniques to create information systems that will meet the needs of...

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Students will be proficient in systems design (M: 3, 4, 8, 10)**

Students will be able to read a system specification and analyze user data requirements within the context of a three-tier architecture. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to analyze user requirements for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to analyze user requirements for real-world applications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to presentation tier, business tier, and data tier abstractions. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to design current system architectures will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design current systems architectures will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Student will be able to model and develop a design for a web-based application. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to make effective and efficient use of Internet applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design and develop effective, graphically pleasing web sites will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

13 Technology--major

**SLO 2: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency (M: 5, 7, 11)**

Students will be able to read a program specification using unified modeling language. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop object-oriented software that conforms to specifications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to develop object-oriented software that conforms to specifications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to design, code, test and document an object-oriented program in an object-oriented programming language. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to design and develop effective, graphically pleasing web sites will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

13 Technology--major

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Identified User Requirements**

Acquired and scoped the system and user requirements
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 2: Specified System Requirements**

Specified, analyzed, & refined the system and user requirements
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 3: Developed Architecture (O: 1)**

Designed the specified system using an appropriate architecture
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design**

| 4.0 |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

4.55 average on capstone survey

**M 4: Designed programs (O: 1)**

Designed the programs according to specifications
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design**

| 4.0 |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

4.55 average on capstone survey

**M 5: Coded and Developed (O: 2)**

Coded/developed the specified & designed programs
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.74 average on capstone survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation**

 Appropriately used object-oriented concepts and notation
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 7: Appropriately used an object-oriented programming (O: 2)**

 Appropriately used an object-oriented programming language
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**

 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.60 average on capstone survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Developed implementation plans (O: 1)**

 Developed implementation plans
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design**

 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.79 average on capstone survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: Developed Program Specifications**

 Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 10: Designed user interface (O: 1)**

 Designed and developed an effective, efficient, and graphically pleasing user interface
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design**

 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.54 average on capstone survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 11: Appropriately used database concepts (O: 2)**

 Appropriately applied database concepts and techniques
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**

 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.43 average on capstone survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

The scores for measures developing test plans and implementation plans improved from 3.84 and 3.89 respectively to 4.64 and 4.79 in this academic year and, thereby, met the target. All other measures for all objectives also improved from last year and remained well above the targets. Data collected during this CIS BBA assessment and the associated analyses may be found at http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/undergraduate/capstonedata08312006AVGAnalysisFinal.xls.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Although this assessment did not identify any core program objective weaknesses, we will strive toward continual improvement. However, while these scores have improved, the number of students enrolled in this CIS BBA program continues to decline. During this coming academic year, CIS add student retention as an objective and will enact changes in this BBA program and its promotion to students so that more students will be attracted, businesses will ever more highly value our graduates, and our high standards of educational excellence will be maintained. Please see the CIS Retention Plan draft at
**Mission / Purpose**

The effective deployment of information technology is one of the keys to business success. New applications of information technology strike at the heart of what management does and how organizations are structured and compete in an increasingly interconnected global economy. In many respects these applications and technologies are redefining the nature of work and its organization. The CIS Graduate Program aims to develop specialists and managers with the combination of business and technology skills needed to continue competitive advancement of American industry. The mission of the CIS major in the Master of Science program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business knowledge with the latest software engineering tools and techniques to create and manage information systems that allow organizations to compete in the global marketplace.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Identify Business Needs and Challenges (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs. This objective is not met in the core courses. In lieu of this, a surrogate objective will be used: Students will be able to select appropriate contemporary and leading-edge tools and techniques and to correctly use these tools and techniques to specify the requirements for an information system. The student should be able to analyze an organization’s performance by assessing its resources, capabilities, and competitive environment.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

13 Technology--major
SLO 2: Translate specifications to programs & systems (M: 3)
Students will be able to read a systems-specification, to analyze user design requirements, and to use appropriate contemporary and leading-edge tools and techniques for designing an information system that meets the specification. Students will be able to read a program-specification and to use appropriate contemporary and leading-edge tools and techniques for design, development, testing and documenting a computer program that meets the specification.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
13 Technology--major

SLO 3: Create environments for programs and systems (M: 4, 5, 6)
Students will be proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
13 Technology--major

SLO 4: Manage projects and balance resources (M: 7)
Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan. Students will be able to work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

SLO 5: Build and renew business via technology & process (M: 8, 9)
Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with an emerging technology. Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business process, to design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and to manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

SLO 6: Communicate effectively. (M: 10)
Students should possess the ability to write memos, letters, and reports in a style appropriate to business, with contents that are clear, concise and objective oriented. Students must be able to develop and deliver effective oral presentations, including appropriate, high-impact visuals in support of key ideas. All graduates should be capable of presenting technical material to a non-technical audience.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Software Requirements Mgt Student Work (O: 1)
Performance on assignments in the software requirements management course and the process & business innovation course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of CIS 8030 System Specification

Target for O1: Identify Business Needs and Challenges
4.0

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
5.0 average

M 2: Business innovation requirements student work (O: 1)
Performance on assignments in the software requirements management course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8010 Process / Business Innovation

Target for O1: Identify Business Needs and Challenges
4.0

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
4.2 average on the appropriate portion of the Process / Business Innovation survey of student work

M 3: Specs Into systems 8030 student work (O: 2)
Performance on assignments in the software requirements management course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8030 System Specification

Target for O2: Translate specifications to programs & systems
4.0

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
5.0 average

M 4: Network design student work (O: 3)
Performance on assignments in the network design course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8050 Network Design and Management

Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems
4.0
**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
3.58 average  

**M 5: Database systems management student work (O: 3)**  
Performance on assignments in the database systems management course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8040 Database Systems Management  

**Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems**
4.0  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
4.45 average  

**M 6: Systems integration student work (O: 3)**  
Performance on assignments in the systems integration course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8020 Systems Integration  

**Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems**
4.0  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
4.83 average  

**M 7: Information systems project mgt student work (O: 4)**  
Performance on assignments in the information technology project management course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8000 Project Management  

**Target for O4: Manage projects and balance resources**
4.0  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
4.29 average  

**M 8: Innovation systems integration student work (O: 5)**  
Performance on assignments in the systems integration course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8020 Systems Integration  

**Target for O5: Build and renew business via technology & process**
4.0  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
4.37 average  

**M 9: Build and renew business innovation student work (O: 5)**  
Performance on assignments in the business innovation course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8010 Process / Business Innovation  

**Target for O5: Build and renew business via technology & process**
4.0  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
4.37 average  

**M 10: Student effective communication (O: 6)**  
Performance on assignments in all core course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of surveys [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/index.asp](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/index.asp)  

**Target for O6: Communicate effectively.**
4.0  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
4.39 average across all surveys  

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**  
**Analyze and improve network design course**
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

All objectives except network design scored high in the assessment surveys. Data collected during these analyses may be found at:

- [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8000.xls](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8000.xls)
- [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8010.xls](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8010.xls)
- [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8020.xls](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8020.xls)
- [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8030.xls](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8030.xls)
- [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8040.xls](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8040.xls)
- [http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8050.xls](http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/20052006/CIS8050.xls)

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

As mentioned in the opening section of this document, one force driving continuous improvement of the CIS curriculum is economic, i.e., economic forces leading to a reversal of CIS enrollment trends here and world-wide. We have a need to demonstrate to perspective students and to build confidence in the fact that a career in CIS is exciting, challenging, socially important and economically viable. In short we need to reverse the enrollment trend, in part by recruiting from those students already enrolled at GSU but undeclared. Those candidates are persons, at the undergraduate and graduate levels who have not yet declared a major or who may have shied away from the discipline because of ‘bad press.’ At the graduate level in particular we have students entering the MBA program with various engineering and technology degrees who choose a concentration in one of the other management disciplines, rather than CIS, thinking the undergraduate engineering or computer science degree sufficient. One area of recruitment is to help those students understand that the CIS degree program represents a combination of technical and managerial resources and skills to help them become powerful advocates for the appropriate implementation of Information and Communication Technologies in the modern organization. Accordingly, looking forward, we will build additional objectives dealing with enrollment growth and student retention. Continuous benchmarking. To access our progress we must benchmark against our own performance as well as that of others; and we must engage outsiders in the process to provide fresh insights and help guard against ‘group think’. Part of the CIS program level assessment process has been to examine published material on CIS assessment and to look at our competition in the US and abroad. This comparison is a form of benchmarking that will continue in the future. For a fuller discussion of this review see Napier, Johnson and Stucke, 2006. Secondly, faculty will continue to solicit the input form industry leaders locally and nationally. Atlanta, is a technology center in that many firms are dependent on and have made enormous commitments to information technologies. For instance in Atlanta three companies (UPS, Home Depot and Georgia Pacific) account for more than $2 billion of annual information technology development, deployment and sourcing expenditures. CIS faculty continue to do field work with these and other local firms. These companies among others are represented on the CIS board of advisors and GSU is a host institution in 2007 of yet another National CIO Workshop drawing form industry leaders coast to coast. These industry contacts will continue to prove important in understanding and anticipating trends in both business and technology. And contacts with these people at the point the technology meets business, many of whom hire our students will provide critical feedback and insight in our continuing curricular adaptation and development.
SLO 2: Discrete Mathematics (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles of discrete math 2) to formulate problems and theorems 3) to construct and evaluate the validity of proofs 4) to apply discrete structures for solving problems in computer science

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Computer Systems Development (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles, processes, and life cycles of computer systems development 2) to apply modeling techniques and tools for specification of systems under development and of computer systems project team management.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 4: Programming Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the current, best-practices programming paradigms 2) to apply high-level programming languages to implement the programming paradigms.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
SLO 5: Hardware Systems (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles and processes of hardware systems development 2) to apply modeling techniques and tools for implementing the phases of hardware development.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 6: Computer Organization and Programming (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles, organization, and process for designing and programming digital logic devices 2) Students have a working knowledge of current technologies.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 7: Analyze Technology (M: 6, 7)
Students effectively use computers and other technology.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
14 Technology--core

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Examinations: (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Each outcome can be mapped to a particular required course in our curriculum: 1-CSc 4520, 2-CSc 2510, 3-CSc 4530, 4-CSc 2310, and 5-CSc 4210. In each of the courses listed above, instructors include questions on exams targeting specific components of the corresponding outcome. Each outcome will be measured via the quality of the students’ answers to selected questions on exams in the corresponding courses.

Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The samples showed that the students mastered the subject domain basics and the best students demonstrated excellent mastery.

Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate...
excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students mastered the subject domain basics and the best students demonstrated excellent mastery.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students mastered the subject domain basics and the best students demonstrated excellent mastery.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students mastered the subject domain basics and the best students demonstrated excellent mastery.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students mastered the subject domain basics and the best students demonstrated excellent mastery.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students mastered the subject domain basics and the best students demonstrated excellent mastery.

**M 2: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Each outcome can be mapped to a particular required course in our curriculum: 1-CSc 4520, 2-CSc 2510, 3-CSc 4530, 4-CSc 2310, and 5-CSc 4210. In each of the courses listed above, instructors include questions on assignments and projects targeting specific components of the corresponding outcome. Each outcome will be measured via the quality of the students’ answers to selected questions on the assignments and projects in the corresponding courses. Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students worked independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. They demonstrated appropriate levels of skill and mastery of domain knowledge.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students worked independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. They demonstrated appropriate levels of skill and mastery of domain knowledge.
Target for O3: Computer Systems Development

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students worked independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. They demonstrated appropriate levels of skill and mastery of domain knowledge.

Target for O4: Programming Skills

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students worked independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. They demonstrated appropriate levels of skill and mastery of domain knowledge.

Target for O5: Hardware Systems

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students worked independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. They demonstrated appropriate levels of skill and mastery of domain knowledge.

Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students worked independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. They demonstrated appropriate levels of skill and mastery of domain knowledge.

M 3: Senior Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Copies of selected presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee. (each semester) Students are encouraged to participate in external design competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions. (ongoing)

Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The student’s demonstrated competent presentation skills and reflected their mastery of the domain knowledge.

Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The student’s demonstrated competent presentation skills and reflected their mastery of the domain knowledge.

Target for O3: Computer Systems Development

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The student’s demonstrated competent presentation skills and reflected their mastery of the domain knowledge.
Target for **O4: Programming Skills**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates. The assement of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The student’s demonstrated competent presentation skills and reflected their mastery of the domain knowledge.

Target for **O5: Hardware Systems**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates. The assement of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The student’s demonstrated competent presentation skills and reflected their mastery of the domain knowledge.

Target for **O6: Computer Organization and Programming**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates. The assement of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The student’s demonstrated competent presentation skills and reflected their mastery of the domain knowledge.

**M 4: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
A senior level course survey and exit interview will be conducted each term to solicit input from graduating seniors on a self assessment of their education, on their concerns with the department, and their ideas for possible curricular improvements. The undergraduate coordinator will administer the survey in conjunction with the graduation audit check out.

Target for **O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
The self-assessments will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

Target for **O2: Discrete Mathematics**
The self-assessments will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

Target for **O3: Computer Systems Development**
The self-assessments will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

Target for **O4: Programming Skills**
The self-assessments will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

Target for **O5: Hardware Systems**
The self-assessments will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

Target for **O6: Computer Organization and Programming**
The self-assessments will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**M 5: Alumni Surveys: (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
An alumni survey will be mailed to alumni via the departmental newsletter on an annual basis. Survey will solicit input from alumni on job promotions, success in graduate schools, job satisfaction, etc. Results will be provided to the Assessment Committee for review.

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**M 6: HTML project (O: 7)**
This project makes use of the HTML programming language in order to create web pages.

**Target for O7: Analyze Technology**
The average grade for this project should be above 85%.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Using only the data gathered from the Summer 2006 semester, the average grade for the project was 87%. This demonstrates that the students have a solid foundation on programming with HTML and are able to develop web pages.

**M 7: CSC 1010 Assignments (O: 7)**
The assignments given in CSC 1010 help us assess whether students are able to make use of the Web as research tool, compare and analyze current technology, and use basic software packages.

**Target for O7: Analyze Technology**
The average grade for all assignments given in CSC 1010 should be above 80%.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Using only the data gathered from the Summer 2006 semester, the average grade for the project was 86%. This demonstrates that the students have developed a core foundation for using various software tools, understanding concepts and applications of computers, its hardware components, and current technology.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Collection of data from alumni surveys

We intend to initiate building an alumni database. With a database of alumni, a survey will be appended to the department newsletter distributed. This will enable the department to keep in contact with the alumni and obtain a sufficient amount of survey data.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alumni Surveys
  - Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis
  - Computer Organization and Programming
  - Computer Systems Development
  - Discrete Mathematics
  - Hardware Systems
  - Programming Skills

- **Implementation Description:** May 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Staff person.
- **Additional Resources:** We need a current database of alumni as well as the staff to maintain it.

#### Curriculum change for hardware classes

Incorporate more real-world examples in teaching allowing better student comprehension in hardware systems and computer organization. Revise textbook choices for these courses since they do not contain sufficient number of examples. The curriculum committee is currently evaluating options for this action.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alumni Surveys
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Organization and Programming
  - Hardware Systems
  - Measure: Examinations
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Organization and Programming
  - Hardware Systems
  - Measure: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Organization and Programming
  - Hardware Systems
  - Measure: Senior Oral and Written Presentations
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Organization and Programming
  - Hardware Systems
  - Measure: Written Assignments and Reports
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Organization and Programming
  - Hardware Systems

- **Implementation Description:** December 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Departmental curriculum committee

#### Data collection for senior course and exit surveys

Include surveys to the exit procedure implemented prior to student graduations. Also have faculty include surveys at the end of their senior level classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews
  - Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis
  - Computer Organization and Programming
  - Computer Systems Development
  - Discrete Mathematics
  - Hardware Systems
  - Programming Skills

- **Implementation Description:** September 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Staff and department faculty

#### Suggest modification to 3000-level curriculum

Explore possibilities to modify the curriculum that will supplement the deficiencies students have in discrete mathematics. This includes either introducing a new course at the 3000 level or modifying existing 3000 level courses. The curriculum committee is currently discussing this option.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Examinations
  - Outcome/Objective: Discrete Mathematics
  - Measure: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews
  - Outcome/Objective: Discrete Mathematics
  - Measure: Written Assignments and Reports
  - Outcome/Objective: Discrete Mathematics

- **Implementation Description:** December 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Departmental curriculum committee

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

We developed an analytic method for interpreting the raw data and extracting meaningful information. This is described in detail on this linked web page for the assessment procedure. We found strengths in the general education objectives technology, communication, and critical thinking. The strengths for the major outcomes were in algorithm design and analysis, computer systems development, and programming skills.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The major objectives of discrete mathematics, hardware design, and computer organization and programming will require continued attention to improve student performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Data by Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005-2006 Computer Science MS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mission / Purpose

MISSION Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science M.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 every one.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Algorithm Design and Analysis (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Students understand the principles and methods of analyzing algorithms and have a working knowledge of algorithm design techniques.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Discrete Mathematics (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Students understand the mathematics of discrete structures and have a working knowledge of the application of discrete mathematics in computer science.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 2 Written Communication--core
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Computer Systems Development (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Students understand the principles, processes, and life cycles of computer systems development and have a working knowledge of the modeling techniques and tools to specify systems under development and of computer systems project team management.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

2 Written Communication--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Programming Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students understand the current, best-practices programming paradigms and have a working knowledge of programming in high-level programming languages that implement the paradigms.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major
13 Technology--major
14 Technology--core

Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Hardware Systems (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students understand the principles and processes of hardware systems development and have a working knowledge of the modeling techniques and tools to represent the phases of development.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
13 Technology--major
14 Technology--core

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 6: Computer Organization and Programming (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students understand the principles, organization, and process for designing and programming digital logic devices. Students have a working knowledge of current technologies.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major
14 Technology--core
InstitutionalPriorityAssociations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Thesis/Project Reports and Defenses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Copies of M.S. theses and project reports and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Assessment Committee (ongoing).

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 23 M.S. students have defended their master theses/projects during reporting period. M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 23 M.S. students have defended their master theses/projects during reporting period. M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 23 M.S. students have defended their master theses/projects during reporting period. M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 23 M.S. students have defended their master theses/projects during reporting period. M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 23 M.S. students have defended their master theses/projects during reporting period. M.S. students have co-
Target for **O6:** Computer Organization and Programming

The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills suitable for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

A total of 23 M. S. students have defended their master theses/projects during reporting period. M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these where published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**M 2:** Graduate Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Copies of selected presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee (each semester). Students are encouraged to participate in design/research paper competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions (ongoing).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

M 3: Examinations: (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Student ability will be assessed via examinations. Copies of selected examinations will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O3: Computer Systems Development

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O4: Programming Skills

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O5: Hardware Systems

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

M 4: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O3: Computer Systems Development

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O4: Programming Skills

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

Target for O5: Hardware Systems

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method...
that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments, and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills, and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**M 5: Alumni Surveys: (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

An alumni survey will be mailed to alumni via the departmental newsletter on an annual basis. Survey will solicit input from alumni on job promotions, success in graduate schools, job satisfaction, etc. Results will be provided to the Assessment Committee for review.

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**M 6: Research Publications (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Research publications in journals and conference proceedings produced by M.S. graduate students will be catalogued and made available to the Assessment Committee (on going).

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

Target for **O2**: Discrete Mathematics

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Met

M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

Target for **O3**: Computer Systems Development

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Met

M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

Target for **O4**: Programming Skills

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Met

M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

Target for **O5**: Hardware Systems

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Met

M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

Target for **O6**: Computer Organization and Programming

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Met

M.S. students have co-authored 22 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Collection of data from alumni survey**

We intend to initiate building an alumni database. With a database of alumni, a survey will be appended to the department newsletter distributed. This will enable the department to keep in contact with the alumni and obtain a sufficient amount of survey data.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alumni Surveys
  - Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis
  - Computer Organization and Programming
  - Computer Systems Development
  - Discrete Mathematics
  - Hardware Systems
  - Programming Skills
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Staff person.
- **Additional Resources:** We need a current database of alumni as well as the staff to maintain it.

**Consider Foundation Courses at Graduate Level**

We plan to present the results to the computer science curriculum committee and show the areas (discrete mathematics and computer organization) that may need improvement.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alumni Surveys
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Organization and Programming
  - Discrete Mathematics
  - Examinations
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Organization and Programming
  - Discrete Mathematics
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We developed an analytic method for interpreting the raw data and extracting meaningful information. This is described in detail on this linked web page for the assessment procedure. We found strengths in the general education objectives technology, communication, and critical thinking. The strengths for the major outcomes were in algorithm design and analysis, computer systems development, programming skills and hardware systems. Additionally, we found that the publication record of our M.S. students is better than expected -- on average each graduating student has one publication.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The major objectives of discrete mathematics and computer organization and programming will require continued attention to improve student performance.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Computer Science PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
MISSION Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders, educators and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science Ph.D. Program provides students with the underpinnings and advanced topics of computation and computer science for today's applications in industry, science, education, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Algorithm Design and Analysis (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students understand the principles and methods of analyzing algorithms and have a working knowledge of algorithm design techniques.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Discrete Mathematics (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students understand the mathematics of discrete structures and have a working knowledge of the application of discrete
mathematics in computer science.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Computer Systems Development (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students understand the principles, processes, and life cycles of computer systems development and have a working knowledge of the modeling techniques and tools to specify systems under development and of computer systems project team management.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Programming Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students understand the current, best-practices programming paradigms and have a working knowledge of programming in high-level programming languages that implement the paradigms.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 13 Technology--major
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 5: Hardware Systems (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students understand the principles and processes of hardware systems development and have a working knowledge of the modeling techniques and tools to represent the phases of development.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 13 Technology--major
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 6: Computer Organization and Programming (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Students understand the principles, organization, and process for designing and programming digital logic devices. Students have a working knowledge of current technologies.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s
Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**M 2: Alumni Surveys: (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

An alumni survey will be mailed to alumni via the departmental newsletter on an annual basis. Survey will solicit input from alumni on job promotions, success in graduate schools, job satisfaction, etc. Results will be provided to the Assessment Committee for review.

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

### M 3: Research Publications (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Research publications in journals and conference proceedings produced by Ph.D. graduate students will be catalogued and made available to the Assessment Committee (ongoing).

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

### M 4: Graduate Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Copies of selected presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee (each semester). Students are encouraged to participate in design/research paper competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions (ongoing).

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty level, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.
We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty level, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty level, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty level, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty level, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty level, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**M 5: Dissertation Manuscripts and Defenses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Copies of Ph.D. manuscripts and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Assessment Committee (on going).

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**

The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient
quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assement of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 6 Ph.D. students have defended their dissertations during the reporting period, and on average each graduate has 10 publications. Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assement of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 6 Ph.D. students have defended their dissertations during the reporting period, and on average each graduate has 10 publications. Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assement of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 6 Ph.D. students have defended their dissertations during the reporting period, and on average each graduate has 10 publications. Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assement of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 6 Ph.D. students have defended their dissertations during the reporting period, and on average each graduate has 10 publications. Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assement of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 6 Ph.D. students have defended their dissertations during the reporting period, and on average each graduate has 10 publications. Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assement of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
A total of 6 Ph.D. students have defended their dissertations during the reporting period, and on average each graduate has 10 publications. Ph.D. students have co-authored 79 publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

M6: Examinations: (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Student ability will be assessed via examinations. Copies of selected examinations will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

**Target for O1: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O2: Discrete Mathematics**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O3: Computer Systems Development**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O4: Programming Skills**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Target for O6: Computer Organization and Programming**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We found that certain individual measures (#1, 2, and 5) are highly correlated. Therefore we developed an analytic method that combines all of the measures to assess student outcomes. Please refer to the following table that describes the findings found using this assessment procedure.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Collection of data from alumni survey**

We intend to initiate building an alumni database. With a database of alumni, a survey will be appended to the department newsletter distributed. This will enable the department to keep in contact with the alumni and obtain a sufficient amount of survey data.

*Established in Cycle: 2005-2006*

*Implementation Status: Planned*
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

We developed an analytic method for interpreting the raw data and extracting meaningful information. This is described in detail on this linked web page for the assessment procedure. We found strengths in the general education objectives technology, communication, and critical thinking. The strengths for the major outcomes were in algorithm design and analysis, computer systems development, programming skills and hardware systems. Additionally, we found that the publication rate of our Ph.D. students is sufficiently high -- on average each Ph.D. student has 1.6 publications this year. Also, each Ph.D. student that graduated this year, had over 10 publications on average.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The major objectives of discrete mathematics and computer organization and programming will require continued attention to improve student performance.
Institutional Priority Associations

3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Problem Solving Processes (M: 3)

Students understand the process of individual and group problem solving. They demonstrate the ability to analyze risk using decision trees.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

Institutional Priority Associations

3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Advanced Capabilities (M: 2)

Students are able to apply advanced multivariate statistical and heuristic techniques to analyze large datasets and demonstrate how the results can be applied in practice to improve the quality of decisions.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

Institutional Priority Associations

3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Modeling Skills (O: 1)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student ability in Business Intelligence and Modeling a) Draw influence diagrams; build mathematical models to analyze a business situation. b) Incorporate Time Series Analysis and Forecasting techniques in the models. c) Make recommendations for Decision Making, and create a Decision Support System d) Demonstrate understanding of the BI framework, and apply concepts to a real situation.

Target for O1: Modeling Skills

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

None to Date

M 2: Application of Statistical Tools (O: 3)

Final Projects in MGS 8110 (Regression and Forecasting), MGS 8040 (Data Mining) and MGS 8170 (Statistical Modeling) will be assessed for students’ ability to apply advanced multivariate statistical and heuristic techniques to analyze large datasets and demonstrate how the results can be applied in practice to improve the quality of decisions.

Target for O3: Advanced Capabilities

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

None to Date

M 3: Decision Process Skills (O: 2)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student ability in Problem Solving and Risk Benefit Analysis a) Demonstrate an understanding of individual and group problem solving processes. b) Draw Decision Trees and analyze payoff and risk associated with various alternatives and make appropriate recommendations.

Target for O2: Problem Solving Processes
Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

None to Date

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Setting out Assessment Plan

The entire MBA Concentration in BA is currently under development. It will closely parallel that of the MS in BA.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Satish Nargundkar
- **Additional Resources:** None

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Concentration in Entrepreneurship MBA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

This program is designed to enable graduates to understand and work effectively within the dynamics and challenges of the new venture arena. Students graduating from the MBA/Entrepreneurship concentration are expected to understand and work effectively within the dynamics and challenges of the new venture arena. Successfully completing the concentration will provide an understanding of the environment in which entrepreneurs act and the behaviors that have a significant opportunity to create value and manage organizational uncertainty. Graduates are prepared to lead and participate with a team in the initiation of new ventures and new products or services. The mission is achieved by providing a variety of educational experiences both in the classroom and in the business community.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Attitudes and Behaviors

Students should be able to describe (a) attitudes and behaviors of successful entrepreneurs, (b) characteristics of environments conducive to innovation, and (c) several methods of managing organizational uncertainty.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - 1 Written Communication--major
  - 3 Oral Communication--major
  - 5 Collaboration--major
  - 7 Critical Thinking--major
  - 9 Contemporary Issues--major

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Analytical Skills

Students should be able to conduct sophisticated analyses of business opportunities, markets, and financial feasibility.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - 7 Critical Thinking--major
  - 9 Contemporary Issues--major

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Business Planning Skills**

Students should be able to write and effectively present a comprehensive business plan for a new organizational opportunity.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Personal Depth**

Students will add depth by taking at least one elective specialized graduate course related to entrepreneurship that fits their personal objectives. For example, students may choose courses in leadership, international entrepreneurship, new technology venturing, negotiation, competitor analysis, and others.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Skill Demonstration**

Prior to graduation students must demonstrate the ability to apply their knowledge and skills in entrepreneurship to real business situations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 6: Student Satisfaction**

Students will be satisfied with the quality of their education and the degree to which the MBA Concentration in Entrepreneurship prepares them to recognize business opportunities and to start new organizations.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 7: Continual Improvement**

Continually improve the MBA Concentration in Entrepreneurship through periodic assessments of program quality and through program change that is responsive to those assessments.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 8: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 1, 2)**

This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: In Development (O: 8)**

The measures of performance for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development. Four of the five
members of the Entrepreneurship faculty are leaving Georgia State and a new Director has been hired for AY 2007-2008. At that time the target performance levels will be set.

**Target for O8: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

The Performance Targets for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None to Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: None (O: 8)**

None to Date

**Target for O8: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

Not yet set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None to Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Development of Entrepreneurship Assessment**

A complete development of the Mission, Outcomes/Objectives, Measures & Findings for 06-07 Assessment cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ben Oviatt
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The human resource management concentration prepares students in the functional areas of the field such as selection, compensation, and employment law. A variety of educational experiences both in the classroom and the business community are offered.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Basic Principles (M: 1)**

Demonstrate a detailed understanding of fundamental components and legal constraints of selected functional areas of Human Resource.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Compensation Comprehension (M: 2)**
Students will be able to understand the basic concepts and developments in the compensation management field and be able to apply these concepts and techniques to produce a high-quality compensation plan for an organization.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking and Analysis (M: 3)**
Students will be able to apply HR practices and techniques to real business organizations, identify and use various legitimate sources of HR information, demonstrate proficiency in HR research methodology, and use analytical and critical thinking skills to synthesize information and make recommendations for implementation of HR practices.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Application of Concepts (M: 4)**
Students will be able to recognize and apply concepts of recruitment and selection, and use the recruitment and selection concepts to develop a recruitment and selection plan.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Knowledge and Application Ability Level (O: 1)**

(1) Likert scale evaluations by faculty of student performance on projects and papers in MGS 8300 and 8320. (2) Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) Certification exam results. (3) survey of students after graduation. Management (SHRM) Certification exam results. (3) survey of students after graduation.

**Target for O1: Basic Principles**
Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
None to date with the new approach. First assessment with new approach will be done in the 2006-2007 academic year.

**M 2: Level of Compensation Skills (O: 2)**

(1) Likert scale evaluations by faculty of student performance on projects and assignments in MGS 8300 and MGS 8390; (2) Results of SHRM and WorldatWork certification exams; (3) Survey of Beebe graduates; (4) Sample of student projects.

**Target for O2: Compensation Comprehension**
Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
None to date with the new approach. First assessment with new approach will be done in the 2006-2007 academic year.

**M 3: Translation of Skills to Business (O: 3)**
Students in MGS 8395 work on solutions to problems defined by their corporate sponsors. Each team designs, implements, and reports orally and in writing to executives of the sponsoring corporation and the instructor the results of their study. This learning objective will be evaluated by clients’ and faculty members’ judgment of knowledge and application of skills via the oral report and the written report. A rating system for judging projects will be completed by clients and instructors.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking and Analysis**
Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
M 4: Recruiting and Selection Skills (O: 4)
(1) Likert scale evaluations of student projects and assignments in MGS 8360; (2) SHRM certification exam results; (3) survey of recent Beebe graduates.

Target for O4: Application of Concepts
Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
None to date with the new approach. First assessment with new approach will be done in the 2006-2007 academic year.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Implementation of Assessment
Using the revised assessment tools the HR group will conduct assessment throughout the 2006-2007 Academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge and Application Ability Level | Outcome/Objective: Basic Principles
- Measure: Level of Compensation Skills | Outcome/Objective: Compensation Comprehension
- Measure: Recruiting and Selection Skills | Outcome/Objective: Application of Concepts
- Measure: Translation of Skills to Business | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking and Analysis

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Concentration in Operations Management MBA
As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Operations Management (OM) focuses on the management of resources and activities that produce and deliver the goods and services for customers. OM can play a critical role in enhancing a company’s competitive position by providing superior products and services.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Operations Planning & Control
The student should be able to identify critical success factors of the operations planning and control system for an organization, describe key elements of widely used operation planning and control systems and techniques, identify the critical success factors of designing and implementing a total quality management, program, service operations and describe the key elements required in planning and controlling.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
4 Oral Communication--core
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
### Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Analysis and Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

The ability to analyze and evaluate alternative operations strategies for a given business environment and to identify the appropriate facility location, design and technology choices as related to the operations function of the organization.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 4 Oral Communication—core
- 6 Collaboration—core

### Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 2: Employment (M: 4)

The student should secure a position in or related to the operations management function within one year after graduation and should succeed as evidenced by increasing responsibility, promotions, and salary increases over a period of five years after graduation.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Reasoned Analysis (O: 3)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student projects done in their class: In the completion of their final project and coursework this student team was able to do a reasoned analysis of: a) The studied firm's specific dimensions of the Operations Management application. b) The studied industry specific application of the Operations Management application. c) Highlight the affects of the different dimensions of Operations Management as it applies to their chosen topic.

**Target for O3: Analysis and Evaluation**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

1. In the completion of their final project and coursework this student team was able to do a reasoned analysis of: Strongly Agree Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 a) The studied firm's specific dimensions of the Operations Management application. **1.58** b) The studied industry specific application of the Operations Management application. **1.28** c) Highlight the affects of the different dimensions of Operations Management as it applies to their chosen topic. **1.25**

#### M 2: Integration of Recommendations (O: 3)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student projects done in their class: In presenting their final project this student team was able to make integrated recommendations on: a) The studied firm's specific dimensions of the Operations Management application. b) The industry specific application of the Operations Management application. c) Highlight the affects of the different dimensions of Operations Management as it applies to their chosen topic.

**Target for O3: Analysis and Evaluation**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In presenting their final project this student team was able to make integrated recommendations on: a) The studied firm's specific dimensions of the Operations Management application. **1.58** b) The industry specific application of the Operations Management application. **1.14** c) Highlight the affects of the different dimensions of Operations Management as it applies to their chosen topic. **1.58**

#### M 3: Performance (O: 3)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student projects done in their class: In analyzing the Operations Management area of the Industry and the Firm this student team was able to: a) Identify the critical success factors for the Operations Application. b) Analyze and understand the firm's performance in part through an assessment of its resources and capabilities used in the operations management application. c) Analyze and understand how the firm's performance is affected by the application of the OM process in the competitive environment.

**Target for O3: Analysis and Evaluation**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a
scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

3. In analyzing the Operations Management area of the Industry and the Firm this student team was able to: a) Identify the critical success factors for the Operations Application. 1.25 b) Analyze and understand the firm's performance in part through an assessment of its resources and capabilities used in the operations management application. 1.14 c) Analyze and understand how the firm's performance is affected by the application of the OM process in the competitive environment. 1.14

**M 4: Team Skills (O: 2, 3)**

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student projects done in their class: My impression of the students' contributions to this project and the overall coursework is, in general: a) The students delivered a project that showed an understanding of the integration of the basic areas of Operations. b) Each student was able to contribute functional expertise in Operations Management to the team's project effort.

**Target for O2: Employment**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

4. My impression of the students' contributions to this project and the overall coursework is, in general: a) The students delivered a project that showed an understanding of the integration of the basic areas of Operations. 1.14 b) Each student was able to contribute functional expertise in Operations Management to the team's project effort. 1.28

**Target for O3: Analysis and Evaluation**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

4. My impression of the students' contributions to this project and the overall coursework is, in general: a) The students delivered a project that showed an understanding of the integration of the basic areas of Operations. 1.14 b) Each student was able to contribute functional expertise in Operations Management to the team's project effort. 1.28

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Peer Evaluations**

Student peer evaluation may be needed to identify uneven contribution and delivery.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Team Skills | Outcome/Objective: Employment

**Implementation Description:** AY 2007

- **Responsible Person/Group:** OM Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Qualitative Emphasis**

Some quantitative analytical methods are covered in the later part of the course, which may be the reason students use qualitative methods.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Reansoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation

**Implementation Description:** AY 2007

- **Responsible Person/Group:** OM Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Supply Chain Emphasis**

Their weaknesses come from a lack of experience in the analysis of a production process. The course will need to place more emphasis on the production process when developing the overall supply chain strategy.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
- Measure: Reazoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation

**Implementation Description:** AY 2007

- **Responsible Person/Group:** OM Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The teams were able to present the firms’ dimensions of Operations Management from the viewpoint of someone who is experienced in Operations Management. The students developed an analysis of the organization from a viewpoint of someone who is currently holding an operations management position. The students gave presentations and completed projects showed an understanding of how to analyze a firm. Their analytical skills were very high. The students were very homogenous in their understanding of the OM processes. The teams were able to present the industry applications of Service Operations Management from the viewpoint of someone who is experienced in Operations Management. The students developed an analysis of the organization from a viewpoint of someone who is currently holding an operations management position. Overall, the teams were able to do a reasoned analysis on these dimensions, although there are areas that could be improved.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The projects could have developed more completely scenarios that are in opposition to their analytical conclusions. The teams were able to demonstrate the operations viewpoint from a logistics and supply chain viewpoint, their understanding of production processes were somewhat more limited. The actual presentation skills were somewhat weak in this class. The materials contained all of the necessary detail, but the students could easily have presented their ideas during the presentation in a more efficient way. Student peer evaluation may be needed to identify uneven contribution and delivery. The teams were able to address the issues from topics learned in the course. However, their understanding of the human/employee related issues were somewhat more limited. In addition, the project typically addressed one issue which may not be a true weakness. The actual presentation skills were somewhat weak in this class. The materials contained all of the necessary detail, but the students could easily have presented their ideas during the presentation in a more efficient way. The projects could have developed more completely scenarios that are in opposition to their analytical conclusions.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Concentration in Organization Management MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
None to date

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Development of MBA Assessment
To complete the development of an MBA Concentration Assessment plan distinctive from the one for the MS program and including Measures to be used.

O/O 2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 1)
This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: None yet Developed (O: 2)
None yet Developed

Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified
None yet Developed

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
None this cycle

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Development of Assessment
Develop an WEAVE-oriented Assessment plan to have operational in 2006-2007

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: OB Faculty
Additional Resources: None
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Counseling Psychology PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

---

### Mission / Purpose

The Counseling Psychology PhD Program, a unit of the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, subscribes to a scientist-practitioner model designed to integrate science with practice. Students are prepared to generate and apply psychological knowledge to human problems. Note: Our program has 32 students and had 3 students graduate with the Ph.D. degree during this assessment cycle.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Use and conduct research (M: 5, 6)**

Use and conduct research  
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

**O/O 2: Understands relevant theories (M: 2, 3)**

Understand theories of human development, psychopathology, counseling process, and behavior change  
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

**O/O 3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice (M: 4, 7, 9)**

Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice.  
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

**O/O 4: Is effective with diverse groups of clients (M: 10, 11)**

Prepared to work with clients who are culturally and individually different.

**O/O 5: Is proficient in key areas of the profession (M: 1, 8)**

Proficiency in psycho-educational interventions, diagnosis, prevention, remedial interventions, psychotherapy, consultation, and supervision.  
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: written practicum evaluation from supervisors (O: 5)**

Written practicum evaluation from supervisors. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must score a 3 or above on all items to be satisfactory.

**Target for O5: Is proficient in key areas of the profession**

100% of students receive a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors on categories relating to assessment for counseling.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors.

**M 2: Grades in theories courses (O: 2)**

Grades in theories courses (e.g., CPS 8450, CPS 8650, CPS 8370, PSYC 8660)

**Target for O2: Understands relevant theories**
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% passing grades in theories coursework

### M 3: Comprehensive examination question on theory (O: 2)
Theory comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students need to write a 12-page answer to this question to demonstrate their knowledge of counseling theories and applications. Answers are evaluated by a three-person faculty committee who determines whether the student receives a grade of pass or fail.

**Target for O2: Understands relevant theories**
100% passing grades on theory comprehensive examination question

### M 4: Grades in Ethics course (O: 3)
Grades in Ethics course (i.e., CPS 8530).

**Target for O3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**
100% passing grades in Ethics course

### M 5: Grades in research courses (O: 1)
Grades in research courses about research methods (e.g., EPRS 8530, EPRS 8540, EPRS 9820, CPS 9930).

**Target for O1: Use and conduct research**
100% passing grades (B or Better) in research courses

### M 6: Research comprehensive examination question (O: 1)
Research question in doctoral comprehensive exam. Students need to write a 12-page answer to this question to demonstrate their knowledge of research methods and applications. Answers are evaluated by a three-person faculty committee who determines whether the student receives a grade of pass or fail.

**Target for O1: Use and conduct research**
100% passing grades on research comprehensive examination question

### M 7: Comprehensive examination question on ethics (O: 3)
Ethics comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students need to write a 12-page answer to this question to demonstrate their knowledge of professional ethics and applications. Answers are evaluated by a three-person faculty committee who determines whether the student receives a grade of pass or fail.

**Target for O3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**
100% passing grades on Ethics comprehensive examination question

### M 8: Grades in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) (O: 5)
Grades in didactic courses (e.g., PSY 8020, PSY 8030, CPS 9420)

**Target for O5: Is proficient in key areas of the profession**
100% passing grades in didactic courses

### M 9: Evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 3)
Evaluation by practicum supervisor. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must score a 3 or above on all items to be satisfactory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students receive a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors on categories relating to professional ethics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students received a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10:</th>
<th>grades in Advanced Multicultural Counseling course (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grades in Advanced Multicultural Counseling course (i.e., CPS 8340)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for | Is effective with diverse groups of clients**
100% passing grades in Advanced Multicultural course

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passing grades in Advanced Multicultural course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11:</th>
<th>evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation by practicum supervisor. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must score a 3 or above on all items to be satisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for | Is effective with diverse groups of clients**
100% of students receive a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors on categories relating to counseling in multicultural settings.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students received a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Maintain and monitor program strengths**
All outcome objectives were fully met. Program faculty will work to maintain positive program characteristics, and will continue to monitor and assessment stated learning outcomes.

| Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 |
| Implementation Status: Planned |
| Priority: High |
| Implementation Description: Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year |
| Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty |

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
All outcome objectives were fully met. These results demonstrate our program's success in training students to be a scientist-practitioner through the learning of theory and research and incorporating this knowledge in practice with clients from diverse cultural backgrounds.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
While we have achieved our learning goals, we intend to monitor student progress in the next year to ensure that our goals are met by our program design and instructional methods.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Counselor Education PhD**

(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
The Counselor Education and Practice Ph. D. program is designed to prepare students to work as counselor educators, supervisors, and advanced practitioners in academic, public schools, and clinical settings. The program accepts as a primary obligation extending the knowledge base of the counseling profession in a climate of scholarly inquiry. The doctoral program subscribes to a scientist-practitioner model and as such is designed to prepare students to be both consumer and producer of research.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Teach effectively in university settings (M: 1)**
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Competence in instructing adults (O: 1)
In order to demonstrate competencies in instructing adults students will: 1. Develop a professional portfolio. 2. Enroll in the instructing adults course. 3. Meet regularly with faculty mentor who will provide feedback to the student on teaching competencies.

**Target for O1: Teach effectively in university settings**
- 1. 100% passing of the teaching portfolio.
- 2. 100% passing grades (B or better) in instructing adults course.
- Mentor assesses the competency level of the student via observations and ability of student to use feedback.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- 1. Students received a 100% passing on their teaching portfolio.
- 2. Students received 100% passing grade in instructing adults course.
- 3. Mentors assessed that students competently demonstrated teaching skills via observations and ability of student to use feedback.

#### M 2: Research competence (O: 2)
To demonstrate competence in the student’s ability to use and conduct research students will: 1. Complete research core sequence (24 semester hours). 2. Successfully pass the research portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Target for O2: Use and conduct research**
- 1. 100% passing grades (B or better) in research courses.
- 2. 100% passing on the research component of comprehensives.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- 1. Students received 100% passing grade in research courses.
- 2. Students received 100% passing in the research component of the comprehensive examination.

#### M 3: Competent in professional issues and decisions. (O: 3)
In order to demonstrate competence in professional issues and decisions students will: 1. Complete coursework in advanced group, advanced counseling theory, professional issues and decisions, and advanced career counseling. 2. Complete practicum and internship. 3. Complete written comprehensive examination related to counseling theory, ethics, and multicultural issues. Sample of a comprehensive examination question: 1. Within the multicultural counseling literature there has been some debate about the definition of “multicultural”. Some take a very broad perspective including diverse groups as well as racial groups while others take a very narrow perspective including only racial groups. How do you define multicultural and provide literature support and rationale for your definition? 2. Provide a review of the literature on substance abuse and low-income clients. Based on your review, develop a clinical program to address the needs of this population. a. Discuss the ethical, legal, and multicultural implications of your program.

**Target for O3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**
1. 100% passing grades (B or better) in the various courses. 2. Acceptable professional and ethical behavior as evaluated by the supervisors of their practicum and internship. 3. 100% passing grades on written comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

1. Students received 100% passing grade in professional issues and decisions course. 2. Students successfully completed their internship experience. 3. 100% pass rate on the written comprehensive examination.

**M 4: Competence in counseling supervision. (O: 4)**

In order to demonstrate competence in supervision, students will: 1. Enroll in coursework in supervision of counseling services; 2. Complete one semester of practicum in supervision.

**Target for O4: Prepared to provide supervision**

1. Students will receive a 100% passing grade in their counseling supervision course. 2. Acceptable professional and ethical behavior as assessed by the practicum supervisor who makes this assessment through listening to taped supervision sessions and case presentation of their supervision sessions.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

1. Students received 100% passing grade in the counseling supervision course. 2. Students received 100% passing grade in their counseling supervision practicum. Students demonstrated competence in supervision as assessed by their practicum supervisor using taped supervision sessions and case presentations of supervision.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Maintain current design**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Competence in counseling supervision. | Outcome/Objective: Prepared to provide supervision
- Measure: Competence in instructing adults | Outcome/Objective: Teach effectively in university settings
- Measure: Competent in professional issues and decisions. | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice
- Measure: Research competence | Outcome/Objective: Use and conduct research

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Our students successfully met the outcomes/objectives.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

We will continue to monitor the outcomes/objectives.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Creative Writing MFA**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs. We serve students at every level in the university with a broad range of curricular and extracurricular opportunities, including study abroad, internships, tutoring, and research assistantships.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge (M: 1)**

M.F.A. students will demonstrate a thorough familiarity with representative examples of writing by major figures in fiction or poetry, English and American literary history of fiction or poetry, and form and theory of fiction or poetry, depending on the student's choice of genre.
Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Application of Literary Studies (M: 1)
Students will be able to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics gained in their English studies to compose meaningful literary works and to compose literary works deemed worthy of being published in national literary journals. Students will be able to develop vocabularies for studying and discussing poetry or fiction, depending on the student's choice of genre.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Craftsmanship (M: 1)
Students will be able to produce writing that is authentic and engaging, in part by identifying and accessing material from their own lives and interests, and is of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Revising Skills (M: 1)
Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weakness of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism. Students will also be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and the instructor, and to revise their creative works to create writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Teaching Skills
Students will be able to teach an entry-level course in the discipline.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: M.F.A. Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students who entered the M.F.A. program are required to complete a thesis by the end of their program. Starting in the fall of 2008, the department will use an assessment form to measure their success beyond the traditional measure of a failing or passing grade. An assessment form, which will be completed by faculty members on the student’s committee, will rate how effectively the student work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes, using a six-point scale. In the summer, the Associate Graduate Director will meet with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze the resulting data in order to make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change.

Target for O1: Content Knowledge
The idea of requiring M.F.A. students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so an M.F.A. thesis assessment form was developed in the summer of 2006.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

Target for O2: Application of Literary Studies
The idea of requiring M.F.A. students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so an M.F.A. thesis assessment form was developed in the summer of 2006.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.
**Target for O3: Craftsmanship**

The idea of requiring M.F.A. students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so an M.F.A. thesis assessment form was developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O4: Revising Skills**

The idea of requiring M.F.A. students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so an M.F.A. thesis assessment form was developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Create criteria for M.F.A. thesis**

The Graduate Director will create a list of criteria to accompany the M.F.A. thesis assessment form, similar to the criteria developed for the PhD dissertation assessment tool.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
  - **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** Application of Literary Studies
  - **Implementation Description:** October 1, 2006
  - **Responsible Person/Group:** Calvin Thomas

**Initiate assessment tool for M.F.A. thesis**

All M.A. students submitting a thesis will defend the work before their M.A. committee. Afterwards, the Graduate Director will have the committee members complete an assessment form which evaluates how well the work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
  - **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** Application of Literary Studies
  - **Implementation Description:** August 2006
  - **Responsible Person/Group:** Tanya Caldwell, Associate Graduate Director

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

In 2005-2006, no assessment tools other than course grades and exam and thesis pass rates existed for the M.F.A. program. Because of this, no conclusions can be drawn about the strengths of the program based on assessment data. On the other hand, the director of Creative Writing has offered insights about the 2005-2006 cycle based on his own observations. Improvements in the Creative Writing M.A. are seen in the fact that students are now getting through the program at a faster rate and current students have established an impressive publication record.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

The main assessment focus in 2006-2007 will be establishing the assessment tool for the M.F.A. thesis. (All students in this program take the thesis.) While assessment forms have already been created for this purpose, the Graduate Director will work to formulate written criteria to accompany the assessment form, as was done with the PhD dissertation assessment tool. In addition, faculty members will continue to discuss expectations for the thesis defense to reach an understanding of the purpose of this new type of assessment. Creative Writing faculty will also strive to improve student funding since many highly qualified students who are attracted to the program do not attend because of limited graduate funding.
**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of Criminal Justice is to generate and disseminate knowledge and information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant for the fields of criminal justice and criminology. This is accomplished by (1) engaging in research and scholarly activities to address issues of crime and justice affecting diverse populations in urban settings; (2) producing students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice problems; and (3) collaborating with public and private agencies through education, training, and research ventures that enhance our understanding of, and response to, issues associated with crime and the administration of justice. Through these activities, the Department strives to promote basic principles of justice that enhance the criminal justice profession and benefit the community at large. Note: Our program has approximately 465 majors and had 91 students graduate with the BS degree during this assessment cycle. At a meeting on April 6, 2006, Drs. Joan Carson and Harry Dangel suggested that the department streamline data collection for the undergraduate program by reducing the size of student portfolios and identifying fewer questions to be posed to internship agencies for evaluation purposes. Those changes have been made and will be implemented in Fall 2006.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate understanding of the role of law (M: 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will explain the role of law, both substantive and procedural, as a central feature in the criminal justice system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Demonstrate basic skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will demonstrate a command of four basic skills: to read critically, to write clearly, to think analytically, and to speak effectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Apply scientific reasoning (M: 3)**

Students will understand and apply scientific reasoning to the study of crime and justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Use social science approach to study crime (M: 3)**

Students will display a comprehensive social science approach to the study of crime and justice by utilizing the academic disciplines of anthropology, economics, history, political science, psychology, public administration, and sociology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Demonstrate understanding of justice system (M: 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will articulate a comprehensive understanding of the evolution and current operations of the principal components of the criminal justice system (public safety, judiciary, corrections, and juvenile justice).

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime (M: 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the significant role that crime plays in our society and a command of criminological theory.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 8: Analyzing Contemporary Issues (M: 10)**

Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives, contemporary multicultural concerns, and contemporary global and international issues, conducted through the study of crime from a social science perspective.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

10. Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 7: Demonstrate career and educational advancement (M: 1, 4)**

Students will benefit from this comprehensive approach of the study of crime and justice with its theoretical and practical applications upon graduation either by entering graduate school or commencing their career.

**O/O 9: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 5)**

This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Field placement experience (O: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7)**

All students will intern in a criminal justice agency or other criminal law environment prior to graduation from the criminal justice program. This 10-week internship experience provides students an opportunity to integrate theory and practice in a professional setting. The field placement supervisor will assess the student’s knowledge of relevant criminal justice issues and his/her job readiness and submit a written evaluation to the Department prior to the end of the semester in which the internship is completed.

**Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of the role of law**

100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all criminal justice students completed a field placement in a criminal justice agency setting. Several students were hired by the internship agencies on completion of the field placement.

### Target for O2: Demonstrate basic skills
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all criminal justice students completed a field placement in a criminal justice agency setting. Several students were hired by the internship agencies on completion of the field placement.

### Target for O5: Demonstrate understanding of justice system
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all criminal justice students completed a field placement in a criminal justice agency setting. Several students were hired by the internship agencies on completion of the field placement.

### Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all criminal justice students completed a field placement in a criminal justice agency setting. Several students were hired by the internship agencies on completion of the field placement.

### Target for O7: Demonstrate career and educational advancement
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all criminal justice students completed a field placement in a criminal justice agency setting. Several students were hired by the internship agencies on completion of the field placement.

#### M 2: Agency evaluations (O: 1, 2, 5, 6)
The internship agency will complete an evaluation of the student intern prior to the end of the semester. The agency’s evaluation will assess the student’s knowledge of criminal justice issues and his/her job readiness.

### Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of the role of law
100% of students will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all students were evaluated by their field placement agencies; most received an overall rating of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale.

### Target for O2: Demonstrate basic skills
100% of students will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all students were evaluated by their field placement agencies; most received an overall rating of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale.

### Target for O5: Demonstrate understanding of justice system
100% of students will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all students were evaluated by their field placement agencies; most received an overall rating of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale.

### Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
100% of students will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all students were evaluated by their field placement agencies; most received an overall rating of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale.

#### M 3: Writing intensive courses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Two core courses in the major (CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice) have been designated as writing intensive in accordance with university guidelines and requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of the role of law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will complete writing intensive courses (CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice) with a satisfactory grade of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75% of students completed CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice with satisfactory grades of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Demonstrate basic skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will complete writing intensive courses (CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice) with a satisfactory grade of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75% of students completed CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice with satisfactory grades of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Apply scientific reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will complete writing intensive courses (CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice) with a satisfactory grade of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75% of students completed CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice with satisfactory grades of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Use social science approach to study crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will complete writing intensive courses (CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice) with a satisfactory grade of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75% of students completed CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice with satisfactory grades of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Demonstrate understanding of justice system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will complete writing intensive courses (CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice) with a satisfactory grade of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75% of students completed CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice with satisfactory grades of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will complete writing intensive courses (CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice) with a satisfactory grade of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 75% of students completed CrJu 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice with satisfactory grades of 70% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Survey of alumni (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice alumni will be asked to complete a survey assessing the value of their major for their job placement, future career aspirations and own personal goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Demonstrate career and educational advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every three years a survey will be sent to all students who have graduated from the Criminal Justice Department in the past three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department conducted a self study in 2002. All current criminal justice majors and alumni were surveyed about the value of their major to their job placements, career aspirations and personal goals. Overall results indicated that students were “quite satisfied with their choice to major in Criminal Justice” and would recommend the Department to others with similar interests. The next self study will be conducted in Fiscal Year 2007/2008. All current Criminal Justice students and alumni that graduated during the preceding three years will again be surveyed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Analysis of curriculum and syllabi (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A panel of faculty will assess the department’s curriculum and syllabi on a continuing basis to ensure that the subject matter reflects relevant and recent developments in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Outcome/Objective Not Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of faculty will report that all classes taught reflect relevant and recent developments in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of faculty reported that classes taught reflected the inclusion of relevant and recent developments in the field.

#### M 6: Capstone portfolio (O: 1, 2, 5, 6)

Students will develop a portfolio of written work assessing their knowledge and understanding of crime and justice issues, components of the justice system, and the impact of criminological theory on criminal justice administration.

**Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of the role of law**

- On an annual basis the portfolios of 20% of all students completing the capstone courses will be randomly selected and reviewed to assess students’ performance. Ninety percent (90%) of the portfolios chosen will receive a satisfactory or better rating, as defined by established criteria and evaluated by a panel of faculty.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- Teaching faculty evaluated the portfolios of all students completing the capstone courses. Better than 90% of the portfolios evaluated received a satisfactory rating.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate basic skills**

- On an annual basis the portfolios of 20% of all students completing the capstone courses will be randomly selected and reviewed to assess students’ performance. Ninety percent (90%) of the portfolios chosen will receive a satisfactory or better rating, as defined by established criteria and evaluated by a panel of faculty.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- Teaching faculty evaluated the portfolios of all students completing the capstone courses. Better than 90% of the portfolios evaluated received a satisfactory rating.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate understanding of justice system**

- On an annual basis the portfolios of 20% of all students completing the capstone courses will be randomly selected and reviewed to assess students’ performance. Ninety percent (90%) of the portfolios chosen will receive a satisfactory or better rating, as defined by established criteria and evaluated by a panel of faculty.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- Teaching faculty evaluated the portfolios of all students completing the capstone courses. Better than 90% of the portfolios evaluated received a satisfactory rating.

**Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime**

- On an annual basis the portfolios of 20% of all students completing the capstone courses will be randomly selected and reviewed to assess students’ performance. Ninety percent (90%) of the portfolios chosen will receive a satisfactory or better rating, as defined by established criteria and evaluated by a panel of faculty.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- Teaching faculty evaluated the portfolios of all students completing the capstone courses. Better than 90% of the portfolios evaluated received a satisfactory rating.

#### M 7: Capstone papers (O: 1, 2, 5, 6)

Students complete a variety of writing assignments including (a) a descriptive essay on the roles and functions of the internship agency, (b) a critical thinking through writing essay that analyzes a criminological/criminal justice issue, and (c) a reflective critical assessment of the field placement agency and the students’ professional growth as a result of the field placement experience.

**Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of the role of law**

- 90% of students will receive a satisfactory grade of C or higher on each essay.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- Teaching faculty evaluated the capstone papers of all students completing the capstone courses. Better than 90% of the papers received a satisfactory grade of C or better.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate basic skills**

- 90% of students will receive a satisfactory grade of C or higher on each essay.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- Teaching faculty evaluated the capstone papers of all students completing the capstone courses. Better than 90% of the papers received a satisfactory grade of C or better.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate understanding of justice system**

- 90% of students will receive a satisfactory grade of C or higher on each essay.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- Teaching faculty evaluated the capstone papers of all students completing the capstone courses. Better than 90% of the papers received a satisfactory grade of C or better.
Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
90% of students will receive a satisfactory grade of C or higher on each essay.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Teaching faculty evaluated the capstone papers of all students completing the capstone courses. Better than 90% of the papers received a satisfactory grade of C or better.

M 8: Oral presentations (O: 1, 2, 5, 6)
Students will make oral presentations throughout the semester that combine information from extant criminal justice literature and the intern's agency experience. At least one presentation will be developed in PowerPoint format to ensure familiarity with the technology.

Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of the role of law
90% of the oral presentations will be rated as satisfactory or better by internship faculty.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Teaching faculty evaluated the oral presentations made by all students completing the capstone courses. 100% of students completed PowerPoint presentations. Better than 90% of the oral presentations evaluated receive a satisfactory rating.

Target for O2: Demonstrate basic skills
90% of the oral presentations will be rated as satisfactory or better by internship faculty.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Teaching faculty evaluated the oral presentations made by all students completing the capstone courses. 100% of students completed PowerPoint presentations. Better than 90% of the oral presentations evaluated receive a satisfactory rating.

Target for O5: Demonstrate understanding of justice system
90% of the oral presentations will be rated as satisfactory or better by internship faculty.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Teaching faculty evaluated the oral presentations made by all students completing the capstone courses. 100% of students completed PowerPoint presentations. Better than 90% of the oral presentations evaluated receive a satisfactory rating.

Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
90% of the oral presentations will be rated as satisfactory or better by internship faculty.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Teaching faculty evaluated the oral presentations made by all students completing the capstone courses. 100% of students completed PowerPoint presentations. Better than 90% of the oral presentations evaluated receive a satisfactory rating.

M 9: Capstone examination (O: 1, 2, 5, 6)
All students are required to take a substantive knowledge examination in the semester immediately prior to enrollment in the Internship. The examination covers the basic areas of Criminology, Public Safety, Courts, Corrections and Juvenile Justice.

Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of the role of law
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students pass the examination with a score 70% or better on the first attempt.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The capstone examination was administered for the first time in Summer 2005 when 41 students (Fall 2005 interns) took the examination; 98% passed with a score of 60% or better on the first attempt. Failing students retook the examination in Fall 2005 when it was administered to 34 students (Spring 2006 interns); 100% of these students achieved a passing score of 60% or better. 37 students (Summer 2006 interns) took the examination in Spring 2006 and 100% achieved a passing score of 60% or greater.

Target for O2: Demonstrate basic skills
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students pass the examination with a score 70% or better on the first attempt.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The capstone examination was administered for the first time in Summer 2005 when 41 students (Fall 2005 interns) took the examination; 98% passed with a score of 60% or better on the first attempt. Failing students retook the examination in Fall 2005 when it was administered to 34 students (Spring 2006 interns); 100% of these students achieved a passing score of 60% or better. 37 students (Summer 2006 interns) took the examination in Spring 2006 and 100% achieved a passing score of 60% or greater.

Target for O5: Demonstrate understanding of justice system
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students pass the examination with a score 70% or better on the first attempt.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The capstone examination was administered for the first time in Summer 2005 when 41 students (Fall 2005 interns) took the examination; 98% passed with a score of 60% or better on the first attempt. Failing students retook the examination in Fall 2005 when it was administered to 34 students (Spring 2006 interns); 100% of these students achieved a passing score of 60% or better. 37 students (Summer 2006 interns) took the examination in Spring 2006 and 100% achieved a passing score of 60% or greater.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Administer Alumni Survey
Administer survey to program alumni who graduated during the past three years to track their job placement and determine the perceived value of the criminal justice major to their job placement and future educational and/or career aspirations. The Alumni Survey was last administered during the Department’s Self Study in 2002; it will next be administered in 2008.

M 10: Contemporary Issues exam questions (O: 8)
The course used to assess General Education Outcomes by the Department of Criminal Justice was CRJU 2200 - Social Science and the American Crime Problem. Three sections of this course were offered during the Spring 2007 semester and three objective examinations were administered in each section. Each examination covered approximately one-third (1/3) of the course materials. Three student learning outcomes (course goals) are associated with the course: Goal IV.1: Students will effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. Goal IV.2.a: Students will effectively analyze contemporary multicultural questions. Goal IV.2.b: Students will effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions. Two questions related to each Goal were asked on each examination in each section of the course. The questions were different substantively but addressed the stated issues.

Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students pass the examination with a score 70% or better on the first attempt.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The capstone examination was administered for the first time in Summer 2005 when 41 students (Fall 2005 interns) took the examination; 98% passed with a score of 60% or better on the first attempt. Failing students retook the examination in Fall 2005 when it was administered to 34 students (Spring 2006 interns); 100% of these students achieved a passing score of 60% or better. 37 students (Summer 2006 interns) took the examination in Spring 2006 and 100% achieved a passing score of 60% or greater.

Target for O8: Analyzing Contemporary Issues
The desired performance is to have at least 60% of students pass each objective question with a score 60%.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Student responses (N=63) to each of the six questions were tabulated and analyzed. The percentage pass rate for each question was calculated and is presented below. Two questions related to contemporary issues with the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. The results were as follows: Question One Pass Rate was 84%, Question 2 Pass Rate was 94%. Two questions dealt with contemporary multicultural concerns. The results here were: Question One Pass Rate was 97%, Question 2 Pass Rate was 86%. Finally, two questions concerned contemporary global and international issues. The results were as follows: Question One Pass Rate was 60%, Question 2 Pass Rate was 71%.
Develop and maintain a strategic plan
Develop and maintain a strategic plan for the undergraduate program, monitor implementation, and report on progress toward goal attainment.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Establish benchmarks for curricular success
Establish and maintain benchmarks for undergraduate curricular success including the number and quality of Criminal Justice majors, recruitment measures, retention and placement trends.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Field placement experience | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate career and educational advancement
  Measure: Survey of alumni | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate career and educational advancement

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Evaluate strengths and weaknesses of program
Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate program and provide recommendations for improvements.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Agency evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  | Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
  Measure: Capstone examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  | Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
  Measure: Capstone papers | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  | Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
  Measure: Capstone portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  | Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
  Measure: Field placement experience | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  | Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
  Measure: Oral presentations | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  | Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime
  Measure: Survey of alumni | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate career and educational advancement
  Measure: Writing intensive courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply scientific reasoning
  | Use social science approach to study crime
  Measure: Writing intensive courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply scientific reasoning

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and all faculty.

Reevaluate capstone examination
Reevaluate capstone examination to ensure that the content of the examination reflects the substantive information taught in the criminal justice curriculum.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  | Demonstrate understanding of justice system | Demonstrate understanding of the role of crime | Demonstrate understanding of the role of law

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Review all learning outcomes
Review syllabi and curriculums to ensure that all basic learning outcomes are relevant, measurable and achievable.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  Measure: Capstone papers | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  Measure: Capstone portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  Measure: Oral presentations | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills
  Measure: Writing intensive courses | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate basic skills

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and all faculty.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Department continues to excel in areas related to communication, critical thinking, contemporary issues, quantitative skills and technology. Additionally, the Capstone Examination was administered for the first time in Summer 2005 (for Fall 2005 interns) with 98% of students achieving a satisfactory passage rate of 60% or better on the first attempt. Subsequent administrations in Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 reflected that 100% of students taking the examination achieved an acceptable passing score on the first attempt. Existing measures including agency evaluations of interns indicate that students have developed good basic skills sets and are well prepared academically and professionally.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
As suggested by Drs. Carson and Dangel, the Department streamlined the amount of data collected in student portfolios. Agency evaluations also have been streamlined and the data from these surveys will be collected and analyzed at the end of each term beginning in Fall 2006. The Department also recognizes a need to collect and analyze data from the 2006/2007 Capstone Examination to identify strengths and weaknesses in students' general knowledge of criminal justice issues. The Undergraduate Committee will continue to evaluate the data collected to ensure that it is harmonious with learning objectives and provides quality information that may be used for strategic planning. The Department does not presently have a mechanism in place to determine retention rates or to adequately track job placements of graduates. Addressing these issues will be accorded a high priority in the coming year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Criminal Justice MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of Criminal Justice is to generate and disseminate knowledge and information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant for the fields of criminal justice and criminology. This is accomplished by (1) engaging in research and scholarly activities to address issues of crime and justice affecting diverse populations in urban settings; (2) producing students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice problems; and (3) collaborating with public and private agencies through education, training, and research ventures that enhance our understanding of, and response to, issues associated with crime and the administration of justice. Through these activities, the Department strives to promote basic principles of justice that enhance the criminal justice profession and benefit the community at large. Note: The graduate committee is in the process of designing the capstone seminar course and will seek course approval from the CHHS Academic Affairs Committee during the Spring semester, 2007. The capstone seminar will be first offered during Spring semester, 2007.

Student Learning Outcomes/ Objectives

SLO 1: Understand Theory (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate a working understanding of the theoretical knowledge base in criminology and criminal justice.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
4 Oral Communication--core

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will critically analyze crime and justice issues and/or information utilizing theoretical, methodological, and statistical skill bases.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
4 Oral Communication--core
5 Collaboration--major
6 Collaboration--core

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience
### SLO 3: Apply Terminology and Theory (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will apply learned terminology and theory to real-world situations that both relate to and expand outside the fields of criminology and criminal justice.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 5 Collaboration--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Communicate Effectively (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will communicate effectively, in oral and written form, their understanding and analyses of crime and justice issues as they apply their knowledge to real-world problems and questions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 5 Collaboration--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 5: Understand Integration of Systems and Processes (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will be able to discuss an integrated view of crime and criminal justice systems and processes and how the components interact and intersect to provide coordinated justice administration.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 6: Apply Research and Statistical Skills (M: 1, 2)

Students will apply acquired research and statistical skill bases to evaluate the quality of scholarly products and their contribution to the fields of criminology and criminal justice.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Knowledge Assessment Survey of Thesis Students (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

The Capstone knowledge assessment survey is a 21-item faculty-rated questionnaire that measures the degree to which students who defended their thesis successfully have met the student learning outcomes. The questionnaire is completed by the student’s thesis supervisor.

**Target for O1: Understand Theory**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Two theses were completed during the 2005-2006 academic year. The average ratings for the individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.75 to 5.00 (on a 5-point scale). The average overall rating for the six learning outcomes was 4.86 (on a 5-point scale). Thus, 100% of the students had averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Two theses were completed during the 2005-2006 academic year. The average ratings for the individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.75 to 5.00 (on a 5-point scale). The average overall rating for the six learning outcomes was 4.86 (on a 5-point scale). Thus, 100% of the students had averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Target for O3: Apply Terminology and Theory**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Two theses were completed during the 2005-2006 academic year. The average ratings for the individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.75 to 5.00 (on a 5-point scale). The average overall rating for the six learning outcomes was 4.86 (on a 5-point scale). Thus, 100% of the students had averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Target for O4: Communicate Effectively**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Two theses were completed during the 2005-2006 academic year. The average ratings for the individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.75 to 5.00 (on a 5-point scale). The average overall rating for the six learning outcomes was 4.86 (on a 5-point scale). Thus, 100% of the students had averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Target for O5: Understand Integration of Systems and Processes**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Two theses were completed during the 2005-2006 academic year. The average ratings for the individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.75 to 5.00 (on a 5-point scale). The average overall rating for the six learning outcomes was 4.86 (on a 5-point scale). Thus, 100% of the students had averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Target for O6: Apply Research and Statistical Skills**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Two theses were completed during the 2005-2006 academic year. The average ratings for the individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.75 to 5.00 (on a 5-point scale). The average overall rating for the six learning outcomes was 4.86 (on a 5-point scale). Thus, 100% of the students had averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**M 2: Alumni Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Graduate alumni will be asked to complete a questionnaire, assessing their satisfaction with the program’s contribution to their learning in the related outcomes, as well as assessing their satisfaction with the value of their degree for their job placement, future career aspirations, and personal goals. Finally, the survey also will evaluate graduate program recruitment practices; the capstone experience, including the thesis and capstone seminar; and graduate admissions and program services.

**Target for O1: Understand Theory**
Current alumni to report satisfaction with the program’s contribution to their learning in the related outcomes, as well as satisfaction with the value of their degree in finding job placement in a criminal justice or related profession.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
No findings to report at this time.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking**
Current alumni to report satisfaction with the program’s contribution to their learning in the related outcomes, as well as satisfaction with the value of their degree in finding job placement in a criminal justice or related profession.
Target for **O3: Apply Terminology and Theory**
Current alumni to report satisfaction with the program’s contribution to their learning in the related outcomes, as well as satisfaction with the value of their degree in finding job placement in a criminal justice or related profession.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
No findings to report at this time.

Target for **O4: Communicate Effectively**
Current alumni to report satisfaction with the program’s contribution to their learning in the related outcomes, as well as satisfaction with the value of their degree in finding job placement in a criminal justice or related profession.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
No findings to report at this time.

Target for **O5: Understand Integration of Systems and Processes**
Current alumni to report satisfaction with the program’s contribution to their learning in the related outcomes, as well as satisfaction with the value of their degree in finding job placement in a criminal justice or related profession.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
No findings to report at this time.

Target for **O6: Apply Research and Statistical Skills**
Current alumni to report satisfaction with the program’s contribution to their learning in the related outcomes, as well as satisfaction with the value of their degree in finding job placement in a criminal justice or related profession.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
No findings to report at this time.

**M 3: Knowledge Assessment Survey of Non-Thesis Students (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
A shorter version of the capstone knowledge assessment survey is used for the non-thesis students. The 18-item faculty-rated questionnaire is to be completed by the instructor of the capstone seminar shortly after the completion of the course.

Target for **O1: Understand Theory**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
There are no findings to report at this time. The survey will be first completed at the end of the Capstone Seminar offered this Spring, 2007.

Target for **O2: Critical Thinking**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
There are no findings to report at this time. The survey will be first completed at the end of the Capstone Seminar offered this Spring, 2007.

Target for **O3: Apply Terminology and Theory**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
There are no findings to report at this time. The survey will be first completed at the end of the Capstone Seminar offered this Spring, 2007.

Target for **O4: Communicate Effectively**
The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
There are no findings to report at this time. The survey will be first completed at the end of the Capstone Seminar offered this Spring, 2007.

Target for **O5: Understand Integration of Systems and Processes**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

There are no findings to report at this time. The survey will be first completed at the end of the Capstone Seminar offered this Spring, 2007.

### Development of Alumni Survey

**Graduate Committee will design the graduate alumni survey.**

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relations of Measure | Outcome/Objective:**
- **Measure:** Alumni Survey
- **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Research and Statistical Skills
- Apply Terminology and Theory
- Communicate Effectively
- Critical Thinking
- Understand Integration of Systems and Processes
- Understand Theory

**Implementation Description:** End of Spring semester, 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee

**Additional Resources:** The graduate committee will compile an alumni database, containing current contact information collected from the GSU Alumni Office.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Our students demonstrated competence in all learning outcome areas, but especially with regard to communicating effectively through their oral defense and written thesis. The students demonstrated clearly their understanding and analysis of crime and justice issues, as well as applying research and statistical skills to evaluate published research and to conduct their own analyses.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Nothing required at this time.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Early Childhood Education BSED**

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

**Mission / Purpose**

The purpose of the Bachelor of Science Program in Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University is to prepare instructional personnel who will be qualified to direct the education of young children from pre-school through elementary grades. The theme of this program is to develop teachers as facilitators of learning. Coursework, extensive field experience and collaboration among school and university faculty combine to develop a program that supports the professional growth of the novice educator.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning (M: 3)**

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

**Relevant Associations:** NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Collaboration--major
4. Critical Thinking--major
5. Contemporary Issues--major
6. Quantitative Skills--major
7. Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs
### SLO 2: Practices professional reflection (M: 6)

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Collaboration--major
4. Critical Thinking--major
5. Contemporary Issues--major
6. Quantitative Skills--major
7. Technology--major

### Institutional Priority Associations

1. Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### SLO 6: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 10)

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 1 Written Communication--major |
| 3 Oral Communication--major |
| 5 Collaboration--major |
| 7 Critical Thinking--major |
| 9 Contemporary Issues--major |
| 11 Quantitative Skills--major |
| 13 Technology--major |

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 7: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 5)

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 1 Written Communication--major |
| 3 Oral Communication--major |
| 5 Collaboration--major |
| 7 Critical Thinking--major |
| 9 Contemporary Issues--major |
| 11 Quantitative Skills--major |
| 13 Technology--major |

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 8: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 4)

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 1 Written Communication--major |
| 3 Oral Communication--major |
| 5 Collaboration--major |
| 7 Critical Thinking--major |
| 9 Contemporary Issues--major |
| 11 Quantitative Skills--major |
| 13 Technology--major |

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 9: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 1)

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 10: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 2)
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty Rating: Communication & Technology (O: 9)
The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 6: a.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 6, b.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to verbal, nonverbal, and media communication skills

Target for O9: Uses communication skills and technology
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
79% of candidates met Standard 6: Uses communication skills and technology.

M 2: Faculty Rating: Planning for Instruction (O: 10)
The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 7: a.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit "Technology" component from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 7, c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to planning for instruction

Target for O10: Can effectively plan for instruction
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
79% of all candidates have met Standard 7: Can Effectively Plan for Instruction.

M 3: Faculty Rating: Assessment of Learning (O: 1)
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.

Target for O1: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
79% of candidates have met Standard 8: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning.
setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76% of all candidates have met Standard 8: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Faculty Rating: Motivation & Management (O: 8)**

The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 5: a.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 5, b.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to motivating and managing students, and c.) Classroom center design and implementation evaluation (Student Teaching).

**Target for O8: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78% of candidates met Standard 5: Can Motivate and Manage Student Learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Faculty Rating: Multiple Instructional Strategies (O: 7)**

The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 4: a.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 4, and c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to using multiple instructional strategies.

**Target for O7: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74% of candidates met Standard 4: Knows and Uses Multiple Instructional Strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Faculty Rating: Professional Reflection (O: 2)**

The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 9: a.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit "Reflecting on Practice" component from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 9, and c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to professional reflection, "Reflections post-teaching" across all ten standards.

**Target for O2: Practices professional reflection**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83% of all candidates have met Standard 9: Practices Professional Reflection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: Faculty Rating: School/Community Relationships (O: 3)**

The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 10: a.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 10, b.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to "Partnerships with the School/Community," and c.) Parent conference report and reflection.

**Target for O3: Fosters relationships with school and community**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of candidates have met Standard 10: Fosters Relationships Among School and Community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Faculty Rating: Content Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 4)**

The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 1: a.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 1, and c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to content and pedagogical knowledge.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

85% of candidates have met Standard 1: Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

85% of candidates have met Standard 10: Fosters Relationships Among School and Community.
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
79% of candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

M 9: Faculty Rating: Understanding Student Development (O: 5)
The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 2: a.) Focal Child Portfolio/Parent Conference Report (Student Teaching) b.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), c.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 2, d.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to understanding human growth and development.

Target for O5: Understands student development regrading learning
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
79% of candidates met Standard 2: Understands Student Development Regarding Learning.

M 10: Faculty Rating: Teaching Diverse Learners (O: 6)
The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 3: a.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit, "Modifications included in Lesson Plans" from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 3, c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to adapting instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Target for O6: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
80% of candidates met Standard 3: Effectively Teach Diverse Groups of Learners.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Standard 4: Multiple Instructional Strategies
In order for candidates to improve knowledge and use of multiple instructional strategies, we will require all student teachers to:
Participate in a seminar to: 1) learn procedures for referring students for support through SST (Student Support Teams),
2) understand factors that impact the effectiveness of the SST for the student.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating: Multiple Instructional Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teacher Supervisors

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our assessments show that our teacher candidates demonstrated expected or above performance levels for a majority of the 10 standards.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We are currently working to include additional experiences that will strengthen candidates' knowledge and ability to plan and implement a variety of instructional strategies to motivate and meet the needs of all learners. We have developed an action plan to address this need. All other standard assessments will be monitored and maintained.
### Mission / Purpose

The Educational Specialist program provides opportunities for teachers to reflect upon and refine their understanding about being a teacher and being a leader. Graduates of the Ed.S. program are viewed as educational leaders and decision makers in their schools and community. Their primary professional responsibilities are related to being inspiring instructional leaders and interpreters of theory to practice in classroom instruction. This program is intended for school based instructors who are interested in becoming leaders. There are currently 20 student enrolled in this 15 month program.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Participates in profession’s learning communities (M: 2, 3)

Educators collaborate with other professionals to make schools more effective. Educators find ways to work collaboratively with parents engaging them in the work of the school. Educators take advantage of a school's community as a resource for learning.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 1, 2)

Educators appreciate how knowledge in their subject is created, organized and linked to other disciplines. Educators have specialized knowledge about how to convey content to learners. Educators generate multiple paths to learning.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 1, 2)

Educators call on multiple methods to meet their goals. Educators orchestrate learning in different groupings and settings. Educators place a premium on learners' engagement. Educators regularly assess learners' progress. Educators have clear goals.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #3 PSC Standard Domain: Clinical Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 1, 2)

Educators are models for life-long learning, exemplifying the ideals they seek to inspire in others. Educators seek advice from others and draw on educational research and scholarship to improve their practice and make principled judgments.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #4 PSC Standard Domain: Planning, Content Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 5: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 2, 3)

Educators adjust their practice according to learners' individual differences. Educators have an understanding of how learners develop and learn and use these to make decisions about how to teach. Educators treat learners equitably. An educators' mission extends beyond developing the cognitive capacity of their learners.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
# Measures, Targets, and Findings

## M 1: Action Research Project (O: 2, 3, 4)

The goal of action research is for teacher-researchers to solve educational problems by engaging in a systematic process of inquiry. This process enables teacher-researchers to make informed decisions at both the classroom and school level. Students will conduct an action research project in their classrooms thereby helping to bridge theory and practice. The project will enable students to solve an educational problem as they practice the skills of reflective practitioner.

### Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development

80% of students will reach the "exceeds goal" category

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

19 of 20 students reached the "exceeds goal" category.

### Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development

80% of students will reach the "exceeds goal" category

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

19 of 20 students reached the "exceeds goal" category.

### Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

80% of students will reach the "exceeds goal" category

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

19 of 20 students reached the "exceeds goal" category.

## M 2: Capstone Experience (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Periodic benchmarks (collaborative conferences to share work) are formal performance assessments that provide evaluative information (decision-points). The last of these benchmarks is a capstone experience (projects which synthesize and demonstrate growth in knowledge, skills, and attitudes over time) where teachers design a final reflection and representation of their work. Capstones require approved program proposals that detailed projects illustrating competencies across three focus strands of the program: identity as teacher researcher, teacher as professional learner, and learner-centered practitioner.

### Target for O1: Participates in profession’s learning communities

All students will “meet” goals and 80% will "exceed goals”.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

All students met the goal. Fourteen of 20 or 70% "exceeded" the goal.

### Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development

All students will "meet” goals and 80% will "exceed goals”.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

All students met the goal. Fourteen of 20 or 70% "exceeded" the goal.

### Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development

All students will "meet” goals and 80% will "exceed goals”.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

All students met the goal. Fourteen of 20 or 70% "exceeded" the goal.

### Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

All students will "meet” goals and 80% will "exceed goals”.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

All students met the goal. Fourteen of 20 or 70% "exceeded" the goal.

### Target for O5: Is committed to student learning and development

All students will "meet” goals and 80% will "exceed goals”.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

All students met the goal. Fourteen of 20 or 70% "exceeded" the goal.

## M 3: Teacher Development Project (O: 1, 5)

The teacher development project includes three major criteria: 1. Reflection on growth 2. Application of content knowledge and skills
3. Supporting evidence

**Target for O1: Participates in profession’s learning communities**

All students will "meet" the standard and 80% will "exceed" the standard.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

All students met the standard. Fourteen of 20 or 70% exceeded the standard.

**Target for O5: Is committed to student learning and development**

All students will "meet" the standard and 80% will "exceed" the standard.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

All students met the standard. Fourteen of 20 or 70% exceeded the standard.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Reflection**

Better assist students in deep and insightful reflection that evaluates performance and provides new directions for learning

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Capstone Experience | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in profession’s learning communities
- **Measure:** Teacher Development Project | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in profession’s learning communities

**Implementation Description:** Next new cohort begins January 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Cohort facilitator and course instructor

**Supporting evidence**

Better assist students in providing clear and specific supporting evidence of progress toward meeting goals.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Capstone Experience | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in profession’s learning communities
- **Measure:** Teacher Development Project | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in profession’s learning communities

**Implementation Description:** Next cohort to begin January 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Cohort facilitator and course instructor

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Data indicated that all students "meet" program goals and graduate on schedule. Eighty percent "exceed" goals #1, 2, and 3.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

While data indicate all students "meet" program goals, at the Specialist level we would like 80% to "exceed" goals. Currently 80% of students "exceed" goals #1, 2, 3; 70% of students exceed goals #4 and 5.

---

**Georgia State University**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Early Childhood Education is a community of Early Childhood educators committed to equity, collaboration, and excellence in field-based teacher education, research, and service.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Fosters relationships with school and community (M: 10)**

The teacher candidate fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well being.
### SLO 2: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)
The teacher candidate is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>1.3 Quality professional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 3: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 2)
The teacher candidate plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>1.3 Quality professional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 4: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 3)
The teacher candidate understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>1.3 Quality professional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 5: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 1)
The teacher candidate uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>1.3 Quality professional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 6: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 7)
The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>1.3 Quality professional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 7: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 4)
The teacher candidate uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>1.3 Quality professional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### SLO 8: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 6)

The teacher candidate understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Relevant Associations:** INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

### Strategic Plan Associations

| 6.3 Graduate Experience |

### Institutional Priority Associations

| 1.3 Quality professional programs |
| 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives |

### SLO 9: Understands student development regarding learning (M: 5)

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

**Relevant Associations:** NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

### Strategic Plan Associations

| 6.3 Graduate Experience |

### Institutional Priority Associations

| 1.3 Quality professional programs |

### SLO 10: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 8)

The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

**Relevant Associations:** INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

### Strategic Plan Associations

| 6.3 Graduate Experience |

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 5)

Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6.

**Target for O5: Uses communication skills and technology**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

91% of candidates met Standard 6: Candidate uses communication skills and technology.

#### M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 3)

Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.

**Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

92% of candidates met Standard 7: Candidate can effectively plan for instruction.

#### M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 4)

Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.

**Target for O4: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
57% of candidates met Standard 8: Candidate understands and uses assessment for learning.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 7)
Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

Target for O7: Can motivate and manage students for learning
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
91% of candidates met Standard 5: Candidate can motivate and manage students for learning.

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 9)
Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Target for O9: Understands student development regarding learning
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
85% of candidates met Standard 2: Candidate understands student development regarding learning.

M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 8)
Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Target for O8: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
91% of candidates met Standard 3: Candidate can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 6)
Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Target for O6: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
87% of candidates met Standard 4: Candidate knows and uses multiple instructional strategies.

M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 10)
Supervising final evaluation, final exams, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O10: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
86% of candidates met Standard 1: Candidate demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 2)
Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9.

Target for O2: Practices professional reflection
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
85% of candidates met Standard 9: Candidate practices professional reflection.

M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 1)
Supervising final evaluation, course grades, and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.

Target for O1: Fosters relationships with school and community
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
92% of candidates met Standard 10: Candidate fosters relationships with school and community.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Standard 8: Assessment Action Plan
In order for candidates to understand and use assessment for learning, we: 1. Redesigned the Student Learning Project to focus on both pre and post assessments. 2. Developed a SST simulation which includes training on various assessments that can be used to gather information about diverse learners in order to inform instruction. 3. Developed a assessment unit as a part of the mathematics methods course which includes the use of a new assessment methods textbook.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Implementation Description: May 2007
Responsible Person/Group: UAPP Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our assessments show that our candidates are able to successfully: 1. Demonstrate content pedagogical knowledge, 2. Understand student development regarding learning, 3. Teach diverse groups of learners, 4. Use multiple instructional strategies, 5. Motivate and manage students for learning, 6. Use communication skills and technology, 7. Plan for effective instruction, 8. Practice professional reflection, and 10. Participate in School and Community. All standards that have been met will be monitored and maintained.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We are currently working to improve our candidates ability to meet Standard 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning. We have developed an action plan to address this need.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Early Childhood Education MEd
As of: 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
This program is based on the assumption that learning is a constructive process which builds on the knowledge and experience of the learner. Through an integrated approach that provides choices and opportunities for decision making and dynamic group interactions, teachers participating in the Collaborative Masters Program become partners with faculty in shaping the path(s) by which content is learned. Students enrolled in the Collaborative Program receive an Masters in Education Degree in Early Childhood Education.
Education. In 2005-2006, 20 students completed the program and were awarded this degree.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Educator will show commitment to student learning. (M: 1)
Educators are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They believe all students can learn and they understand how students develop and learn. They respect the cultural and family differences students bring to their classroom.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NBPTS

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge. (M: 2)
Educators have mastery over the subject(s) they teach and the skill and experience in teaching the subject (s).
Relevant Associations: NCTM, IRA, NAEYC, NBPTS

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Educators manage and monitor student learning. (M: 2)
Educators know how to engage students to ensure a disciplined learning environment, and how to organize instruction to meet instructional goals. Educators also know how to assess the progress of individual students as well as the class as a whole.
Relevant Associations: NCTM, IRA, NAEYC, NBPTS

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Educators reflect on their practice. (M: 3)
Educators critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new findings into their practice.
Relevant Associations: NCTM, IRA, NAEYC, NBPTS

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Educator will collaborate with peers and others. (M: 1)
Educators collaborate with others to improve student learning and they know how to work collaboratively with parents.
Relevant Associations: NCTM, IRA, NAEYC, NBPTA

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Capstone Experience Portfolio (O: 1, 5)
The Capstone is similar to a Showcase Portfolio in that it includes written reflections, samples of educator's work while in the program as well as sample of their students’ work. All are included to demonstrate the educator's growth while in the CMP program. The completed Capstone is scored on a scale of 1-3, with three representing the highest level. For Objective 1 this means the educator demonstrated, through evidence submitted in the Capstone, the highest level of commitment to students. For Objective 5 this means the educator demonstrated, through evidence submitted, the highest level of valuing and participating in learning communities.

Target for O1: Educator will show commitment to student learning.
Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. For a scale of 1-3 that level is 2.40.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target:
The Capstone is completed during the final semester of the program (Summer 2007). Therefore findings for 2006-2007 will not be available until August 2007.

**Target for O5: Educator will collaborate with peers and others.**

Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. For a scale of 1-3 that level is 2.40.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

The Capstone is completed during the final semester of the program (Summer 2007). Therefore findings for 2006-2007 will not be available until August 2007.

**M 2: Field Observations (O: 2, 3)**

Faculty visit each educator approximately 8 times while the educator is in the program. The visits include an observation of the educator and a follow-up debriefing. After the visit, the educator submits a written reflection describing what was learned and how future work will be influenced by this new information. Faculty rating is based on the educator's preparation for the visit, quality of reflection, and alterations of future teaching.

**Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.**

Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. For a scale of 1-3 that level is 2.40.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For objective 2, on a scale of 1-3, with N = 20, Literacy: 13 students received 3 2 students received 2.5 4 students received 2.0 1 student received 1.5 Math: 9 students received 3.0 6 Students received 2.5 3 students received 2.0 2 students received 1.5 Objective 3 14 students received 3.0 3 students received 2.5 3 students received 2.0

**Target for O3: Educators manage and monitor student learning.**

Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. For a scale of 1-3 that level is 2.40.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For objective 2, on a scale of 1-3, with N = 20, Literacy: 13 students received 3 2 students received 2.5 4 students received 2.0 1 student received 1.5 Math: 9 students received 3.0 6 Students received 2.5 3 students received 2.0 2 students received 1.5 Objective 3 14 students received 3.0 3 students received 2.5 3 students received 2.0

**M 3: Action Research Project (O: 4)**

The goal of action research is for teacher-researchers to solve educational problems by engaging in a systematic process of inquiry. This process enables teacher-researchers to make informed decisions at both the classroom and school-level. Each educator submits to the course instructor a written description of the completed project. This project is scored on a scale of 1-3, with three indicating that all components of the project were included and presented in a thorough and professional way.

**Target for O4: Educators reflect on their practice.**

Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. For a scale of 1-3 that level is 2.40.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

On a scale of 1-3, with N = 20: 20 students received a rating of 3.0

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Monitor educator’s knowledge.**

All educators are observed teaching math and literacy. Specific feedback on weaknesses in subject matter knowledge will be addressed during the debriefing protocol. Faculty will also monitor educator’s response to the question on the debriefing protocol related to monitoring student learning. Feedback will be provided as indicated.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Field Observations
- **Outcome/Objective:** Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.
- Educators manage and monitor student learning.

**Implementation Description:** 2006-2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Directors

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

In reviewing the assessments, educators in our program demonstrated success in objectives 1 & 5. Our students are committed to their students’ learning and develop as active members of learning communities.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention? In reviewing the assessments, educators in our program demonstrated partial success in objectives 2,3,4. These data suggest we, as program directors, need to implement strategies which will enhance our students subject matter knowledge in mathematics and literacy and ability to think systematically about their practice.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Early Childhood Education MEd GATAPP
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Early Childhood Education is a community of Early Childhood educators committed to equity, collaboration and excellence in field-based teacher education, research and service. Unique within the education arena is the Department of Early Childhood Education's Urban Alternative Preparation Program (UAPP), which is comprised of the Georgia Teacher Alternative Preparation Program (GTAPP). This program was developed to address the issue of dwindling numbers of competent, qualified teachers for the urban classroom. Today, the demands on public education have never been greater in this regard. There is an unprecedented need for competent, enthusiastic, and reflective teachers, particularly in the urban setting. The Department of Early Childhood Education is committed to providing a dynamic program for training pre-service and novice teachers with an emphasis on practical classroom experience supported by intensive coaching and continual professional development. The UAPP reflects the same commitment from the urban perspective. For the 2005-2006 academic year the GATAPP program recommended 16 candidates for a Master’s degree in Education.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 1)
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 5)
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 2)
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experiences (M: 3)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

Strategic Plan Associations
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)
A summary rating derived from field coaching evaluations, portfolio evaluation, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development**
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
89% of candidates met Standard 1: Candidate is committed to student learning and development

#### M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)
A summary rating derived from field coaching evaluations, portfolio evaluation, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

**Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
91% of candidates met Standard 3: Candidate manages and monitors student learning/development

#### M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)
A summary rating derived from field coaching evaluations, portfolio evaluation, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

**Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experiences**
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
87% of candidates met Standard 4: Candidate reflects on and learns from professional experience

#### M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)
A summary rating derived from field coaching evaluations, portfolio evaluation, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities**
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
89% of candidates met Standard 5: Candidate participates in professional learning communities.

#### M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 2)
A summary rating derived from field coaching evaluations, portfolio evaluation, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development**
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
93% of candidates met Standard 2: Candidate can apply expertise for learning and development
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Maintain and monitor**

Program faculty will continue to maintain the effective components of the program, assess all outcomes/objectives, and monitor students’ performance on each objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating</td>
<td>Can apply expertise for learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating</td>
<td>Is committed to student learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating</td>
<td>Manages and monitors student learning/development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating</td>
<td>Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating</td>
<td>Participates in professional learning communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year

**Responsible Person/Group:** Nancy Schafer

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Our assessments show that our candidates are able to successfully meet all of the standards. Demonstrating that each candidate: 1. Is committed to student learning and development, 2. Can apply expertise for learning and development, 3. Manages and monitors student learning/development, 4. Reflects on & learns from professional experience, 5. Participates in professional learning communities. The STARS assessment of the standards show that candidates scored particularly high in the area of commitment to student learning and development.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Although our assessment shows that all candidates met the standards set by the faculty, we will continue to monitor and maintain these standards.

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Early Childhood Education PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

Pursuing a doctoral degree is more than completing a series of courses; it is a coherent and integrated process designed to develop scholars and leaders in early childhood and elementary education. Congruent with the vision of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the ECE faculty believe that the "primary outcome for the doctoral candidate is to become a leader who influences the practice of early childhood education through the generation of knowledge; the education of early childhood professionals; the conduct of research, the development, implementation and evaluation of curriculum; the administration of early childhood programs and services; and the analysis and generation of public policy" (NAEYC Core Principles for Advanced Degrees, 2003). There are currently 24 active doctoral students in the program.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrates research skills (M: 1)**

Researchers who conduct quality, valid and socially responsible inquiry related to teaching and learning.

**Relevant Associations:** NAEYC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Are knowledgeable and effective teachers (M: 2)**

Knowledgeable teachers who are capable of challenging their students' thinking and constructing knowledge relative to early childhood education.

**Relevant Associations:** NAEYC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Are active seekers of knowledge (M: 1, 3)**

Active seekers of knowledge who remain current on theory and research and are able to critique, synthesize, and implement these ideas in their practice.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Are thoughtful writers and speakers (M: 1, 3)**

Completers are thoughtful writers and speakers who disseminate ideas through publication, electronic media, and other public venues.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Research Apprenticeship (O: 1, 3, 4)**

During the research apprenticeship, the student completes a research project including reviewing the literature, analyzing data and writing a final report for publication or presentation.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates research skills**

Each student is required to present the completed research or submit it for publication.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Five of five (100%) of students successfully completed their research apprenticeships from Su 2005-Sp2006.

**Target for O3: Are active seekers of knowledge**

Each student is required to present the completed research or submit it for publication.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Five of five (100%) of students successfully completed their research apprenticeships from Su 2005-Sp2006.

**Target for O4: Are thoughtful writers and speakers**

Each student is required to present the completed research or submit it for publication.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Five of five (100%) of students successfully completed their research apprenticeships from Su 2005-Sp2006.

**M 2: Teaching Apprenticeship (O: 2)**

The teaching apprenticeship requires the doctoral student to experience teaching at the university-level.

**Target for O2: Are knowledgeable and effective teachers**

1. Prepare a comprehensive course syllabus including objectives, schedule of class topics, reading list, and evaluative procedures, 2. Have responsibility for actual teaching, which will include the development of subject matter, content, and method of presentation (specific guidelines for this requirement must be developed with the faculty supervisor in order to provide a consistent experience for students in the course), 3. Establish methods for evaluating him or herself (e.g., teaching portfolio, journals, surveys) and the course, 4. Use and interpret data gathered from all course evaluations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Three out of three (100%) students successfully completed their teaching apprenticeships during the Su05-Sp06 year.

**M 3: Comprehensive examination (O: 3, 4)**

The Comprehensive Examination requires students to demonstrate their ability to critically discuss theory, research, and practice in the field of early childhood education. The comprehensive examination consists of three parts: a written examination, a written paper, and an oral examination. Three primary skills are assessed by the comprehensive examination process: (a) the ability to provide an in-depth written analysis, (b) the ability to demonstrate in writing a thorough understanding of content in the major and cognate
Target for O3: Are active seekers of knowledge
All students successfully complete their comprehensive examination on their first attempt.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Three out of three students (100%) eligible to take comprehensive exams successfully passed their exams during Su2005-Sp06 year.

Target for O4: Are thoughtful writers and speakers
All students successfully complete their comprehensive examination on their first attempt.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Three out of three students (100%) eligible to take comprehensive exams successfully passed their exams during Su2005-Sp06 year.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Clarify criteria for apprenticeships
Students work with a variety of faculty for their university teaching and teacher development apprenticeships. Our goal is to clarify criteria to make the apprenticeships more consistent among faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching Apprenticeship | Outcome/Objective: Are knowledgeable and effective teachers

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: PHD coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our assessment data show that the research and teaching apprenticeships are effective non-coursework strategies to assist doctoral students in 1) developing their research ability, 2) teaching effectively, 3) seeking knowledge, and 4) writing and speaking effectively. The results of these two apprenticeships, coupled with the comprehensive exam process, indicate that students are prepared for the dissertation process and careers in higher education.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
While both faculty and students benefit from the research apprenticeship, it is time consuming for faculty and students. Research itself is time consuming. We may want to streamline the process for this apprenticeship. Also, we may want to develop research prerequisites for this apprenticeship. The outcomes of the teaching apprenticeship vary depending on the faculty member who supervises the apprenticeship. We need to develop a reporting system to document the student's progress on specific objectives for this apprenticeship.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Economics BA,BBA,BS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Economics is the study of how best to allocate scarce resources. Economics is an academic discipline that is central to the offerings of all major universities. As at most universities, economics plays an essential role in the general education required of all undergraduates, extending well beyond our undergraduate majors to essential courses in the core curriculum required of all GSU students, especially those majoring in business. At the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University, it is the fundamental mission of the Department of Economics to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in our discipline, to share that knowledge with our students, and to disseminate that knowledge with policymakers and leaders in the public, nonprofit, and business communities, here and abroad. The Department of Economics is committed to the broad goals of Georgia State University and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. The University Strategic Plan 2000 states the "[t]he overarching goal of the Georgia State University is to become one of the nation’s premiere research universities located in an urban setting". As stated in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Strategic Plan 2002-2007, the School “…intends to be the highest rated policy school in the South and one of the highest ranked in the nation by 2007”. The Department of Economics shares both of these goals. We intend to contribute to these goals by continuing our efforts to better serve the needs of our undergraduate majors, our graduate students, and GSU students more broadly, by engaging in such activities as improving our curricula, introducing innovative course features, and creating new degree programs. Finally, we will continue to expand our service and outreach activities, to the profession, to the local business, nonprofit, and public sectors, to the State of Georgia, and to foreign countries and international agencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Apply to specific fields (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to apply theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to specific fields of economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Benefits and costs (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Communication (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to communicate, using appropriate writing and oral conventions, basic economic theories,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts, analytical methods, and policy choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: contemporary issues (diverse disciplinary perspec) (M: 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5: contemporary issues (global questions) (M: 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 6: Economics Basic Theories (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macroeconomics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M1: Problem Sets & Assignments in courses (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)
Problem sets and assignments in each course will permit instructor assessment of student comprehension.

**Target for O1: Apply to specific fields**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Not Met
no data gathered in 2005-2006

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Not Met
no data gathered in 2005-2006

**Target for O3: Communication**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Not Met
no data gathered in 2005-2006

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Not Met
no data gathered in 2005-2006

#### M2: Exams in courses (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)
Examinations in each course will permit instructor assessment of student comprehension.

**Target for O1: Apply to specific fields**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Not Met
no data gathered in 2005-2006

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Not Met
no data gathered in 2005-2006

**Target for O3: Communication**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Not Met
no data gathered in 2005-2006

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target...
for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no data gathered in 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Oral assignments in courses (O: 3)**

In courses that require written and oral assignments, these assignments will permit instructor assessment of student communication skills.

**Target for O3: Communication**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no data gathered in 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Alumni Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)**

Graduates will be asked to complete a questionnaire that assesses how what was learned in the program contributes to their performance in their current job. This survey will be given at one year and three years after graduation.

**Target for O1: Apply to specific fields**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no data gathered in 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no data gathered in 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Communication**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no data gathered in 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no data gathered in 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Tracking Examination (O: 1, 2, 6)**

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 last year about students taking the TEs seriously). ECON 4999 is required for all new undergraduate economics majors, effective Fall 2006 (the only degree it is not required for is the new BA with a major in International Economics and Modern Languages, because that degree already has half of the upper level economics courses specified). 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.

**Target for O1: Apply to specific fields**

The average score on the tracking exams is consistently 60% or better in all semesters.
In Fall 2005, the MicroTE was given to 76 students in four upper-level economics courses; in Spring 2006, the MicroTE was given to 27 students in one upper-level economics course. Students showed some improvement during the 2005-2006 academic year. In both semesters, the students answered 61% of the questions correctly. In general, students performed best (e.g., more than 50% answered the questions correctly) on questions that were definitional in nature or were very simple applications, and they performed worse on questions that required more complex applications. When the MacroTE was administered in the Fall 2005 semester, the average correct score was 54%; when it was given in the Spring 2006 semester, the score went up to 62%.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**
The average score on the tracking exams is consistently 60% or better in all semesters.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
In Fall 2005, the MicroTE was given to 76 students in four upper-level economics courses; in Spring 2006, the MicroTE was given to 27 students in one upper-level economics course. Students showed some improvement during the 2005-2006 academic year. In both semesters, the students answered 61% of the questions correctly. In general, students performed best (e.g., more than 50% answered the questions correctly) on questions that were definitional in nature or were very simple applications, and they performed worse on questions that required more complex applications. When the MacroTE was administered in the Fall 2005 semester, the average correct score was 54%; when it was given in the Spring 2006 semester, the score went up to 62%.

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**
The average score on the tracking exams is consistently 60% or better in all semesters.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
In Fall 2005, the MicroTE was given to 76 students in four upper-level economics courses; in Spring 2006, the MicroTE was given to 27 students in one upper-level economics course. Students showed some improvement during the 2005-2006 academic year. In both semesters, the students answered 61% of the questions correctly. In general, students performed best (e.g., more than 50% answered the questions correctly) on questions that were definitional in nature or were very simple applications, and they performed worse on questions that required more complex applications. When the MacroTE was administered in the Fall 2005 semester, the average correct score was 54%; when it was given in the Spring 2006 semester, the score went up to 62%.

**M 6: Multiple Choice Questions on Final Exams (O: 4, 5)**
Five multiple choice questions on each of the two contemporary issues learning outcomes were embedded on the final exams of selected sections of economics courses in the core (ECON 2100 - The Global Economy; ECON 2105 - Principles of Macroeconomics; ECON 2106 - Principles of Microeconomics) in the Spring 2007 semester. Different questions were used in different classes, but all questions were selected from an approved list that can be used to measure the learning outcomes.

**Target for O4: contemporary issues (diverse disciplinary perspec)**
At least 60% of students assessed will get at least 3 out of 5 of the questions correct.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
For ECON 2100 the assessments were done in 3 sections in Fall 2005 (a total of 202 students), and 98% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 80% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 6). For ECON 2105, the assessments were done in 2 sections in Fall 2005 (a total of 122 students), and 84% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 84% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 6). For ECON 2106, the assessments were done in 2 sections in Fall 2005 (a total of 201 students), and 79% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 82% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 6).

**Target for O5: contemporary issues (global questions)**
At least 60% of students assessed will get at least 3 out of 5 of the questions correct.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
For ECON 2100 the assessments were done in 3 sections in Fall 2005 (a total of 202 students), and 98% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 80% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 6). For ECON 2105, the assessments were done in 2 sections in Fall 2005 (a total of 122 students), and 84% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 84% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 6). For ECON 2106, the assessments were done in 2 sections in Fall 2005 (a total of 201 students), and 79% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 82% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 6).

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Drop the Alumni Survey**
Upon discussion, the Economics Department’s Undergraduate Programs Committee felt that the information that could be gathered from an alumni survey might not be useful after all, and therefore we decided to drop this.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Move assessments to new Capstone Course

The MicroTE was modified in response to the first set of results. The MacroTE is currently under revision in response to faculty concerns about some specific questions included. The Department is considering the effectiveness of this assessment instrument in the absence of incentives for students to do well, by exploring how to provide appropriate incentives for the exams. In the future, the TEs will be administered in the newly developed ECON 4999 (senior capstone course in economic policy), and will count as 5% of the student’s grade in that course. It will be administered twice, once at the beginning of the semester and again at the end, and only the maximum of the two scores will count. The capstone course was designed explicitly with the assessments in mind and all future assessments (including the TEs) will be done in that course; the course description can be found at http://ayspu.gsu.edu/academics/courses/econ4999.htm. The course includes individual and group projects that can be used to assess written and oral communication skills, as well as computer and collaborative skills. A portfolio requirement helps prepare students for the job market, and has them explicitly reflect on what they have gained from the program as part of the assignment.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Exams in courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Measure: Oral assignments in courses | Outcome/Objective: Communication
- Measure: Problem Sets & Assignments in courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields

Implementation Description: Spring 2007

Responsible Person/Group: Economics Department Undergraduate Programs Committee

Additional Resources: Perhaps more teaching resources to make sure we can offer this new class every Fall and Spring semesters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits and costs</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Economics Basic Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

The economics department is doing well at teaching contemporary issues in our core courses. The results of the tracking exams indicate that students performed best on questions that were definitional in nature or were very simple applications, and they performed worse on questions that required more complex applications.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

After evaluating the MicroTE and the MacroTE, the Department shared the results with the faculty, emphasizing that students need more practice applying the core economic concepts in the upper level courses (for microeconomics) and that instructors in macroeconomics must have a consistent approach that emphasizes the core macro concepts rather than definitions and stylized relationships. These areas of emphasis are being suggested for both the introductory and upper-level courses. Additionally, for those teaching upper-level courses, it is recommended that faculty revisit the core concepts and give students ample opportunity to apply the concepts in new settings, rather than assuming the students have a firm grasp on the core concepts as a result of an earlier principles course. The goals for next year are to improve the results so that the average score on the tracking exams is consistently 60% or better in all semesters and also to improve on questions that require more complex applications.
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Mission / Purpose

Economics is the study of how best to allocate scarce resources. Economics is an academic discipline that is central to the offerings of all major universities. At all universities, economics plays an essential role in the general education required of all undergraduates, extending well beyond our undergraduate majors to essential courses in the core curriculum required of all GSU students, especially those majoring in business. At the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University, it is the fundamental mission of the Department of Economics to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in our discipline, to share that knowledge with our students, and to disseminate that knowledge with policymakers and leaders in the public, nonprofit, and business communities, here and abroad. The Department of Economics is committed to the broad goals of Georgia State University and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. The University Strategic Plan 2000 states the "the overarching goal of the Georgia State University is to become one of the nation’s premiere research universities located in an urban setting". As stated in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Strategic Plan 2002-2007, the School “…intends to be the highest rated policy school in the South and one of the highest ranked in the nation by 2007”. The Department of Economics shares both of these goals. We intend to contribute to these goals by continuing our efforts to better serve the needs of our undergraduate majors, our graduate students, and GSU students more broadly, by engaging in such activities as improving our curricula, introducing innovative course features, and creating new degree programs. Finally, we will continue to expand our service and outreach activities, to the profession, to the local business, nonprofit, and public sectors, to the State of Georgia, and to foreign countries and international agencies.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
### SLO 4: Applying Economic Models (M: 2, 3)
To be able to use and develop economic models to analyze various economic issues and to make policy recommendations.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Analytical Skills (M: 1)
To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 12 Quantitative Skills--core

#### O/O 2: Economic Disciplines (M: 1, 2)
To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking economic issues.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

#### O/O 3: Economic Data (M: 2)
To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 12 Quantitative Skills--core

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Core Examination (O: 1, 2)
All graduating Master of Arts in Economics students will be assessed on their basic learning of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics (e.g., Master of Arts in Economics, Learning Outcome 1). The assessment will be based on the performances of their final examinations in microeconomics, macroeconomics and econometrics, the three required courses in their programs. Each exam will be graded on a discrete scale (e.g., A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.

**Target for O1: Analytical Skills**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For the MA-Econ program, there were 11 students who took the Macroeconomics exam during the academic year 2005-2006, with 5 Fail and 6 Pass grades, for a pass rate of 55%. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed the weakest factor was Mathematics with a mean score of 2.46, while the strongest factor was Communication with a mean score of 3.64. There were 7 students who took the Microeconomics exam during the academic year 2005-2006, with 2 Fail and 5 Pass grades (a 71% pass rate). A factor analysis revealed that the weakest part was Mathematics with a mean score of 2.57, while the strongest part was Definitions with a mean score of 3.14. There were 16 MA-Econ students who took the Econometrics exam during the academic year 2005-2006, with 6 Fail and 10 Pass grades (a 63% pass rate). A factor analysis revealed that the weakest factor was Communication with a mean score of 2.75, while the strongest factor was Critical Judgment with a mean score of 3.14. For the MA-Econ: Policy Track program, there were 5 students who took the Macroeconomics exam in the academic year 2005-2006, with 4 Fail and 1 Pass grade. A factor analysis showed that the weakest factor was Definitions with a mean score of 1.6, while the strongest factor was Communication with a mean score of 3.2. Two students took the Microeconomics exam during the academic year 2004-2005, with both Fail grades. The weakest factors were Mathematics and Computation each with a mean score of 1, and the strongest factor was Definitions with a mean score of 3. Two students took the Econometrics exam in the academic year 2005-2006, with one Pass and one Fail grade.

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For the MA-Econ program, there were 11 students who took the Macroeconomics exam during the academic year 2005-2006, with 5 Fail and 6 Pass grades, for a pass rate of 55%. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed the weakest factor was Mathematics with a mean score of 2.46, while the strongest factor was Communication with a mean score of 3.64. There were 7 students who took the Microeconomics exam during the academic year 2005-2006, with 2 Fail and 5 Pass grades (a 71% pass rate). A factor analysis revealed that the weakest part was Mathematics with a mean score of 2.57, while the strongest part was Definitions with a mean score of 3.14. There were 16 MA-Econ students who took
the Econometrics exam during the academic year 2005-2006, with 6 Fail and 10 Pass grades (a 63% pass rate). A factor analysis revealed that the weakest factor was Communication with a mean score of 2.75, while the strongest factor was Critical Judgment with a mean score of 3.14. For the MA-Econ: Policy Track program, there were 5 students who took the Macroeconomics exam in the academic year 2005-2006, with 4 Fail and 1 Pass grades. A factor analysis showed that the weakest factor was Definitions with a mean score of 1.6, while the strongest factor was Communication with a mean score of 3.2. Two students took the Microeconomics exam during the academic year 2004-2005, with both Fail grades. The weakest factors were Mathematics and Computation each with a mean score of 1, and the strongest factor was Definitions with a mean score of 3. Two students took the Econometrics exam in the academic year 2005-2006, with one Pass and one Fail grades.

**M2: Essay (O: 2, 3, 4)**

All students will submit a research paper to demonstrate their learning in a chosen subject of their own and to show their understanding, usage, and analysis of economic data. The Essay will typically be a product of the interaction with at least one faculty member in the Department of Economics, and will be assessed by the faculty member(s) involved. The Essay will be evaluated on several criteria (e.g., overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on).

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

An essay was evaluated on several dimensions. For the sample collected, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.67 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.3 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.8 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4 for Econometric Skills, 4.2 for Economic Analysis, 3.5 for Theoretical Skills, and 4 for Data Collection, Measurement, and Computation. For some essays, advisors indicated that the essays could result in publications in some regional journals. These evaluation scores indicate that learning outcomes #2, #3, and #4 were met fairly satisfactorily.

**Target for O3: Economic Data**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

An essay was evaluated on several dimensions. For the sample collected, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.67 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.3 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.8 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4 for Econometric Skills, 4.2 for Economic Analysis, 3.5 for Theoretical Skills, and 4 for Data Collection, Measurement, and Computation. For some essays, advisors indicated that the essays could result in publications in some regional journals. These evaluation scores indicate that learning outcomes #2, #3, and #4 were met fairly satisfactorily.

**Target for O4: Applying Economic Models**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

An essay was evaluated on several dimensions. For the sample collected, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.67 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.3 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.8 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4 for Econometric Skills, 4.2 for Economic Analysis, 3.5 for Theoretical Skills, and 4 for Data Collection, Measurement, and Computation. For some essays, advisors indicated that the essays could result in publications in some regional journals. These evaluation scores indicate that learning outcomes #2, #3, and #4 were met fairly satisfactorily.

**M3: Alumni Survey (O: 4)**

All graduates of this program will be asked to complete a questionnaire that assesses how what was learned in the program contributes to their performance in their current job. This survey will be given at one year and three years after graduation.

**Target for O4: Applying Economic Models**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

Only one student completed the survey. There were problems with the online response software. The survey needs to be resent in the 2006-2007 academic year.

---

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Strengthen Math in Core Courses**

Since the lowest scores in both macro and micro exams is Mathematics, instructors of these courses should strive to strengthen this area.

**Established in Cycle: 2005-2006**
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

In the MA-Econ program, the exit examination element of assessment evaluated the first learning outcome of the program (“To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics”). The data analysis discussed above showed that this learning outcome was achieved with passing grades by a majority of the students who took the exams (55% for Macroeconomics, 71% for Microeconomics, and 63% for Econometrics). It should be noted that the percentage of passing for each decreased slightly compared with the previous year. The main concern for both Macroeconomics and Microeconomics was Mathematics; Communication was a major concern in Econometrics. Compared to the previous year, students were consistently weak in Mathematics for the Microeconomics exam; for the Macroeconomics exam, the weakest factor changed from Application to Mathematics; for the Econometrics exam, the weakest factor changed from Application to Communication. The strongest areas were Critical Judgment (in Econometrics), Communication (in Microeconomics), and Definitions (in Microeconomics). Concerning learning outcome #2 (“To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking economic issues”), #3 (“To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data”), and #4 (“To be able to use and develop economic models to analyze various economic issues and to make policy recommendations”), these outcomes were demonstrably met as indicated by the evaluation of master research papers. An essay was evaluated on several dimensions. For the sample collected, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.67 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.3 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.8 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4 for Ability to Convey Research Question (s), 4 for Econometric Skills, 4.2 for Economic Analysis, 3.5 for Theoretical Skills, and 4 for Data Collection, Measurement, and Computation.

For some essays, advisors indicated that the essays could result in publications in some regional journals. These evaluation scores indicate that learning outcomes #2, #3, and #4 were met fairly satisfactorily. In the MA-Econ, Policy Track program, the exit examination evaluates the first (“To be able to learn and to grasp basic tools for economics analysis”) and the second (“To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data”) learning outcome of the program. The learning analysis shows that the students in this program, who traditionally have a weaker background in mathematics and statistics, continue to have difficulty in achieving these two learning outcomes. The pass rate for Macroeconomics was 20%, for Microeconomics was 0%, and for Econometrics was 50%. The other two learning outcomes, #3 (“To be able to evaluate the potential for economic policy to influence outcomes”) and #4 (“To be able to interpret economic policies to a wider audience”), were assessed on students’ overall course works and portfolios. Analysis on their course works and portfolio indicate that the majority of MA-Econ, Policy Track students took policy-related graduate courses (e.g., courses such as development economics, urban policy arena and planning, international trade, international public finance, nonprofit management and leadership, environmental economics) and did very well. In summary, learning outcomes #1 and #2 continued to have some difficulty being met, while the other two learning outcomes were met satisfactorily. As discussed earlier, the students in this program are traditionally weaker in math and statistics. The exit exam designed for them probably was not a good assessment tool for them. The Department has responded to this concern by changing the current practice of the exit exam to a different format.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The area of Mathematics must be strengthened in the Microeconomics and Macroeconomics core courses. This goes to improving outcomes in learning objectives #1 and #2.
To achieve a high level of competence understanding and using the analytical skills of microeconomics and macroeconomics.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
8 Critical Thinking--core
12 Quantitative Skills--core

**SLO 2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods (M: 1, 3)**
To achieve a high level of competence understanding the most recent theoretical and quantitative methods in economics.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
8 Critical Thinking--core
10 Contemporary Issues--core
12 Quantitative Skills--core

**SLO 3: Field specialization (M: 2)**
To demonstrate mastery of the issues, theories and latest advances in one of the sub-fields of economics offered by the program.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**SLO 4: Conducting Independent Research (M: 3, 4)**
To demonstrate ability to conduct independent and original basic and applied research in economics.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 2)**
All Ph.D. students will take a Comprehensive Examination at the end of the first-year after taking the core courses. This examination will test their basic learning of microeconomics and macroeconomics (e.g., Ph.D. in Economics, Learning Outcome 1). The examination will be graded, on a discrete scale (e.g., High Pass, Pass, Low Pass, High Fail, Fail), and students will be given feedback. Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.

**Target for O1: Analytical Skills**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All 5 out of 5 students attempting the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam in January 2006 received a grade of Pass. Of this group, 3 were taking the exam for the second time. The mean grade across all questions was 3.93 ("pass") out of a possible 5. This mean grade was higher than the 3.37 ("low pass") obtained during the previous offering of the exam in June 2005. Regarding specific questions in the evaluation forms, all of the following categories received an average grade between 3 (Low Pass) and 5 (High Pass): Definitions, Analytics, Application, Mathematics, Critical Judgment, and Communication. In June 2006, 8 out of 11 students attempting the exam received a grade of Pass, and the other 3 received a grade of Fail. The mean grade across all questions was 3.50 out of 5 for passing exams and 2.11 out of 5 for failing exams. Data for the comprehensive examination of microeconomics was not available for 2005-2006.

**Target for O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All 5 out of 5 students attempting the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam in January 2006 received a grade of Pass. Of this group, 3 were taking the exam for the second time. The mean grade across all questions was 3.93 ("pass") out of a possible 5. This mean grade was higher than the 3.37 ("low pass") obtained during the previous offering of the exam in June 2005. Regarding specific questions in the evaluation forms, all of the following categories received an average grade between 3 (Low Pass) and 5 (High Pass): Definitions, Analytics, Application, Mathematics, Critical Judgment, and Communication. In June 2006, 8 out of 11 students attempting the exam received a grade of Pass, and the other 3 received a grade of Fail. The mean grade across all questions was 3.50 out of 5 for passing exams and 2.11 out of 5 for failing exams. Data for the comprehensive examination of microeconomics was not available for 2005-2006.

**M 2: Field Examination (O: 3)**
All Ph.D. students will take a Field Examination after completing the required courses for their chosen field of specialization. Typically,
Addressing Alumni Suggestions

M 3: Dissertation (O: 2, 4)
After completion of the program’s coursework, students will write a Dissertation. The dissertation is written with close supervision of a faculty dissertation chair and a dissertation committee. The Dissertation will be evaluated on several criteria (e.g., overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on).

Target for O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Concerning the question of whether the dissertation will result in publication in a peer reviewed academic journal, faculty evaluators “strongly agree” (the highest rating) for all 6 dissertations for which evaluations were filled out. Moreover, for all these dissertations, faculty evaluators named a top field journal as likely outlet. Since publication is one of the strongest indicators of the quality of research, this speaks well of the faculty's opinion of these dissertations. Questions regarding comprehension of the literature, ability to convey technical material and research questions, command of econometric skills, data collection, measurement, computation, contribution to the literature, economic analysis, and theoretical skills all received higher scores than last year. In summary, these dissertation scores indicate that learning outcomes #2 and #4 continue to be met very satisfactorily.

Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
There were technical problems with the online survey since responses were not being saved by the software. Only four responses in hard copy were received. We will attempt to re-send the survey in Fall 2006, and will ensure that we have an operational online system. Alumni recommended that areas such as “practical econometrics”, statistical software programming (e.g., Stata, SAS), data skills, and “project evaluation” should receive greater emphasis. They also recommended that theoretical econometrics, theoretical microeconomics, and theoretical macroeconomics be less emphasized. It should be noted that all 4 students that responded work in government or private research institutes and none in academia, so their suggestions may arise from the particular policy needs of their jobs. The graduate committee and the Department faculty will analyze these suggestions during the course of the 2006-2007 year, and propose changes if deemed necessary. In addition, we will try to obtain a larger sample of survey responses to get a broader picture of the assessment of the program by alumni.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Addressing Alumni Suggestions

M 4: Alumni Survey (O: 4)
Graduates of this program will be asked to complete a questionnaire that assesses how what was learned in the program contributes to their performance in their current job. This survey will also include questions about whether the dissertation (or parts of the dissertation) has been submitted for publication or already published; the quality of the publication (s) will be used to assess Ph.D. in Economics, Learning Outcome 4. This survey will be given at one year and three years after graduation.

Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
There were technical problems with the online survey since responses were not being saved by the software. Only four responses in hard copy were received. We will attempt to re-send the survey in Fall 2006, and will ensure that we have an operational online system. Alumni recommended that areas such as “practical econometrics”, statistical software programming (e.g., Stata, SAS), data skills, and “project evaluation” should receive greater emphasis. They also recommended that theoretical econometrics, theoretical microeconomics, and theoretical macroeconomics be less emphasized. It should be noted that all 4 students that responded work in government or private research institutes and none in academia, so their suggestions may arise from the particular policy needs of their jobs. The graduate committee and the Department faculty will analyze these suggestions during the course of the 2006-2007 year, and propose changes if deemed necessary. In addition, we will try to obtain a larger sample of survey responses to get a broader picture of the assessment of the program by alumni.
The alumni survey raises important issues. Alumni recommended that areas such as “practical econometrics”, statistical software programming (e.g., Stata, SAS), data skills, and “project evaluation” should receive greater emphasis. They also recommended that theoretical econometrics, theoretical microeconomics, and theoretical macroeconomics be less emphasized. It should be noted that all 4 students that responded work in government or private research institutes and none in academia, so their suggestions may arise from the particular policy needs of their jobs. The graduate committee and the Department faculty will analyze these suggestions during the course of the 2006-2007 year, and propose changes if deemed necessary. In addition, we will try to obtain a larger sample of survey responses to get a broader picture of the assessment of the program by alumni.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research
Implementation Description: Summer 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The desired outcomes are generally being met quite well. In terms of learning outcome #1 (“To achieve a high level of competence understanding and using the analytical skills of microeconomics and macroeconomics”), the comprehensive and field exams show that this goal is being achieved very well. The overall averages from the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam and the Public Economics field exam increased compared to the year before. The main area of concern in the Macroeconomics exam the previous year was the Application category. As a result, the instructors of the relevant macroeconomics courses tried to emphasize this area of weakness, a strategy that yielded positive results. Compared to last year, the average score in the Application area increased from 1.93 to 2.93 (basically from a “low fail” to a “low pass”). While this is a sizable increase, efforts in this area should be continued. The learning outcomes in the remaining categories (Analytics, Definitions, Mathematics, Critical Judgment, and Communication) continue to be met quite well in Macroeconomics. In the Public Economics field exam there was a large increase in average score from 2.67 to 4.05 (or from a “low pass” to a “pass”). Further, the issue raised last year that some exam answers were somewhat mechanical regarding Analytics and Critical Judgment was also addressed. The faculty had suggested increased exposure in class to a variety of economic models that require creative ways of solving them, avoiding a “one-size-fits-all” mechanical approach. The results have been very encouraging, as demonstrated by an increase in the average grade in Analytics from 2.33 to 4.44, and in the average grade in Critical Judgment from 1.83 to 3.77. The Labor and Urban/Regional Economics field exams were given in 2005-2006, but not the previous year, so there is no benchmark for comparison. Even so, the learning outcomes seem to be generally met for these two exams with no clear weaknesses. Regarding learning outcome #2 (“To achieve a high level of competence understanding the most recent theoretical and quantitative methods in economics”) and learning outcome #4 (“To demonstrate ability to conduct independent and original basic and applied research in economics”), these are clearly being met as indicated by the evaluation of dissertations. Concerning the question of whether the dissertation will result in publication in a peer reviewed academic journal, faculty evaluators “strongly agree” (the highest rating) for all 6 dissertations for which evaluations were filled out. Moreover, for all these dissertations, faculty evaluators named a top field journal as likely outlet. Since publication is one of the strongest indicators of the quality of research, this speaks well of the faculty’s opinion of these dissertations. Questions regarding comprehension of the literature, ability to convey technical material and research questions, command of econometric skills, data collection, measurement, computation, contribution to the literature, economic analysis, and theoretical skills all received higher scores than last year. In summary, these dissertation scores indicate that learning outcomes #2 and #4 continue to be met very satisfactorily. The surveys from alumni also generally confirm that the learning outcomes were met. Alumni specifically pointed to econometrics and the writing of reports as useful skills that were learned in the program.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The two areas of concern raised in last year’s report were addressed successfully. However, it will be important to maintain efforts in these two areas to continue improvement. Also, the suggestions from the Alumni Survey will be studied by the Graduate Committee and the department's faculty.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Ph.D. program in Exceptional Students, Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education at Georgia State University, is to prepare graduates who are capable of performing the roles expected of faculty members in special education at institutions of higher education. Students enrolled in this program will demonstrate the ability to (a) prepare and teach courses at a university level which have a theoretical foundation and convey research-based information, (b) design, implement, evaluate, and interpret data-based research, (c) write proposals for funded projects, (d) collaborate with colleagues at the university and K-12 levels, and with members of community organizations; and (e) are dedicated to performing service for the public schools. There were 28 Ph.D. students in Special Education during the 05-06 year. Five of the students were PULSE students, funded through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. Five students completed the program during this time period.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Develop expertise in research skills (M: 1)
Students will develop expertise in research skills including article preparation and grant writing.
### Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 2: Develop expertise teaching in higher education (M: 2)

Students will develop expertise in teaching skills including University courses, course lectures and/or practicum supervision.

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 3: Engage in professional development (M: 3)

Students will engage in professional development experiences.

#### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Research section (O: 1)**
Evidence of submitted database articles, number of published articles, number of book chapters, and participation in grant development as compiled from the research activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

**Target for O1: Develop expertise in research skills**
By candidacy, 100% of students will have submitted a manuscript in which they were the senior author, to a refereed journal.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author, to a refereed journal. Other evaluation in this area includes the following: 57% (16 of 28) of students submitted 1-4 articles. 46% (13 of 28) of students submitted 1-2 databased articles in a refereed journal in which they were senior author. 38% (10 students) had 1-2 articles published. 29% (8 students) had 1-2 databased articles published in a refereed journal in which they were the senior author. 21% (6 students) had 1-4 book chapters published. 29% (8 students) assisted in preparing 1-10 grants.

**M 2: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Teaching Section (O: 2)**
Evidence of teaching college courses as teaching assistant and/or instructor, number of guest lecturers, number of students who supervised practica, as compiled from the teaching activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

**Target for O2: Develop expertise teaching in higher education**
By candidacy, 100% of the students will have completed their requirement of assisting or teaching a university course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students who have reached candidacy have assisted or taught at least one university course. Other evaluation in this area includes the following: 79% (22 students) have assisted in teaching 1-19 university courses (mean 4.6 courses). 46% (13 students) have taught 1-8 university courses as a GTA. 71% (20 students) have given 1-45 guest lectures (mean 7.4). 64% (18 students) have supervised 1-50 practicum students.

**M 3: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Professional Development (O: 3)**
Evidence of professional development including presentations and participation in professional organizations as compiled from the professional development section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

**Target for O3: Engage in professional development**
100% of the students will have made at least one conference or workshop presentation by graduation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of graduates made at least one conference or workshop presentation. Other evaluation in this area includes the following: 39% (11 students) presented at 1-8 national conferences. 46% (13 students) presented at 1-6 state conferences. 61% (17 students) attended 1-14 national/regional conferences. 42% (12 students) attended 1-12 state conferences. 50% (14 students) attended 1-15 other conferences. 96% (27 students) belonged to 1-10 professional organizations. 25% (7 students) hold 1-2 offices in professional organizations. 46% (13 students) serve on 1-3 committees within professional organizations.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Review Professional Development Component
Review residency requirements pertaining to service and professional development.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Professional Development | Outcome/Objective: Engage in professional development
Implementation Description: April 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Kathy Heller

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Indicators are positive in all areas. Doctoral students continue to meet the program learning outcomes.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Educational Leadership EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Ed.S. program in Educational Leadership is to educate and prepare school leaders with the capacity to transform schools and improve student learning. This mission focuses on the education and preparation of urban educational leaders with a commitment to social justice and systemic change. The Ed.S. degree is an advanced leadership program that builds on the requirements for initial licensure obtained in the M.Ed. and L-5 certification programs. By engaging students in advanced academic and field-based preparation, candidates in the Ed.S. program are prepared to be positive change agents within the rapidly changing contexts of schools. Leaders are prepared to facilitate reflective inquiry on teaching and learning throughout the school. Students enrolled in the program come from highly diverse backgrounds, varied educational backgrounds, and possess multiple needs, interests, and abilities. The Ed.S. program recognizes this diversity and provides opportunities to meet the needs of the individual student. The program seeks to create and structure learning environments so that educational leaders can meaningfully incorporate new knowledge into existing knowledge structures. This is accomplished through an active, social and authentic learning process. Student input is not only encouraged but also required in the courses and field experiences. Teaching and learning strategies are guided by current research, community need, and the diversity of the students. The Ed.S. program adheres to the belief that teaching and learning occur through a process incorporating reflection, inquiry, and action within the context of practice. Consequently, the Ed.S. program has been designed to align course work with actual leadership practice. This facilitates students' ability to integrate abstract theoretical knowledge with practice, which gives students the opportunity to directly engage in practice as informed, analytical, and critical learners.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Can apply theory to practice of Ed. Admin. (M: 1)
Student can apply advanced theories of leadership to the practice of educational administration.

O/O 2: Can apply research to improve schools (M: 4)
Student can apply school-based research to improve school performance.

O/O 3: Can facilitate programs and reform projects (M: 3)
Student is able to facilitate a curriculum program or reform project in an actual school setting.

O/O 4: Understands urban educational leadership (M: 2)
Student understands current issues and concepts in urban educational leadership.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Modeling the theory-practice dyad in leadership (O: 1)
Several alternative models and strategies for leadership exist that allow for the integration of theory with practice, usually referred to as praxis. The central thrust of EPEL 8260: Theory in Educational Leadership is an opportunity for students to use their own school or district as a living laboratory for examining and developing their own conceptual model that brings theory and practice together in ways that will build advocacy coalitions in support of children, families, and educators.

Target for O1: Can apply theory to practice of Ed. Admin.
80% or more of students receiving a grade of "A" for developing a school or district conceptual model that relates leadership
theory to administrative practice.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The last time this course was offered, 89% of the students received an "A" and 11% received a "B".

M 2: Report on urban educational issues and concepts (O: 4)

The poverty and social isolation of certain urban neighborhoods and populations has constrained the ability of actors in central city schools to achieve meaningful school reform. Because the improvement of city schools is dependent on improvement in the lives and opportunities of inner city residents, educational reformers have to join forces with others who are dedicated to improving the social and economic conditions in our cities. The central premise of EPEL 8020: Issues in Educational Leadership is the challenge to current and future urban administrators to investigate and contextualize the relationship between policy, communities, and schools. Students are asked to create a report that critically examines conditions in their school, district, and community such that schools can work collaboratively with other relevant institutions, agencies, and non-government organizations to bring about needed changes that will result in improved learning outcomes for all students.

Target for O4: Understands urban educational leadership

80% or more of students receiving a grade of "A" for developing a report that critically examines and interprets the constraints and possibilities for change in urban school systems.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The last time this course was offered, 80% of students received an "A" and 20% received a "B".

M 3: Advanced Field Experience (O: 3)

Successful completion of an advanced field internship in educational leadership. The individually designed field experience project forms the core of the work required in EPEL 8690: Field Experience in Educational Leadership. The various facets of the practicum are designed to comprehensively evaluate the extent to which students have mastered the range of knowledge and skills necessary for the effective facilitation of programs and reform projects in schools and/or districts.

Target for O3: Can facilitate programs and reform projects

80% or more of students receiving a grade of "A" for facilitating a program or reform project as specified within the individually designed field experience.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The last time this course was offered, 70% of students received an "A" and 30% received a "B".

M 4: Analytical research project (O: 2)

School administrators need to be sophisticated and critical consumers of educational research in order to maintain and improve schools. The primary requirement of EPEL 8910: Research and Research Methods in Educational Leadership is a context specific analytical project designed to assess a student’s competency in gathering and critically examining educational research that is relevant to informing administrative practice.

Target for O2: Can apply research to improve schools

80% or more of students receiving a grade of "A" for conducting an analytical research project in which research is used to inform administrative decision making.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The last time this course was offered, 91.7% of students received an "A" and 8.3% received a "B".

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Application of theory to practice

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-07 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Modeling the theory-practice dyad in leadership | Outcome/Objective: Can apply theory to practice of Ed. Admin.
  Implementation Description: Academic year 2006-07
  Responsible Person/Group: All members of the Educational Leadership unit

Facilitation of programs and reform projects

The failure to attain the 80% rate of students earning an "A" in this course is likely due to the complexities involved in understanding the principles of sound educational research, designing effective educational interventions and implementing meaningful programs aimed at school improvement. In the coming academic year, the Educational Leadership unit will devote additional time to initiating curricular changes that will enhance students’ knowledge and skill about research issues and problems that should better equip them to use research as a critical component of the decision making process.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Understanding urban educational leadership
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-08 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Report on urban educational issues and concepts | Outcome/Objective: Understands urban educational leadership
Implementation Description: Academic year 2006-2007
Responsible Person/Group: All members of the Educational Leadership unit

Use of research
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-08 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Analytical research project | Outcome/Objective: Can apply research to improve schools
Implementation Description: Academic year 2006-07
Responsible Person/Group: All members of the Educational Leadership unit

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Overall, the assessments in the Ed.S. program indicate that the program is strong in regard to outcomes and objectives. We met or exceeded target in 3 of 4 objectives and narrowly missed achieving target in only one. This suggests to us that the Ed.S. program is largely successful in that students are attaining mastery in the knowledge and skill areas that we have designed into the curriculum.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
This means that the educational leadership unit needs to pay special attention to this feature of the program if we intend to attain our target goal of 80% or more of students receiving a grade of "A" in the course. For the current academic year, 2006-07, we will begin by looking at the curricular content of the course to see if what changes can be implemented that would enhance the effectiveness of the course. We may also need to consider our pedagogical approach in order to rule out the possibility that our teaching is hindering our efforts to achieve all the goals of the program. We may also need to examine the extent to which the other coursework in the program is supporting the work students do in EPEL 8690. These steps require incremental action and a subsequent reanalysis of the data. Therefore, each one cannot be realistically carried out in the same year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Educational Leadership MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Educational Leadership (EL) programs is to educate and prepare school leaders with the capacity to transform schools and improve student learning. This mission focuses on the education and preparation of urban educational leaders with a commitment to social justice and systemic change. The EL degree and certification programs are based on the Educational Leadership Constituent Council’s (ELCC) Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership. The M.Ed. and L-5 Certification Program are based on the “Standards for school building leadership.” Through academic and field-based preparation, candidates in the EL program are prepared to be positive change agents within the rapidly changing contexts of schools. Leaders are prepared to facilitate reflective inquiry on teaching and learning throughout the school. Students enrolled in each program come from highly diverse backgrounds, varied educational backgrounds, and possess multiple needs, interests, and abilities. The EL Program recognizes this diversity and provides opportunities to meet the needs of the individual student. The program seeks to create and structure learning environments so that educational leaders can meaningfully incorporate new knowledge into existing knowledge structures. This is accomplished through an active, social and authentic learning process. Student input is not only encouraged but also required in the courses and field experiences. Teaching and learning strategies are guided by current research, community need, and the diversity of the students. The EL Program believes that teaching and learning occurs through a process incorporating reflection, inquiry, and action within the context of practice. Consequently, the cohort leadership program has been designed to align course work with actual leadership practice. This facilitates students’ ability to integrate abstract theoretical knowledge with practice, which gives students the opportunity to directly engage in practice as informed, analytical, and critical learners.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Can apply leadership theory in practice (M: 1)**

Student is able to apply general theories of leadership to practice

Relevant Associations: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality programs
2. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**SLO 2: Can design and implement action research (M: 2)**

Student can apply the tools of action research to improve school performance

Relevant Associations: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major

**SLO 3: Can perform as change agent in schools (M: 3)**

Student effectively performs as a change agent by positively impacting the culture of the school

Relevant Associations: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 4: Can provide leadership for urban education (M: 4)

Student is able to lead an effective urban school

Relevant Associations: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by providing a positive school culture, offering an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Evaluations in key courses (O: 1)

Individual student grades in EPEL 7000 (Leadership in Educational Organizations), EPEL 7510 (Issues of School Governance), EPEL 7500 (Human Resources Administration), EPEL 7330 (School Law), EPEL 7410 (Supervision of Instruction), EPSF 7450 (Curriculum Foundations of Educational Leadership)

Target for O1: Can apply leadership theory in practice

70 percent of all students earning an "A" in all of these courses combined and in each individual course.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

EPEL 7000 (Met): 85% A’s. EPEL 7510 (Met): 73% A’s. EPEL 7500 (Not Met): 69% A’s. EPEL 7330 (Met): 91% A’s. EPEL 7410 (Met): 100% A’s. EPSF 7450 (Met): 74% A’s. TOTAL (Met): 82% A’s.

M 2: Action Research Leadership Project (O: 2)

The action research leadership project is the culminating assessment for candidates in the M.Ed. and ND (L-5 Add-On) programs. The project is designed to provide opportunities for candidates to apply their knowledge and skills in an authentic administrative process. Candidates are allowed to develop their own projects based on the needs of their practicum school, the needs of the on-site mentor, and the needs of the candidate. Candidates are required to identify a problem (e.g., low parental involvement; low scores in 3rd grade reading) or a program (e.g., an after school program, a new math program) on which to work for their entire practicum period. The project is the academic equivalent to a Masters’ Thesis. A successful project requires candidates to identify and analyze an actual school problem, collect, review and interpret research on the problem, and develop an action research proposal. Regardless of the project topic, these tasks require knowledge and skills in organizational management. The following ELCC Standards have been identified as commonly assessed through the action research project rubric: 1.Statement of the problem (ELCC standard 1.1) 2.Review of literature (ELCC standard 6.1) 3.Data sources (ELCC standard 3, all) 4.Data analysis (ELCC standard 3, all) 5.Data interpretations, conclusions, implications (ELCC standard 3 all) 6.Quality of writing and presentation

Target for O2: Can design and implement action research

Seventy percent of all students receiving a "target" rating with no less than five percent of students receiving an "unacceptable" rating

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

PROBLEM STATEMENT (Met): Target = 76%, Unacceptable = 0% REVIEW OF LITERATURE (Not Met): Target = 65%, Unacceptable = 14% DATA SOURCES (Patially Met): Target = 71%, Unacceptable = 2% DATA ANALYSIS (Not Met) Target = 59%, Unacceptable = 17% DATA INTERPRETATION (Not Met): Target = 63%, Unacceptable = 13% QUALITY OF WRITING (Not Met): Target = 63%, Unacceptable = 6% TOTAL (Not Met) Target = 66%, Unacceptable = 9%

M 3: Professional Leadership Portfolio (O: 3)

A primary assessment for the year-long practicum in the M.Ed. and ND (L-5 Add-On) programs in educational leadership is the portfolio. The practicum is designed to provide opportunities for candidates to apply their knowledge and skills in all six of the ELCC standards. A strength of the practicum is that it allows candidates a high degree of flexibility in structuring their own activities and assessments based on the needs of their internship site, the needs of the on-site mentor, and the needs of the candidates. Candidates are required to complete a range of tasks and assessments that demonstrate knowledge and skills in each of the GLISL's 8 Roles of Effective Leadership. The 8 Roles are consistent with the ELCC standards. For purposes of program assessment, faculty
members rate each candidate on each of six indicators within the final portfolio each candidate submits. Portfolios are assessed on the Internship Plan, Log of Internship Activities, WebCT Reflections and Discussions, Career Development Plan, Personal Leadership Profile, and Final Self-Assessment.

**Target for O3: Can perform as change agent in schools**

Seventy percent of all students receiving a "target" rating with no less than five percent of students receiving an "unacceptable" rating

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

- MODULE (Met): Target = 89%, Unacceptable = 0%
- LOG (Partially Met): Target = 62%, Unacceptable = 0%
- REFLECTION (Met): Target = 75%, Unacceptable = 0%
- PLAN (Met): Target = 86%, Unacceptable = 0%
- PROFILE (Met): Target = 84%, Unacceptable = 0%
- PRESENTATION (Partially Met): Target = 68%, Unacceptable = 0%
- TOTAL (Met): Target = 78%, Unacceptable = 1%

**M 4: STARS Survey (individual mean scores) (O: 4)**

The STARS Student Survey in Educational Leadership was developed to assess candidates' professional knowledge, skills and dispositions in all six ELCC Standards. The survey contains five questions for each of the six standards; two are designed to measure professional knowledge and three are designed to measure professional skills. There are ten questions designed to measure student professional dispositions. Professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to effectively lead an urban school. Students complete the survey at the end of the program.

**Target for O4: Can provide leadership for urban education**

70% of students rating themselves At or Above the Expected level of "4 - Proficient" at program completion accros all standards and in each standard.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

- STANDARD 1 (Met): 89% At Expected. STANDARD 2 (Met): 89% At Expected. STANDARD 3 (Not Met): 67% At Expected. STANDARD 4 (Met): 78% At Expected. STANDARD 5 (Met): 96% At Expected. STANDARD 6 (Met): 82% At Expected. ACROSS ALL STANDARDS (Met): 84% At Expected.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Action Research**

The results of this assessment in 2005/06 support partial meeting of the required ELCC program standards. We believe that target scores on the action research project are an indication that candidates have the knowledge, skills and dispositions to support student learning and development. We also believe, however, that the range of target scores(59-76%) in the individual areas assessed and the total of 66% across all measures is much too low. The program desires to have all of its candidates achieve target performance in the action research project. This requires that candidates design an action research study that will support student learning and development. We interpret these results as an indication of the need for improvement in our ability to prepare candidates to identify a problem and to select the research tools needed to assess and understand the problem, access, interpret and apply existing research/scholarship in the problem, and design a high-quality action research study that will provide the necessary data to address the problem. In response to this need, the EPEL faculty will redesign the Action Research Project. Because of the limited time available in the program (9 months), the Action Research Project will be changed to focus on identification and articulation of a problem, conceptualizing the problem in the context of a specific school organization, conducting a quality review of literature related to the problem, and developing a solid action research proposal.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Action Research Leadership Project | Outcome/Objective: Can design and implement action research
- Implementation Description: October 2006
- Responsible Person/Group: The educational leadership unit faculty

**Application of leadership theory to schools**

These data indicate that candidate content knowledge as assessed by course grades is high(82% met expectations) across all courses. These data did reveal some differences among different courses with 100% of students receiving A’s in EPEL 7410 and 69% of students receiving A’s in EPEL 7500. As a result of these data, EPEL unit faculty will discuss the EPEL 7500 course and make modifications if necessary. The unit faculty will also take measures to clearly articulate expectations and learning outcomes for each course, emphasize to students the relationship between learning outcomes and professional standards, and further link course content knowledge to the practicum experience. Specifically, students will be provided more opportunities to demonstrate performance of course knowledge in the practicum.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Evaluations in key courses | Outcome/Objective: Can apply leadership theory in practice
- Implementation Description: Academic Year 2006-2007
- Responsible Person/Group: EPEL Unit Faculty

**Can perform as a change agent in schools**

While these results largely meet target expectations the portfolio. The program desires to have all of its candidates achieve target performance in the practicum. In short, these data indicate that many candidates in the program are not provided the opportunity to apply professional knowledge and skills in all the necessary standards; or, that candidates do not have the ability to apply professional knowledge and skills in the necessary standards. We find the numbers of candidates achieving target ratings in their
Log of Internship Activities, Weekly Reflections, and the Career Development Plan to be lower than we desire. These data indicate the need for major changes and improvement in the practicum. As a result, the EPEL unit faculty will make modifications in the practicum. Specifically, changes will be made to make the reflection process more meaningful and less time consuming; efforts will be made to provide more resources and better supervision in the selection of practicum activities; all practicum activities will be specifically linked to course knowledge, and, the overall process will be simplified.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Professional Leadership Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Can provide leadership for urban education
- **Implementation Description:** October 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPEL Unit Faculty

**Can provide leadership for urban education**

The STARS Student Survey was developed to measure professional knowledge, skills and dispositions of candidates in the M.Ed. and ND(L-5 Add-On) programs in educational leadership. The EPEL faculty believes this assessment, based on the ELCC standards for the preparation of educational leaders, also measures skills necessary for successful urban leadership. The fact that these data are self-reported makes these results especially meaningful. These data indicate that leadership and vision (ELCC standard 1), culture (ELCC standard 2), moral leadership (ELCC standard 5) and social foundations (ELCC standard 6) are strengths of the program and areas in which the program meets target learning outcomes. These data also identify organizational management (ELCC standard 3) and community relations (ELCC standard 4) as areas of concern and areas in need of improvement. The results from the disposition questions are less conclusive. The candidates rated themselves high in all of the disposition questions. Candidates did seem to place a higher value on accommodating individual differences and relationships, and a lower value on school-based indicators and data-based research strategies. Based on these results, the EPEL unit faculty will hold discussions, and if necessary make modifications in course content, on how to increase coverage of operational management and community relations in schools. The unit faculty will also explore options for allowing students to apply this knowledge in the practicum experience.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: STARS Survey (individual mean scores) | Outcome/Objective: Can provide leadership for urban education
- **Implementation Description:** Academic Year 2006-2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPEL Unit Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Overall, the assessments in the M.Ed./ND program indicate that the program is strong in the area of preparing educational leaders to apply theory to practice, perform as change agents in schools, and lead effective urban schools.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

These data indicated that the following specific areas need continued attention: Application of Leadership Theory to Practice: (1) discussion and possible modification of EPEL 7500, (2) clear articulation of expectations and learning outcomes for each course, (3) emphasis on the relationship between learning outcomes and professional standards, (4) stronger linkage between coursework and internship experiences; Design and Implement Action Research—Revision of the action research project; Perform as Change Agent—Modifications in the practicum; Leading an Effective Urban School—Modification in course content.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Educational Policy Studies PhD**

*As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST*

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Educational Policy Studies offers a Ph.D. degree in Educational Policy Studies with concentrations in educational leadership, social foundations of education, and research, measurement, and statistics. The program allows students to examine the philosophy and practice of education and to develop skills in both the methodology and the study of educational practice. Students will prepare to become policy makers and examiners of policy and the effects of policy on education. The broader requirements of the Department of Educational Policy Studies offer students the opportunity to linked their programs of study with broader social and educational issues in such areas as race, gender, leadership, and policy. This broader context established an understanding of the programs of study as essential components rather than separate structures of our social, economic, and political lives.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Understands the full significance of diversity (M: 1)**

Student has acquired an understanding of education that includes sensitivity to human potentials and differences.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Has high levels of disciplinary knowledge (M: 3)
Students demonstrate the ability to perform cognitive tasks in their approved program of study.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Can design and execute a major research study (M: 4)
Students demonstrate the ability to design and execute a major research study in their program concentrations.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Can write a literature review (M: 2)
Students can write, critique, organize and analyze a literature review focused upon their specific research topic or problem.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Critical analyses papers (O: 1)
The method of assessment was a critical essay review of a book for the doctoral cohort course EPS 9260 "Issues of Race, Class, and Gender in Education." The assessment scoring was based on the following scale: (a) 1 = did not meet outcome expectations, (b) 2 = met outcome expectations, and (c) 3 = exceeded outcome expectations. For papers a score of 1 was given for a grade of "C," 2 was given for a grade of "B," and 3 was given for a grade of "A."

Target for O1: Understands the full significance of diversity
95% of students attained a 2 or higher on the papers.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
56 students were assessed: 3 did not meet; 14 met, and 39 exceeded stated expectations.

M 2: Capstone (O: 4)
The method of assessment is a literature review in doctoral cohort course EPS 9980 "Research Seminar in Educational Policy Studies." The assessment scoring was based on the following scale: (a) 1 = did not meet outcome expectations, (b) 2 = met outcome expectations, and (c) 3 = exceeded outcome expectations. For literature reviews a score of 1 was given for a grade of "C," 2 was given for a grade of "B," and 3 was given for a grade of "A."

Target for O4: Can write a literature review
95% of students meet or exceed expectations.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
12 students met stated expectations.

M 3: Comprehensive Exam (O: 2)
The method of assessment was a student's ability to successfully complete the comprehensive examination and an oral defense of one's responses.

Target for O2: Has high levels of disciplinary knowledge
95% of students pass their comprehensive examinations on their first attempt.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
16 students met the expectation; 2 students did not meet expectations.

**M 4: Research Study (O: 3)**
The method of assessment was the student's ability to complete a successful defense of the prospectus.

**Target for O3: Can design and execute a major research study**
95% of students have their prospectus approved on their first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
6 students received unconditional approval on their prospectus at their first attempt. We do not have data in regard to how many students received conditional approval.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Evaluation of prospectus**
Dissertation advisory committees need to work more closely with students to ensure that their prospectus work will receive unconditional approval in their first attempt.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Research Study | **Outcome/Objective:** Can design and execute a major research study
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPS faculty

**Improving student preparation for comp exams**
Program advisory committees need to monitor and improve student preparation for comprehensive examinations.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has high levels of disciplinary knowledge
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Doctoral Program Committees

**Maintain and monitor outcomes of cohort classes**
EPS faculty will maintain and monitor learning outcomes and objectives of cohort classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Capstone | **Objective:** Can write a literature review
  - **Measure:** Critical analyses papers | **Objective:** Understands the full significance of diversity
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPS faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Because Objectives #1 and #2 were on target, no further action is planned for these outcomes except to monitor and maintain current levels of performance. Because Objectives #3 and #4 were only partly met, further actions are planned in order to raise student performance levels to target.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
For Objectives #3 and #4 doctoral advisory committees need to become more attentive to student readiness levels prior to students sitting for the comprehensive exams and writing and defending their prospectus. The fact that these objective were partially met indicates that certain students need additional faculty guidance and mentoring. The focus of the EPS department this year will be to develop a process that will better identify those students who are in jeopardy of not passing their comps or successfully defending their prospectus.
### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to emphasize content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the Masters level prepares students to pursue a variety of career paths, including research, evaluation, and the applied practice of a number of disciplines, including K-12 instruction. Note: There are 48 students in the MS program. There were 6 graduates during the 2005-2006 academic year.

### Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Displays expertise with major concepts (M: 1)

Students demonstrate expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in the field of Educational Psychology.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 2: Apply research methods (M: 1, 2)

Understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 3: Values underpinning educational psychology (M: 3)

Students can weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning educational psychology.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 4: Participates in scholarly activities (M: 1)

Students demonstrate independence and competence in scholarly activities.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Comprehensive examination (O: 1, 2, 4)

Each MS student in the Educational Psychology program must complete a comprehensive exam before finishing the program. Faculty read and score comprehensive exams as pass/fail. The comprehensive exam is made up of two parts. The first part consists of writing either a thesis or a project. For the thesis, students conduct their own research, and for the project students write an in-depth analysis of an area within the field. The written component of the comprehensive exam is followed by an oral defense of the thesis or project and is conducted by the student’s committee.

**Target for O1: Displays expertise with major concepts**
All students will pass the oral and written portions of the comps.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
During the past academic year 100% (n = 6) students successfully completed the written and oral component of the comps.

**Target for O2: Apply research methods**
All students will pass the oral and written portions of the comps.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
During the past academic year 100% (n = 6) students successfully completed the written and oral component of the comps.

**Target for O4: Participates in scholarly activities**
All students will pass the oral and written portions of the comps.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
During the past academic year 100% (n = 6) students successfully completed the written and oral component of the comps.

**M 2: Coursework in Research Design (O: 2)**
All students in the MS program are required to complete coursework related to research design and statistics. This coursework is agreed upon by the students and two faculty members and becomes a part of the student's planned program. Generally, this coursework includes developing expertise in ANOVA, ANCOVA, MANOVA, multiple regression and qualitative techniques. Students decide with their advisor and committee which skills meet individual needs and goals.

**Target for O2: Apply research methods**
All students must successfully complete assigned coursework in research design prior to beginning work on their project or thesis.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All students successfully completed coursework related to research and design before beginning work on the thesis or project.

**M 3: Coursework in Social Foundations of Education (O: 3)**
All EPY MS students must successfully complete at least one course in Social Foundations of Education. Students have the choice of several courses (e.g., history of education, philosophy of education, sociology of education, etc.) to match specific interests with individual program goals.

**Target for O3: Values underpinning educational psychology**
All students must complete coursework in Social Foundations before beginning their project or thesis.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All students successfully completed coursework related to Social Foundations of Education before beginning work on the thesis or project.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Refine analysis of comprehensive exam results**
Faculty will meet and discuss performance of students who undertook the project or thesis. Effort will be made to determine areas of specific strength and weakness.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Comprehensive examination
- Outcome/Objective: Apply research methods
  - Displays expertise with major concepts
  - Participates in scholarly activities

- **Implementation Description:** June 1, 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Students have met program outcomes in all areas. Students' course work remains excellent and the quality of projects and theses are high.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Program faculty will meet to review how to refine descriptions of student performance on comprehensive examinations.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Educational Psychology PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to emphasize content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the Doctoral level prepares students for careers in teaching in schools, colleges, and universities; as researchers in state and city departments of education; and professionals in training research programs in government and industry. There are 36 students in the Ph.D. program. There were 2 graduates during the 2005-2006 academic year.
### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Displays expertise with concepts (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**
Demonstrate expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in the field of Educational Psychology.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Understands and applies Research Methods (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**
Understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Can communicate Professionally (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**
Communicate professionally, orally and in writing

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**
Can weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning Educational Psychology.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 5: Participates in scholarly activities (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**
Demonstrate independence and competence in scholarly activities.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 6: Demonstrates competence in teaching (M: 1, 3)**
Develop competence in college teaching

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Annual Evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
This review includes all students who have not completed the comprehensive examination. The evaluation of each student includes a review of academic progress, residency progress, professional growth, and professionalism.

**Target for O1: Displays expertise with concepts**
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Partially Met
During the past academic year, all students except one passed the annual evaluation.

**Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods**
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the past academic year, all students except one passed the annual evaluation.

**Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally**

All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the past academic year, all students except one passed the annual evaluation.

**Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology**

All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the past academic year, all students except one passed the annual evaluation.

**Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities**

All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the past academic year, all students except one passed the annual evaluation.

**Target for O6: Demonstrates competence in teaching**

All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the past academic year, all students except one passed the annual evaluation.

**M 2: Dissertation Proposal (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

All students must defend a dissertation proposal based on a data-based study to their dissertation committee.

**Target for O1: Displays expertise with concepts**

All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 3 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

**Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods**

All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 3 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

**Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally**

All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 3 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

**Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology**

All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 3 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

**Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities**

All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 3 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

**M 3: Teaching Internship (O: 6)**

The teaching internship includes attending class sessions, teaching a specified unit of the class under supervision of the instructor, assessing students on the material taught during the unit, and providing feedback to the class regarding their performance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O6: Demonstrates competence in teaching</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the 2005-2006 academic year, all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 4: Professional Development Seminar (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All EPY doctoral students are required to enroll in EPY 8961 every year until they complete their comprehensive exams. As part of this seminar, students discuss current issues and topics in Educational Psychology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Displays expertise with concepts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 5: Professional Communication (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students in EPY are expected to present papers at professional organizations and publish in professional journals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Displays expertise with concepts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the 2005-2006 academic year, a total of over 30 presentations, publications, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the 2005-2006 academic year, a total of over 30 presentations, publications, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the 2005-2006 academic year, a total of over 30 presentations, publications, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.
Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology

Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

During the 2005-2006 academic year, at total of over 30 presentations, publications, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities

Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

During the 2005-2006 academic year, at total of over 30 presentations, publications, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Annual Evaluation Follow Up

When a student receives a rating of unsatisfactory, students are informed in writing about areas in which they are not meeting goals of the program, and a remediation plan is prepared and signed by both the student and the advisor.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Annual Evaluation
  Outcome/Objective: Can communicate Professionally
| Demonstrates competence in teaching | Displays expertise with concepts | Participates in scholarly activities | Understands and applies Research Methods | Values underpinning Educational Psychology

Implementation Description: Annually
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Indicators are positive in all areas. Students continue to meet the program learning outcomes.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Program faculty will continue to monitor students’ performance during the year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Educational Research MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The Research, Measurement, and Statistics program offers a variety of research courses and services to the College of Education as well as training to students who major in the field of Educational Research, Measurement and Statistics. The program provides infrastructure support in areas such as qualitative and quantitative research methods, program evaluation, testing, and computer applications to the College of Education, across Georgia State University, and increasingly to external agencies. This includes expertise in the planning and conducting of quasi-experimental and mixed-methods program evaluations using logic models and grounded theory to support educational and other interventions. Because recent initiatives that increase governmental and private sector accountability show the importance of evaluation in today's global society, there is a clear need for evaluators with a high level of expertise. The research program also helps foster research-supported practices in the college, with particular emphasis on a serious effort to inform practice, using the urban context as an integral part of research and evaluation studies. In general, the RMS faculty and students help the College of Education and Georgia State University fulfill their research and service missions, in addition to having M.S. and Ph.D. programs that produce outstanding graduates who obtain leadership and professional roles in universities, in governmental agencies, and in the private sector. In summary, the synergy created by the faculty and students in the RMS program provides support for programs and external funding in the College of Education and prepares students who attain leadership and professional roles in research and evaluation.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query (M: 4, 5)
Develop a research idea into a query that is clearly stated, that has a useful place in the extant literature, and that can be practically
addressed through research.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 2: Analyze data and report on the results (M: 1, 2, 4)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institutional Priority Associations**  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity  
**Strategic Plan Associations**  
6.3 Graduate Experience |
| **Be able**:  
1. to recognize an appropriate technique for analyzing data, given the research query and the design used to collect the data  
2. to conduct the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data  
3. to interpret and to report on the results of the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 3: Review and critique the research literature (M: 3, 4, 5)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institutional Priority Associations**  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity  
**Strategic Plan Associations**  
6.3 Graduate Experience |
| **Be able to write a review of an article in a professional journal.** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 4: Design a research study (M: 1, 4)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institutional Priority Associations**  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity  
**Strategic Plan Associations**  
6.3 Graduate Experience |
| **Students will be able**:  
1. to select an appropriate design for addressing a research query  
2. to choose an appropriate population from which to sample  
3. to choose an appropriate sampling technique for the intended level of generalizability  
4. to operationalize all variables of interest, including, as applicable, the selection of measurement instruments intended to gather data on said variable(s)  
5. to craft an appropriate procedure for data collection  
6. to write a professional-level Method section of a research report, describing the above aspects of a design |

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 1: Course assessment: Write a Method section (O: 2, 4)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depending on the courses taken, students will write a Method section of a research paper reporting on a research design used or potentially intended for use and indicating the analysis(es) to be used once/as the data are collected. A Method section written as a course assessment will be assessed by the instructor(s) of the course(s) in which Method sections are assigned.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Analyze data and report on the results**  
100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**  
We have no data for this assessment, because this assessment was not used in any courses in which any of our master`s students were enrolled.

**Target for O4: Design a research study**  
100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**  
We have no data for this assessment, because this assessment was not used in any courses in which any of our master`s students were enrolled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 2: Course assessment: Write a Results section (O: 2)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In completing a high quality Results section of a research report, students demonstrate that they can select an appropriate analytic technique and that they can communicate the results of said analysis using relevant technical format/jargon. A Results section written as a course assessment will be assessed by the instructor(s) of the course(s) in which Results sections are assigned.

**Target for O2: Analyze data and report on the results**
100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** 
We have no data for this assessment, because this assessment was not used in any courses in which any of our master’s students were enrolled.

**M 3: Course assessment: Article review (O: 3)**
Students will write multiple article reviews, reflecting a student’s ability to understand published research articles and to critique the theory/implementation presented in the research articles. An article review written as a course assessment will be assessed by the instructor(s) of the course(s) in which article reviews are assigned.

**Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature**
100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** 
We have no data for this assessment, because this assessment was not used in any courses in which any of our master’s students were enrolled.

**M 4: Master’s project/thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
The final project for master’s students is a major paper or a thesis. In this assessment, faculty will be able to evaluate a student’s overall understanding of research and the research process, thereby providing a summative assessment of the student’s research capabilities. Master’s projects/theses are assessed by the project advisor or the thesis committee.

**Target for O1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query**
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** 
We have no data for this assessment, because we had no master’s students complete a project/thesis during the 2005-2006 academic year.

**Target for O2: Analyze data and report on the results**
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** 
We have no data for this assessment, because we had no master’s students complete a project/thesis during the 2005-2006 academic year.

**Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature**
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** 
We have no data for this assessment, because we had no master’s students complete a project/thesis during the 2005-2006 academic year.

**Target for O4: Design a research study**
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** 
We have no data for this assessment, because we had no master’s students complete a project/thesis during the 2005-2006 academic year.

**M 5: Course assessment: Write a literature review (O: 1, 3)**
In preparing a high-quality literature review, students demonstrate that they can: 1. form a clear research question and support its relevance to the extant literature 2. understand the content of research reports in having to provide some information about those reports 3. critique the literature by choosing the sources to cite and by pointing out the strengths/weaknesses of various studies in shaping their own research queries and designs. A literature review written as a course assessment will be assessed by the instructor(s) of the course(s) in which literature reviews are assigned.

**Target for O1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query**
100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** 
We have no data for this assessment, because this assessment was not used in any courses in which any of our master’s students were enrolled.
**Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature**

100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

We have no data for this assessment, because this assessment was not used in any courses in which any of our master`s students were enrolled.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

Incorporate LOA-relevant assessments into courses

Although several of our doctoral courses have one or more of the assessments for evaluating students on the learning objectives, these assessments are scarce in our master`s level courses. We will incorporate them into our master`s courses for 2006-2007 and update the report when we have data.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Course assessment: Article review  
  Outcome/Objective: Review and critique the research literature
- Measure: Course assessment: Write a literature review  
  Outcome/Objective: Review and critique the research literature
- Measure: Course assessment: Write a Method section  
  | Outcome/Objective: Analyze data and report on the results
  | Design a research study
- Measure: Course assessment: Write a Results section  
  | Outcome/Objective: Analyze data and report on the results

**Implementation Description:** Some already in FA06, more to come in SP06  
**Responsible Person/Group:** RMS Faculty

Mentor master`s students to/through project/thesis

Ensure that master`s students have proper advisement regarding the master`s project/thesis, and ensure that they have full guidance in preparing and completing the project/thesis.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Master`s project/thesis  
  Outcome/Objective: Analyze data and report on the results  
  | Design a research study  
  | Form a clear, useful, and practical research query  
  | Review and critique the research literature

**Implementation Description:** Immediately  
**Responsible Person/Group:** RMS Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Due to a lack of data, we are unfortunately unable to make any statements about strengths/progress demonstrated on the outcomes/objectives.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

All our outcomes/objectives will require continued attention in order to ensure that we have data to report on for the next academic year. Whatever the data show, we will continue to give attention to our outcomes/objectives in order to meet standards that have not been met and to maintain those standards that have been met.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 English BA**

*(As of 12/13/2016 02:31 PM EST)*

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs. We serve students at every level in the university with a broad range of curricular and extracurricular opportunities, including study abroad, internships, tutoring, and research assistantships.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**
Students will demonstrate knowledge of representative figures in American, British, and World literature and will recognize and distinguish crucial genres and forms such as the novel, the lyric, the sonnet, the play, the essay, the short story, the novella, and so forth.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will demonstrate an awareness of a subset of the major historical periods of English, American, and World literature and the central characteristics of those periods.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Knowledge of literary terms (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the meaning of important literary terms and be able to apply them in their analyses of literary works.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Knowledge of language and linguistics (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will demonstrate an awareness of the centrality of language to human experience as well an understanding of some of the structures and functions of language.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Knowledge of criticism and theory (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of a subset of the major theoretical approaches to reading literature such as close reading, new criticism, historical criticism, humanism, Marxism, feminism, gender studies, psychoanalytic criticism, queer theory, deconstruction, reception theory, reader response, post-colonial, cultural studies, deconstruction, gender studies, and ethnic studies. Students will also demonstrate knowledge of representative figures, such as Plato, Aristotle, Horace, Longinus, Sidney, Pope, Johnson, Dryden, Vico, Wordsworth, Shelley, Emerson, Poe, Nietzsche, Eliot, Brooks, Warren, Empson, Derrida, Foucault, Lacan, Miller, and Bloom.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Ability to comprehend texts (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will be able to read with attention to detail while grasping a work's overarching themes and to use inquiry to deepen understanding of a work.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience
SLO 7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)

Students will be able to interpret figurative language, to identify literary and thematic patterns, to read for multiple meanings, to apply knowledge of conventions from different periods and genres, to read and use scholarly and theoretical works, and to evaluate critical arguments and construct alternative positions when necessary.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 8: Ability to create effective written communications (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)

Students will be able to apply knowledge of the elements of rhetoric for effective communications in writing; to write in a variety of forms as appropriate to audience, purpose, and occasion; to recognize a range of social, academic, and professional situations and adapt language accordingly; and to comprehend the grammatical and syntactical patterns of the English language and use them as tools in writing and revising.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8)

Students will demonstrate effective oral communications skills and will be able to work collaboratively with other students to further their comprehension of a work.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 10: Ability to use research effectively (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)

Students will be able to formulate effective questions for research, to use traditional research methods to gather information, to use information technology effectively, and to integrate online and traditional sources in writing while maintaining a clearly articulated personal stance on the topic at hand.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9)

Students will be able to engage with contemporary issues that emerge from the study of literature and of writing and to explore contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions that arise from English studies.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

Strategic Plan Associations
### 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 12: Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching (M: 2, 3)**

(for students in Secondary English Concentration) Students will demonstrate a solid foundation in knowledge needed for middle or secondary English instruction: American, British, and World literature; language and grammar; and composition theory and practice.

Relevant Associations: This outcome is designed to prepare students for the TEEMS program or another graduate professional program in English education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 13: Knowledge of English Education profession (M: 2, 3)**

(for students in Secondary English Concentration) Students will demonstrate an understanding of the crucial aspects of the profession such as the realities of classroom teaching, the professional journals in the field, and the professional organizations and opportunities available to English teachers.

Relevant Associations: This outcome is designed to prepare students for the TEEMS program or another graduate professional program in English education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 14: Ability to teach effectively (M: 3)**

(for students in the Secondary English Concentration) Students will be able to create and teach a lesson plan and to reflect upon the effectiveness of their teaching.

Relevant Associations: This outcome is designed to prepare students for the TEEMS program or another graduate professional program in English education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>1 Written Communication--major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 15: Ability to reflect upon/revise teaching practices (M: 2, 3)**

Students will be able to reflect upon the effectiveness of a particular lesson or classroom practice and make revisions when necessary.

Relevant Associations: This outcome is designed to prepare students for the TEEMS program or another graduate professional program in English education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>7 Critical Thinking--major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 16: Knowledge of chosen genre**

(for students in the Creative Writing Program) Students will demonstrate a familiarity with representative examples of writing in fiction or in poetry, depending upon the student's choice of genre.

| Institutional Priority Associations | 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences |
| Strategic Plan Associations | 6.2 Undergraduate Experience |

**SLO 17: Applying literary studies to creative writing (M: 7, 8)**

(for students in the Creative Writing concentration) Students will be able to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics.
gained in their English studies to compose meaningful literary works and will develop vocabularies for studying and discussing poetry or fiction, depending upon the student's choice of genre.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 18: Ability to produce effective literary works (M: 7, 8)**
(for students in the Creative Writing Concentration) Students will be able to use a variety of techniques to create effective fiction or poetry that is authentic and engaging and grammatically and syntactically correct.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 19: Ability to revise literary works effectively (M: 7, 8)**
(for students in the Creative Writing concentration) Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weakness of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism and will be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and the instructor to revise their own creative works.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 20: Knowledge of the history of rhetoric (M: 5, 9)**
(for students in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration) Students will be familiar with the history of rhetoric from pre-classical Greece to the modern era.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 21: Knowledge of the theory of rhetoric (M: 5, 9)**
(for students in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration) Students will read the works of theorists in rhetoric and composition from a wide range of time periods, from the classical to the contemporary.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 22: Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric (M: 5, 9)**
(for students in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration) Students will be familiar with a variety of rhetorical practices and genres, including the following: layout, markup, chunking, concision, textual editing, ethnography, newsletter, brochure, blog, FAQ, user documentation, manuals, memos of various kinds, proposal, report, white paper

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 23: Written Communication--Core (M: 4)**
Written Communication in Lower Division English courses (the Core) is a primary focus of our learning outcomes and objectives for students. In 2006-07, success in written communication was determined through a rubric that included the following categories: clarity of Ideas (topic, thesis/central idea, focus, purpose, and audience); Organization (structure, coherence, unity, and transitions); Development (logical and sufficient details, evidence, examples); Style & Mechanics (sentence structure, word choice, tone, usage, punctuation, and spelling); Format (presentation, sources, documentation, appropriate citation style - MLA).

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

2 Written Communication--core

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**

Starting in Fall 2004, faculty who teach the senior seminar (capstone course) in the four concentrations complete an assessment form on each student, using a 5-point scale to rate how effectively the student work demonstrates the learning outcomes associated with the senior seminar of the student’s particular concentration. The results of these assessments forms are calculated to determine the mean score for each category (with median scores also being tabulated and recorded as of the 2007-2008 assessment report), and the directors from the four concentrations meet with the Assessment Coordinator during the summer to analyze this data and make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change.

#### Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature

Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.

#### Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history

Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.

#### Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms

Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.

#### Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics

Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases,
suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the English department did not begin assessing student work produced in the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration until Fall 04, there was not enough data to establish specific targets for the seminars taught in 2005-2006. All the same, the report did note that particular attention should be given to students’ scores in research and documentation since these areas emerged as weaknesses in the portfolio assessment process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a “can’t determine” score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scores in the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration improved by at least .2 in every category except reading interpretation skills, which remained the same. The greatest increase (of .4) occurred in the areas concerning Knowledge of the Literary Material of the Seminar and Ability to Conduct Detailed Research and to Complete a Substantial Project. Readers gave a "can’t determine" score for the criterion concerning the Ability to Use Information Technology in 16 out of 23 cases, suggesting this criterion needs to be reframed to avoid confusion.

Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of "can’t determine" scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of "can’t determine" scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of "can’t determine" scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.
To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 "can’t determine" scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.
### Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 “can’t determine” scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

### Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 “can’t determine” scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

### Target for O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 “can’t determine” scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

### Target for O12: Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 “can’t determine” scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

### Target for O13: Knowledge of English Education profession

To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 “can’t determine” scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.
To align the assessment tool with the Secondary English portfolios more closely, the Secondary English concentration changed the Knowledge of Criticism and Theory (which received low scores in the previous assessment cycle) to the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. They also revised the category concerning the Ability to Reflect Upon and Revise Teaching Approaches to the simpler criterion of Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since the portfolio does not provide an opportunity to demonstrate revised teaching approaches. Finally, they set as a goal for 2005-2006 to reduce the number of “can’t determine” scores given on the portfolio assessment forms.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Both the student assessment forms and the department assessment forms for the Secondary English portfolios demonstrate an overall increase in all areas, ranging from between .2 to .5. In the area addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism, there was an overall increase of .5, and in the area addressing the Ability to Reflect Upon Teaching, there was an increase of .2. Finally, while the 2004-2005 portfolio scores included 26 “can’t determine” scores, there were only 14 such scores on the 2005-2006 portfolios.

### Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student’s course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

### Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student’s course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

### Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student’s course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

### Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student’s course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.
First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student's course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student's course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student's course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student's course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student's course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a
Senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student’s course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student’s course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student’s course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O12: Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students’ Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students’ Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student’s course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O13: Knowledge of English Education profession**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report.
First, the category that evaluates students' Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students' Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student's course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O14: Ability to teach effectively**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students' Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students' Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student's course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**Target for O15: Ability to reflect upon/revise teaching practices**

Two changes were to the assessment form for the Secondary English senior seminar as a result of the last assessment report. First, the category that evaluates students' Knowledge of Criticism and Theory was changed to a skills category that determines students' Ability to Understand and Incorporate Literary Criticism. Second, another knowledge category was added that reads, “The student's course work determines knowledge of the pedagogical theory introduced during the seminar.” Finally, faculty who teach the senior seminar were asked to make changes to the curriculum to provide students with more explicit opportunities to demonstrate the ability to revise teaching approaches and to revise their writing in the major course project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

While all of the scores on the senior seminars form during this year averaged a 4.0 or higher, the majority of the scores demonstrated a decrease from the scores of the senior seminar taught in the previous cycle. This is in large part due to a senior seminar taught in the fall semester where two of eleven students failed the course and skewed the scores considerably. The new criterion addressing the Ability to Incorporate Literary Criticism did reflect a .3 improvement over the previous criterion on Knowledge of Criticism and Theory. The other new criterion concerning Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory earned an average score of 4.4. The two areas of revision (of teaching approaches and of the major project) received scores of 4.2, in each case a .2 improvement over the senior seminar taught in the last cycle.

**M 4: Written Communication Assessment (O: 23)**

During the fall and spring semesters, 2006-07, instructors of English teaching in the Core (1000 and 2000 level courses) used a rubric in their classes to measure several criteria for written communication. (see outcome description) Data was gathered from 37 instructors and 1025 students taking English courses in the Core. The following data is a compilation of the results of student learning over the academic year.

**Target for O23: Written Communication--Core**

Averge of B level performance across the six categories.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

What we learned from this brief assessment is that in the area of Ideas, students perform well, with 75 % of their papers earning an A or A+/B+ and no papers received an evaluation below a C grade. In the area of Organization, 85% of the papers were assessed in the high range of A or A+/B+ and 25% of papers assessed in the high range of Development, 73% of students demonstrated that they develop their writing with evidence and logic at the A to B+ level, while 21% demonstrate that they still need work in this area, with a 21% average of D. For the category of Style and Mechanics, 48 % of students were assessed with proficiency at the A to B+ level on the rubric. And 38% were assessed at B level of proficiency. This category includes the largest percentage of assessment below the B level. Yet none of the papers were evaluated to be below a C. Finally, for the category of Format, which includes using MLA citation style appropriately as well as documenting sources, instructors rated papers from A to D. 57% of the papers rated A to B+, 13% in the B range, 22% in the C range, and 9 % in the D range.

**M 5: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22)**

Starting in Fall 2004, faculty who teach the senior seminar (capstone course) in the four concentrations complete an assessment form on each student, using a 5-point scale to rate how effectively the student work demonstrates the learning outcomes associated with the senior seminar of the student's particular concentration. The results of these assessments forms are calculated to determine the mean score for each category (with the addition of median scores as of the 2007-2008 assessment report), and the directors from all four concentrations meet with the Assessment Coordinator during the summer to analyze this data and make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change.
Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.
Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O20: Knowledge of the history of rhetoric

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 "can’t determine" scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

Target for O21: Knowledge of the theory of rhetoric

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.
The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 “can’t determine” scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

**Target for O22: Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric**

The assessment report in the last cycle suggested that since portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition were not as successful in criteria associated with knowledge (Knowledge of the Language of and History of Rhetoric and the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory) as they were in criteria associated with the skills related to Rhetoric and Composition, the faculty would discuss possible revisions to the program that would give greater emphasis to the knowledge of Rhetoric and Composition.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The overall scores on the assessment of the senior seminars in Rhetoric and Composition all range from 4.3 to 4.8. The knowledge categories are on the lower side of this range, but only slightly less than scores given to the skills category. The category that assesses the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies received 15 “can’t determine” scores in one seminar, suggesting that this expectation is not in alignment with course content.

**M 6: Senior Exit Portfolios in Literature Concentration (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11)**

While the senior exit portfolios have been required of students since Fall 2002, data has been collected on portfolios in the Literature, Creative Writing, and Secondary English concentrations only since Spring 2004. The procedure used for this data collection is that faculty members review the portfolios and complete the assessment forms, one that goes to the student and one to the department. The student assessment forms rate the student’s work, using a 5-point scale, and assess how well the work satisfies the expectations of the portfolio. The departmental assessment form also uses a 5-point scale and rates how effectively the student work demonstrates the learning outcomes of the student’s particular concentration. Each portfolio is reviewed by two faculty members in the concentration. At the end of each semester, the portfolio results are tabulated and the mean scores are calculated for each criterion (median scores are also being tabulated and recorded as of the 2007-2008 assessment report). In the summer, the director of each concentration meets with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze data from the previous three semesters and make the suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. Their suggestions are incorporated in the assessment report and then presented to the full faculty at the first department meeting of the fall semester.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature**

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format, and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories on the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format, and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories on the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

**Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms**

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format, and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories on the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last
year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

**Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format, and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories on the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or remained the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format, and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories on the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

**Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts**

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format, and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories on the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

**Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format, and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories on the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

**Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications**

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format, and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories on the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)
Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format; and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories of the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

Target for O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues

The Literature concentration established two primary goals in the 2004-2005 assessment report: first, to change the portfolio requirements to require that students submit 4-6 essays in their portfolios, including one essay that reflects their understanding of critical theory and another that demonstrates their ability to incorporate research in their writing and to document their sources according to MLA format; and, second, to have students achieve at least a 4.0 in all categories related to skills (communication, research, and creative writing) on the departmental assessment form.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores indicates, students received a 4.2 to a 4.5 on all categories of the department assessment form for the literature portfolio. All scores improved or remained the same as last year’s scores, with the exception of a .3 decrease in the Knowledge of Language. On the student assessment form, four out of seven categories had an increase or stayed the same. This suggests that students continue to improve their communication and research skills. Also, students maintained last year’s substantial improvement in Knowledge of Theory and Criticism (the average both years on the department form was 4.2, versus 3.8 in 2004-2005.)

M 7: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 19)

While the senior exit portfolios have been required of students since Fall 2002, data has been collected on portfolios in the Literature, Creative Writing, and Secondary English concentrations only since Spring 2004. The procedure used for this data collection is that faculty members review the portfolios and complete two assessment forms, one that goes to the student and one to the department. The student assessment forms rate the student's work, using a 5-point scale, and assess how well the work satisfies the expectations of the portfolio. The departmental assessment form also uses a 5-point scale and rates how effectively the student work demonstrates the learning outcomes of the student's particular concentration. Each portfolio is reviewed by two faculty members in the concentration. At the end of each semester, the portfolio results are tabulated and the mean scores are calculated for each criterion (median scores are also tabulated and recorded as of the 2007-2008 report). In the summer, the directors of the four concentrations meet with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze data from the previous three semesters and make the suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. Their suggestions are incorporated in the assessment report and then presented to the full faculty at the first department meeting of the fall semester.

Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, rising to at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the
Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

**Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts**

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.
Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

Target for O17: Applying literary studies to creative writing

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.
categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

**Target for O18: Ability to produce effective literary works**

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

**Target for O19: Ability to revise literary works effectively**

Creative Writing faculty members met during the fall of 2005 for a number of reasons related to the assessment of portfolios: to review the learning outcomes for the concentration, to reach consensus on the meaning of the various assessment categories, and to discuss the levels of proficiency that can be required of their students if complete mastery of skills is not to be expected. The main goal of this meeting was to develop a clearer sense of what students can be expected to know and to do in their writing by the end of their program. This meeting also resulted in changes to the portfolio assessment forms so that the student assessment form and the departmental assessment form have identical criteria.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Creative Writing portfolios from 2005-2006 demonstrate significant improvement in all categories, with over half of the criteria gaining at least a .4, roughly a half a point on a five-point scale. All but two categories merited at least a 4.0, a contrast to the previous cycle when all but one criterion were scored in the 3.6-3.9 range. As in the previous cycle, the knowledge categories (Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literature Aesthetics and Familiarity with Literary Works) scored higher than the skills categories (Ability to Produce Authentic and Engaging Writing, Ability to Produce Grammatical Sound Writing, Ability to Use a Variety of Techniques, Ability to Provide Evidence of Substantial Revisions). There was still some inconsistencies between scores given on the student and department forms, which was surprising since the revised forms have identical categories. Finally, while there is evidence of notable improvement in the portfolios from this concentration, the Creative Writing scores continue to be the lowest overall scores in all four concentrations.

**M 8: Senior Seminar in Creative Writing (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19)**

Starting in Fall 2004, faculty who teach the senior seminar (capstone course) in the four concentrations complete an assessment form on each student, using a 5-point scale to rate how effectively the student work demonstrates the learning outcomes associated with the senior seminar of the student's particular concentration. The results of these assessments forms are calculated to determine the mean score for each category (with the addition of median scores as of the 2007-2008 assessment report), and the directors from all four concentrations meet with the Assessment Coordinator during the summer to analyze this data and make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature**

Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms**
Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

**Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts**

Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

**Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

**Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications**

Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

**Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication**

Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to
Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22)

Track the specific results of the student portfolios. Starting in summer 2005, this concentration began to use electronic versions of the assessment forms to program assessment as early as 2001, and from 2001-2005 they made specific curricular changes based upon the general trends.

Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively
Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

Target for O17: Applying literary studies to creative writing
Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

Target for O18: Ability to produce effective literary works
Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

Target for O19: Ability to revise literary works effectively
Creative Writing faculty decided at their fall 2005 meeting to eliminate three categories from the senior seminar assessment form: the Ability to Use a Variety of Literary Techniques; the Ability to Compose Substantial Writing in Chosen Genre; and the Ability to Communicate Effectively. The deletions were done to avoid redundancy and to align the assessment form to the work of the senior seminar more closely.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Scores for the Senior Seminar in Creative Writing also demonstrated a significant increase, with all categories showing a .3 to .7 increase and all categories in the 4.1 - 4.4 range. Scores associated with knowledge were slightly higher than those associated with skills.

M 9: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22)
Historically, the portfolio assessment procedures for the Rhetoric and Composition (R & C) concentration developed at a different rate from the other concentrations. Faculty members in this concentration began using electronic portfolios of student work for program assessment as early as 2001, and from 2001-2005 they made specific curricular changes based upon the general trends displayed in the portfolios. Starting in summer 2005, this concentration began to use electronic versions of the assessment forms to track the specific results of the student portfolios.

Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature
In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to research expectations.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history
In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to...
works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with
Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O20: Knowledge of the history of rhetoric**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O21: Knowledge of the theory of rhetoric**

In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem "thin" in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

**Target for O22: Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric**
In the assessment report from last cycle, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty members recommended that at least one paper per course be uploaded into the electronic portfolio of each student in the concentration so that faculty could gather data about what is being done in each course, and which courses are being taken. Faculty members spoke with students about broadening the list of genre descriptors to include a wider array of genres in the portfolios. They also encouraged students to do more with the biographies they submit as part of their portfolios. Finally, faculty observed that the research papers seem “thin” in regard to works cited, as students were relying too heavily on only a few sources, and determined to give further consideration to their research expectations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall scores on departmental portfolio forms ranged between a 4.0 and 4.5, with the criterion judging the Ability to Write with Various Technologies having the lowest number. The student assessment forms indicated higher overall scores, ranging from 4.4 and 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Add overall category to senior seminar forms

The senior seminar forms for all four concentrations will have an overall performance category added as the last criterion. This score will indicate the grade that the student received in the seminar.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** September 15, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

### Broader participation in assessment process (R & C)

A greater number of Rhetoric and Composition faculty members will be encouraged to participate in the assessment of the portfolios so that the evaluation is not determined by only a few individuals and so that more faculty can be involved in programmatic review.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** May 15, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Rhetoric and Composition faculty

### Continue departmental discussion about research

The department will continue discussions about the meaning of research, either at one of the upcoming Senior Seminar meetings or at a forum created specifically for this purpose. Topics for discussion include different types of research, our expectations for research, the best practices for teaching documentation, and the sequencing of research skills in different levels of classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Senior Exit Portfolios in Literature Concentration
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Ability to use research effectively
- **Implementation Description:** May 15, 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Audrey Goodman

### Emphasize basic mechanics (Creative Writing)

Since the grammar/syntax category received the lowest score on the senior seminar assessment forms, students in the senior seminar will be instructed to give more attention to this aspect of their writing.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Senior Seminar in Creative Writing
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Ability to produce effective literary works | Ability to revise literary works effectively
- **Implementation Description:** May 15, 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Creative Writing Faculty

### Hold regular senior seminar meetings

Following up on the initial meetings about the senior seminar held in March, 2006, the department will continue to have regular discussion meetings with faculty who are teaching or are interested in teaching the senior seminars. Topics for discussion include the following: approaches to teaching the seminar, strategies for incorporating research in the seminar, course content, types of writing, ways to introduce the profession of the concentration, and so forth.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Ability to comprehend texts | Ability to create effective written communications | Ability to develop effective oral communication | Ability to understand and analyze texts | Ability to use research effectively | Applying literary studies to creative writing | Knowledge of criticism and theory | Knowledge of language and linguistics | Knowledge of literary terms | Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature | Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Measures and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to comprehend texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create effective written communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to engage in effective oral communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand and analyze texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use research effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying literary studies to creative writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of criticism and theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of language and linguistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of literary terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Reconsider Writing Technologies (R & C)

Instruct faculty on scoring
In the past, faculty have occasionally judged a student’s work in a particular category to be between two scores. This creates confusion when the scores are tabulated. Faculty will be instructed to choose one box for each criterion and to mark it distinctly.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: October 1, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Maintain success in Knowledge of Critical Theory
Students in the Literature Concentration will achieve at least an overall average of 4.2 in their Knowledge of Critical Theory on their senior exit portfolios.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of criticism and theory

Implementation Description: May 15, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Audrey Goodman

Press for smaller classes (Creative Writing)
In an effort to improve student performance on skills related to creative writing, the Creative Writing faculty will continue to articulate the need for smaller classes, with a maximum of 15 students.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to produce effective literary works
   | Ability to revise literary works effectively | Applying literary studies to creative writing
   Measure: Senior Seminar in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to produce effective literary works
   | Ability to revise literary works effectively | Applying literary studies to creative writing

Implementation Description: May 15, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Creative Writing faculty

Reconsider research expectations (R & C)
The Rhetoric and Composition faculty will participate in the departmental discussions about research and will meet as a group to consider the implications for their concentration.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to use research effectively

Implementation Description: December 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Rhetoric and Composition faculty

Reconsider Writing Technologies (R & C)
Rhetoric and Composition will reconsider the criterion that evaluates the Ability to Use a Variety of Writing Strategies in the senior seminar since the course does not provide an opportunity for a demonstration of such a variety. Either the course will be redesigned to teach further technologies or the assessment criteria will be altered to align the assessment criterion to course content more closely.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
   | Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric

Implementation Description: May 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Audrey Goodman
Revise Language Criterion (Secondary English)
Since the lowest score on the Secondary English portfolios was in the area of Knowledge of Language and Linguistics, the Secondary English committee will revisit this criterion to see if it can be aligned with the types of student work that is generally submitted in the senior portfolio more successfully, whether by changing the portfolio instructions or by rewriting the criterion.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Language and Linguistics
Implementation Description: December 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Secondary English Committee

Revise Portfolio Forms (R & C)
The portfolio assessment forms for the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes (adding a criterion assessing the ability to think critically and engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
| Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts
Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Revise Portfolio Forms (Secondary English)
The portfolio assessment forms for the Secondary English Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes (adding critical thinking skills to the criterion that addresses reading interpretation skills, clarifying that the effective communication skills are referring to written communications, and adding a criterion that evaluates the ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
| Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts
Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Revise Portfolio Forms (Creative Writing)
The portfolio assessment forms for the Creative Writing Concentration are going to be revised to reflect more of the general education outcomes by adding a criterion evaluating adequate reading interpretation/ critical thinking skills.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts
Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Revise Senior Seminar Assessment Form (Literature)
The senior seminar form for the Literature Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes (adding critical thinking skills to the criterion that addresses reading interpretation skills, distinguishing between written
communications skills as one criterion and oral communications/collaboration as another criterion, and adding a criterion addressing students’ ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
- Ability to engage in effective oral communication | Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Revise senior seminar form(Creative Writing)**

The senior seminar form for the Creative Writing Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes by adding a criterion that evaluates reading interpretation/critical thinking skills.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Seminar in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Revise senior seminar form(Literature)**

To avoid confusion, the criterion that assesses "the ability to conduct detailed research and to complete a project that demonstrates the ability to read carefully, think critically, organize coherently, and write effectively" will be changed to read "the ability to read carefully, think critically, organize coherently, and write effectively." In addition, the criterion that assesses "the ability to use information technology effectively" will read "the ability to conduct detailed research and to use information technology effectively."

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
- Ability to use research effectively

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Revise senior seminar forms (R & C)**

The senior seminar form for the Rhetoric and Composition concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcome (adding a criterion about oral communications/collaboration and another criterion addressing the ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to engage in effective oral communication
- Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Revise senior seminar forms(Secondary English)**

The senior seminar form for the Secondary English Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes (adding critical thinking skills to the criterion that addresses reading interpretation skills, distinguishing between written communications skills as one criterion and oral communications/collaboration as another criterion, and adding a criterion addressing students’ ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Seminar in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
- Ability to engage in effective oral communication | Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Written Communication--Core**

This data indicates that we should address the issues of Development, Style and Mechanics and Format as we continue to encourage students toward sound ideas and organizational structures that are effective for academic writing. However, since most of the percentages split between the B+ and the C range of grades, we might also look at what might describe a B paper and why this category is virtually empty. The Lower Division Studies committee in the Department of English, a standing committee within the department that considers curriculum and assessment for the core courses in English (all 1000 and 2000 level courses) will review these results in the Fall semester, 2006. In addition, a subcommittee of graduate students who teach the composition courses have already looked at these results and are continuing to pilot this rubric as a way to assess student writing. Feedback from both groups will advise the Director of Lower Division Studies, who implements curricular and assessment changes in the English Department.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Analysis Related to All Four Concentrations: In general, the portfolio results in all four concentrations from 2005-2006 show an increase in almost all categories. This increase was likely prompted by the improved communications with students about the portfolio instructions, as well as the decision to extend the portfolio deadline and give students an additional month to prepare their materials. The highest scores also suggest that faculty members are becoming more familiar with the portfolio assessment procedures. This norming is likely a result of discussions about portfolios at faculty meetings and between faculty of a particular concentration as well as the involvement of additional faculty members in the reading of portfolios. Analysis from the Literature Concentration: The senior exit portfolios for the Literature Concentration show noticeable improvement in skills of communications and research and in the knowledge of critical theory. The scores given for the appearance, organization, and clarity of the portfolios also increased. As a new procedure, the Literature Concentration decided to rotate faculty to serve as readers, rather than depending upon volunteer readers, and this has led to the involvement of many more faculty members in assessment work. The results from the senior seminars in the Literature Concentration also demonstrated improvement across the board. The increases in the spring could be attributed in part to heightened attention of the goals of this course on the part faculty who are teaching the seminar, as a result of two senior seminar meetings held in March, 2006. Results from these meetings were shared with the full faculty at the following department meeting. Analysis from the Secondary English Concentration: There has been a more uniform sense of the criteria for grading. Two new faculty members have taught this class, which means that fewer graduate students are teaching the capstone course. In addition, graduate students who teach English 3150, the prerequisite to the capstone course, have been given more hands-on training and instruction in the concentration’s learning outcomes, and as a result students come better prepared to the senior seminar. Analysis from the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration: The scores on the portfolio in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration indicate that the students are able to provide evidence in their portfolios that demonstrate overall success in the program. Faculty also noted that students included a more extensive array of genres in the work that they choose to submit. The improved scores in the Rhetoric and Composition senior seminar could be due to the fact that as of last year, students were required to take English 2150—Introduction to Rhetorical Studies—before signing up for the senior seminar, and they consequently came in with a better sense of rhetorical theory.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Literature Concentration Analysis Continued: While the portfolios showed an improvement in research skills, conversation among faculty at the meetings on the senior seminar and at subsequent department meetings suggest that the department hasn’t fully worked out its understanding of research and its research expectations for students. A forum will be created to allow for further consideration of this topic. The year’s portfolios also demonstrate that students’ knowledge of critical theory has improved, and the Literature Concentration would like maintain or improve upon this success in next year’s portfolios. Finally, the undergraduate learning outcomes have been expanded to reflect more of the general education outcomes—specifically in critical thinking and contemporary/global questions—, and the portfolio assessment forms will be altered to reflect these additions. The assessment forms for the senior seminar in the Literature Concentration will be revised to reflect the general education outcomes—specifically in critical thinking, oral communications/collaboration, and contemporary/global questions. Another revision will combine into one criterion the expectation of the Ability to Conduct Detailed Research with the Ability to Use Information Technology. Secondary English Concentration Analysis Continued: The portfolio results from the Secondary English concentration indicate that a problem still exists with the criterion concerning the Knowledge and Language and Linguistics. Since students do not always submit writing that demonstrates this knowledge, this criterion either needs to be revised or students need to be required to demonstrate evidence of this type of study. One possibility to be discussed at the fall Secondary English Committee meeting is to require students to include evidence of literature studies, composition studies, and language studies in the materials they choose to include in the portfolio. Finally, the assessment forms for the senior seminar will be changed to reflect more of the general education outcomes, specifically in critical thinking and contemporary/global questions. The assessment forms for the senior seminar in the Secondary English Concentration will also need to be revised to reflect the general education outcomes—specifically in critical thinking, oral communications/collaboration, and contemporary/global questions. Creative Writing Analysis Continued: While the portfolio results are much improved, there is still a concern about the relatively low scores (in comparison to the scores of the other concentrations) in their scores. Recognition that the study of Creative Writing introduces students to the notion of writing as a craft building upon the type of analytical writing that students are already grounded in as in the other concentrations, the Creative Writing faculty will continue to press for smaller classes where their students could write more frequently and receive more feedback from the instructor and from peers. The assessment form for this concentration will also be changed to include the general education outcome addressing critical thinking, though the general education outcomes on contemporary/global issues will not be added since these issues would only appear in a student’s portfolio if his or her creative writing addresses such matters. The lowest score in the Creative Writing senior seminar assessment was in students’ ability to produce grammatically and syntactically sound writing. To address this area of weakness, Creative Writing faculty will continue to press for smaller classes and will encourage students in the seminar to give more attention to this aspect of their writing. The assessment form for the senior seminar in this concentration will also be altered to include an assessment of critical thinking. Rhetoric and Composition Analysis Continued: While there is no criterion that specifically evaluates researching skills on the portfolio assessment forms, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty have the impression that their research expectations are not fully thought out. They will therefore participate in the department’s discussion of research and carefully consider implications for their own concentration. Another concern is that in the past year, senior portfolios
were read by only a few faculty members; greater investment on the part of more faculty members would lead to more informed decisions about programmatic review. Finally, the Rhetoric and Composition portfolio assessment forms will be revised to include general education outcomes concerning critical thinking skills and contemporary issues/global questions. The Rhetoric and Composition senior seminar scores reveal an uncertainty about students' ability to produce writing that reflects a variety of writing technologies. The Rhetoric and Composition faculty will discuss how to address this misalignment, either by revising the course or by altering the language of the assessment criterion.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 English Education MEd
(As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. The M.Ed. major in English Education provides for master's level study in English Education and English content.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of English Grammars (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of English grammars as well as the history and evolution of the English language.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Demonstrates Content Knowledge -Reading & Writing (M: 2)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literature (M: 3)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of an extensive range of literature, including U.S. literature, British literature, world literature, and multicultural literature as well as literature written specifically for children and young adults.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literary Theory (M: 4)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a wide range of literary theories and how these theories inform instructional planning and pedagogy.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Demonstrates Effective Teaching Performance (M: 5)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials (including nonprint media and technological tools) to support writing instruction and the teaching of literature.
Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 6: Teaches with Cultural Responsiveness (M: 6)
Candidates demonstrate that they create learning environments that promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 7: Demonstrates Professional Behaviors and Activities (M: 7)
Candidates demonstrate practices that indicate their commitment to teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 8: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques (M: 8)
Candidates demonstrate the use of a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1 (O: 1)
A portfolio rating for this standard will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of English Grammars
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Portfolio Standard 1 focuses on candidates’ content knowledge with respect to English grammars. 100% of English Ed M.Ed. program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of this standard through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 (O: 2)
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Target for O2: Demonstrates Content Knowledge -Reading & Writing
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Portfolio Standard 2 focuses on candidates’ content knowledge with respect to reading and writing processes. 100% of English Ed M.Ed. program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of this standard through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3 (O: 3)
A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literature**

100% of program completer will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 1 focuses on candidates’ content knowledge with respect to literature. 100% of English Ed M.Ed. program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of this standard through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

---

**M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 (O: 4)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literary Theory**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 4 focuses on candidates’ content knowledge with respect to literature. 100% of English Ed M.Ed. program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of this standard through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

---

**M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5 (O: 5)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O5: Demonstrates Effective Teaching Performance**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 5 focuses on candidates’ teaching performance in English classrooms in middle or secondary schools. 100% of English Ed M.Ed. program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of teaching ability through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

---

**M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6 (O: 6)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 6 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O6: Teaches with Cultural Responsiveness**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 6 focuses on candidates’ teaching performance with respect to use of culturally responsive pedagogy. 100% of English Ed M.Ed. program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of skill utilizing culturally responsive teaching as demonstrated through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

---

**M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7 (O: 7)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 7 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O7: Demonstrates Professional Behaviors and Activities**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 7 focuses on candidates’ disposition to demonstrate professional behaviors and activities. 100% of English Ed M.Ed. program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of professional development through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

---

**M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8 (O: 8)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 8 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O8: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Portfolio Standard 1 focuses on candidates’ abilities to use assessment techniques to inform instruction. 100% of English Ed M.Ed. program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of ability to use effective assessment/instruction techniques as shown through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Enhance focus on English Grammar

Although all program completers met our expectations for content knowledge of English grammars, English Education faculty felt this area was one that could be strengthened in our current program. Faculty will propose a new course focusing on the effective teaching of grammar and will submit a program change integrating this requirement into the program.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of English Grammars
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Effective Teaching Performance
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: English Education Faculty: Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Completers of the English Education M.Ed program performed at high levels on all standards. Oral defenses of the portfolios underscored students' strengths in literature, literary theory, reading and writing processes and pedagogy.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although all standards were met at expected levels, faculty have identified the area of English Grammar as an area to be strengthened through additional course opportunities in the program. Currently attention to grammar happens only within the context of the Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Writing course. A new course focusing exclusively on this area seems merited.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 English Education--TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 10)
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Understands student development re: learning (M: 7)
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: Practices professional reflection (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 10: Involves school and community in learning (M: 6)**

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5 (O: 5)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O5: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

83% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Can motivate and manage students for learning" at the expected level.

**M 2: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6 (O: 6)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O6: Uses communication skills and technology**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

86% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Uses communication skills and technology" at the expected level.

**M 3: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7 (O: 7)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O7: Can effectively plan for instruction**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

88% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Can effectively plan for instruction" at the expected level.

**M 4: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8 (O: 8)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O8: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
94% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Understands and uses assessment for learning" at the expected level.

**M 5: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9 (O: 9)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O9: Practices professional reflection**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Practices professional reflection" at the expected level.

**M 6: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10 (O: 10)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
87% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Involves school and community in learning" at the expected level.

**M 7: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2 (O: 2)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O2: Understands student development re: learning**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
86% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Understands student development re: learning" at the expected level.

**M 8: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3 (O: 3)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
80% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners" at the expected level.

**M 9: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4 (O: 4)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
90% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies" at the expected level.
### M 10: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1 (O: 1)

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

### Target for O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

90% of our students in the English Ed. TEEMS program met "Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge" at the expected level.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Analysis of Alternative Models of Field Experience

Over the next year, TEEM English Faculty, practicum and student teaching supervisors, and cooperating teachers will collaboratively consider alternative models for field experience. Currently, the TEEMS English program completes a 6 week internship in fall with middle grades students and a full time internship in spring in high schools. We wish to examine(a) the addition of a tutoring experience working one-on-one with struggling readers and writers, and (b) the possibilities of year-long internships in PDS sites. These changes are designed to increase interns’ abilities to work with diverse learners and to motivate and manage classrooms as a novice teacher.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners  
- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning

**Implementation Description:** Development 2005-2006, Implementation 2007-2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** English Education Faculty: Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail

#### Increase Collaboration and Communication

The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts will be made to have at least 2 meetings with all faculty and all supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program design, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors will visit practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating teachers and provide an overview of the program and expectations. We expect this initiative to strengthen the overall success of our interns when in the field.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge  
- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10 | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning

**Implementation Description:** Development 2005-2006, Implementation 2007-2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEM English Education Faculty and Supervisors: Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail

#### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

The strengths of our TEEMs English Education program can be found in our students' knowledge of their content fields, their instructional practices, their ability to use assessments to effectively plan instruction, and their reflective practice.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Although all measures of our students' performance were met at our target performance levels, we did identify two areas as more difficult for our students. These areas are their ability to work effectively with diverse learners and their ability to motivate learners and manage classroom instruction.
### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs. We serve students at every level in the university with a broad range of curricular and extracurricular opportunities, including study abroad, internships, tutoring, and research assistantships.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Content Knowledge (Literature) (M: 1)

In addition to knowledge of major figures, genres, periods, movements, and critical approaches in American, British, and world literatures, students will be able to discuss these as a constellation of interconnected fields rather than unrelated categories of information. For example, students will be able to discuss major authors’ works in the context of their historical periods and cultural movements.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature) (M: 1)

Students will bring to their analysis of literary works an appropriate scholarly vocabulary that demonstrates an understanding of concepts important to the study of literature. Examples might include critical terms such as postmodern, deconstruction, and semiotic and technical terms drawn from formal study, such as Rime Riche, ballad, and quarto.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Knowledge of Language (Literature) (M: 1)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the history, structure, and social implications of language as a means of discourse; further, they will be able to relate their understanding of the possibilities and limitations of language to their understanding of major figures, genres, periods, movements, and critical approaches.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 4: Knowledge of Theory (Literature) (M: 1)

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the major theoretical approaches to reading literature and be able to apply them in their own assessment and interpretation of texts.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 5: Skills of Inquiry (Literature) (M: 1)

Students will be able to formulate effective questions for master's level research.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 6: Researching Skills (Literature) (M: 1)

Students will be able to use traditional research methods of research as well as non-traditional information technology.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></th>
<th><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7: Computer Skills (Literature) (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Students will have computer skills appropriate to the discipline for both writing and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8: Evaluative Skills (Literature) (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Students will be able to evaluate information and materials for their accuracy, persuasiveness, and relevance to a research project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Writing Skills (Literature) (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Students will be able to write clearly and persuasively about literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10: Teaching Skills (Literature)</strong></td>
<td>Students will be prepared to teach entry-level courses in the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 11: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing) (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td>M.A. students in Creative Writing will demonstrate the same familiarity with literature and literary history as what is required of the M.A. in literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 12: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing) (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Students will be able to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics gained in their English studies to compose meaningful literary works. They will also be able to develop vocabularies for studying and discussing poetry or fiction, depending on the student's choice of genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 13: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing) (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Students will be able to produce writing that is authentic and engaging, in part by identifying and accessing material from their own lives and interests. They will be able to produce writing that is grammatically and syntactically correct, and they will be able to use a variety of techniques to create effective fiction or poetry, depending upon the student's choice of genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 14: Revising Skills (Creative Writing) (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3 Graduate Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism. They will also be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and the instructor and to revise their creative works.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 15: Teaching Skills (Creative Writing)

Students will be prepared to teach entry-level courses in the discipline.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 16: Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1)

Students will be familiar with the history of rhetoric from pre-classical Greece to the modern era, although students may focus more on one timeframe and area of the discipline than another (emphasizing, for example, classical rhetorical history or the history of composition pedagogy or professional writing history).

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 17: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric (M: 1)

Students will have read the work of rhetorical theorists from a wide range of periods, covering a diverse set of perspectives. Theories of writing practices and pedagogy should be included in this work.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 18: Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1)

Students will have mastery of typical genres of academic writing (e.g., research paper, research proposal, abstracts, presentations, book reviews, web sites for teaching). Students focusing on Professional and Technical Writing will also have mastery of professional writing genres and electronic media (e.g., technical article, documentation, websites for multiple purposes).

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 19: Effective Communications Skills (R & C) (M: 1)

Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts (including academic and workplace environments).

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 20: Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition) (M: 1)

b. Students can conduct graduate-level research on topics of interest to the interdisciplinary field of Rhetoric and Composition.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 21: Teaching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition)

Students will be prepared to teach entry-level courses in the discipline including First-year Composition.
Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: M.A. Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20)**

Starting in fall of 2007, students who entered the M.A. program are required to complete a thesis by the end of their program (rather than being given the option of taking M.A. exams, as was the case in previous years). In the spring and summer of 2009, the students who entered under this new regulation will likely be completing their M.A. program, and so the department has developed a measure for assessing thesis work. An assessment form, which will be completed by faculty members on the student’s committee, will rate how effectively the student work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes, using a six-point scale. In the summer, the Associate Graduate Director will meet with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze the resulting data in order to make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change.

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge (Literature)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Language (Literature)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of Theory (Literature)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O5: Skills of Inquiry (Literature)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O6: Researching Skills (Literature)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O7: Computer Skills (Literature)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O8: Evaluative Skills (Literature)</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O9: Writing Skills (Literature)</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O11: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing)</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O12: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O13: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing)</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O14: Revising Skills (Creative Writing)</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O16: Knowledge of history of Rhetoric (R &amp; C)</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O17: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O18: Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R &amp; C)</strong></td>
<td>The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O19: Effective Communications Skills (R & C)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

**Target for O20: Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition)**

The idea of requiring masters level students to defend their theses was suggested at a spring 2006 faculty meeting. There was general agreement that this would be beneficial to the students, and so thesis assessment forms for the three graduate concentrations were developed in the summer of 2006.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings to report as this assessment tool is only going into effect in the 2006-2007 school year.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Develop criteria for M.A. thesis

The Graduate Director will created a list of criteria to accompany the M.A. thesis assessment form, similar to the criteria developed for the PhD dissertation assessment tool.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: M.A. Thesis  
- Outcome/Objective: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)  
- Computer Skills (Literature)  
- Content Knowledge (Creative Writing)  
- Content Knowledge (Literature)  
- Content Knowledge (Language)  
- Computer Skills (Language)  
- Content Knowledge (Literature)  
- Knowledge of Theory (Historical)  
- Knowledge of Theory (Literary)  
- Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C)  
- Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric (R & C)  
- Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature)  
- Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C)  
- Researching Skills (Literature)  
- Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition)  
- Writing Skills (Literature)

**Implementation Description:** October 1, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Calvin Thomas, Graduate Director

#### Intiate the M.A. thesis assessment

All M.A. students submitting a thesis will defend the work before their M.A. committee. Afterwards, the Graduate Director will have the committee members complete an assessment form which evaluates how well the work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: M.A. Thesis  
- Outcome/Objective: Computer Skills (Literature)  
- Content Knowledge (Literature)  
- Evaluative Skills (Literature)  
- Knowledge of Language (Literature)  
- Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R & C)  
- Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric (R & C)  
- Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature)  
- Researching Skills (Literature)  
- Skills of Inquiry (Literature)  
- Writing Skills (Literature)

**Implementation Description:** August 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Tanya Caldwell, Associate Graduate Director

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

In 2005-2006, no assessment tools other than course grades and exam and thesis pass rates existed for the M.A. program. Because of this, no conclusions can be drawn about the strengths of the program based on assessment data. On the other hand, the directors of the various graduate programs have offered insights about the 2005-2006 cycle based on their own observations. Students in the Literature M.A. continue to demonstrate success in that the majority of them go on the PhD programs, suggesting that the program is adequately preparing them for future study. The Rhetoric and Composition M.A. is particularly successful in the diversity of courses offered and the depth of coverage offered vis a vis the history of rhetoric, which is unparalleled in the country at the master's level. Improvements in the Creative Writing M.A. are seen in the fact that students are now getting through the program at a faster rate and current students have established an impressive publication record.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

The main assessment focus in 2006-2007 will be establishing the assessment tool for the M.A. thesis. While assessment forms have already been created for this purpose, the Graduate Director will work to formulate written criteria to accompany the assessment.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs. We serve students at every level in the university with a broad range of curricular and extracurricular opportunities, including study abroad, internships, tutoring, and research assistantships.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Content Knowledge (Literature) (M: 1)

The learning outcomes for the Ph.D. in English are comparable to those for the M.A. with crucial differences in terms of specificity. Generally speaking, the goal of the master's program is broad-based knowledge of the aspects of literary study and an ability to evaluate a work of literature with an understanding of its various contexts and using any of a number of theoretical approaches. Doctoral study aims for graduates to have greater mastery of content and a higher degree of critical sophistication than master's level work.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Researching/Writing Skills (Literature) (M: 1)

Using and building upon the knowledge and skills acquired during master's level study, doctoral graduates will be able to isolate a fruitful question for extended, in-depth investigation, carry out focused, productive, and thorough research, and produce a clearly written, thorough explication of the results of that research.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing) (M: 1)

Ph.D. students will demonstrate a thorough familiarity with representative examples of writing by major figures, English and American literary history, and form and theory in both fiction and poetry.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing) (M: 1)

Students will be able to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics gained in their English studies to compose meaningful literary works that are deemed worthy of being published in national literary journals. Students will also be able to develop vocabularies for studying and discussing poetry and fiction.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing) (M: 1)

Ph.D. students will be able to produce writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Revising Skills (Creative Writing) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism. Students will also be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and the instructor, and to revise their creative works to create writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Teaching Skills (in all three concentrations) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to teach an entry-level course or an upper-level course in their discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R &amp; C) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate knowledge of the history of rhetoric from pre-classical Greece to the modern era. Students will also specialize in one time frame and area of the discipline (emphasizing, for example, classical rhetorical history or the history of composition pedagogy or professional writing history).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Knowledge of Theory of Rhetoric (R &amp; C) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate familiarity and understanding of the work of rhetorical theorists from a wide range of periods, covering a diverse set of perspectives. Theories of writing practices and pedagogy should be included in this work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (R &amp; C) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will have mastery of typical genres of academic writing and knowledge of those common in publication (e.g., research article, grant proposal, abstracts, presentations, book reviews). Students will have mastery of genres of writing needed for teaching (e.g., syllabi, course handouts, assignments, course web sites). Students focusing on Professional and Technical Writing will also have mastery of professional writing genres and electronic media (e.g., technical article, documentation, web sites for multiple purposes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Effective Communication Skills (R &amp; C) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts (including academic and workplace environments).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students can conduct graduate-level research on topics of interest to the interdisciplinary field of Rhetoric and Composition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 13: Effective Writing Skills (Rhetoric and Comp) (M: 1)
Students will be prepared for professional publication in the field of Rhetoric and Composition.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Ph.D. Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**
Graduating Ph.D. students in all three graduate concentrations are assessed on the work of their dissertation. This assessment is facilitated by the Graduate Director at the student's dissertation defense, and the form is completed by faculty members on the student's committee. The dissertation assessment form uses a 6-point scale and rates how effectively the student work demonstrates the learning outcomes. In the summer, the Graduate Director meets with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze the resulting data in order to make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change.

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge (Literature)**
In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a "good" rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year's cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of "can't determine" was changed to "not applicable to this defense"; a category for "overall evaluation" was added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale ("Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate") to a six-point scale ("Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate"). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year's scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Target for O2: Researching/Writing Skills (Literature)**
In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a "good" rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year's cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of "can't determine" was changed to "not applicable to this defense"; a category for "overall evaluation" was added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale ("Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate") to a six-point scale ("Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate"). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year's scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Target for O3: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing)**
In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a "good" rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year's cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of "can't determine" was changed to "not applicable to this defense"; a category for "overall evaluation" was added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale ("Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate") to a six-point scale ("Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate"). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

Target for O4: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”, a category for “overall evaluation” was be added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

Target for O5: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing)

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was be added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

Target for O6: Revising Skills (Creative Writing)

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was be added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

Target for O7: Teaching Skills (in all three concentrations)

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was be added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that
became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C)**

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was be added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Target for O9: Knowledge of Theory of Rhetoric (R & C)**

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was be added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Target for O10: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (R & C)**

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was be added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between a 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Target for O11: Effective Communication Skills (R & C)**

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was be added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were
changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Target for O12: Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition)**

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Target for O13: Effective Writing Skills (Rhetoric and Comp)**

In the last assessment cycle, three dissertations were defended which were determined to be excellent in all categories, with the exception of a Rhetoric and Advanced Composition dissertation which received a “good” rating in the category evaluating the oral defense. These data seem to indicate that the graduate students are successfully achieving the graduate learning outcomes, but it was difficult to draw conclusions about the program from such a small sample. Since last year’s cycle, the Graduate Program made a number of procedural changes to the assessment of dissertations: the rating of “can’t determine” was changed to “not applicable to this defense”; a category for “overall evaluation” was added to the bottom of the form; and the ratings were changed from a five-point scale (“Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Inadequate”) to a six-point scale (“Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, and Inadequate”). In addition, a description was attached to the assessment form to explain what each of the ratings mean in terms of publication potential and contribution to the field. A weakness in the graduate program that became apparent through the assessment of dissertations is that students frequently do not provide dissertation readers enough time to read and edit their writing. The Graduate Director intended to work with the Graduate Committee to consider ways to concretize a schedule so that students are required to give ample time for readers to respond to their writing before the defense date.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four dissertations were defended this year, three in Literature and one in Creative Writing. The Literature scores were significantly lower than last year’s scores, ranging between 3.7 - 4.7 on a five-point scale. The Creative Writing dissertation earned a 2.5 in all but two categories, in which it earned a 3.0.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Create policy for the submission of dissertation**

To ensure dissertation readers have enough time to read the dissertation and to ask for revisions, guidelines will be created for the timing of the submission of the complete draft.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Ph.D. Dissertation</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Effective Writing Skills (Rhetoric and Comp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researching/Writing Skills (Literature)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: May, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Studies Committee

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

The changes made to the dissertation assessment form after last year’s cycle are working well. The overall evaluation is a useful score to have, especially for faculty when they are writing recommendations for graduate students. The “outstanding” category allows a distinction for the graduate student whose dissertation is ready for publication, with only minor modifications.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?  
While two of the dissertations assessed in this cycle were quite strong, the other two were quite weak. These were students who were being pressed to finish their work because they were nearing or overextending the limit on possible years of graduate study, and their dissertations reflected that reality. In general, it appears that students who complete their degrees in a six-year period are more successful in their dissertation work.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2005-2006 Exercise Science BS**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)

_Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request._

### Mission / Purpose
The Department of Kinesiology and Health in accord with the College of Education and the other colleges and departments of the university seeks an ever increasing degree of excellence in a wide variety of programs. The Department’s mission includes instruction, research and scholarly activity, and community service in the areas of exercise science, sports administration, sports medicine, health and physical education, and recreation. The department provides professional preparation and continuing education in each of these fields, generates and communicates knowledge, and serves the community with particular emphasis on the urban setting of which it is a part. The Department recognizes the necessity of cross cultural competence and actively supports international development activities in research, teaching and service. Although the department is diverse in the disciplines it embraces, the members of the faculty are united in their interdisciplinary commitment to the highest quality in all of these pursuits.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Has knowledge of exercise and fitness science (M: 1, 5)**

Students should have a basic understanding of the scientific principles of exercise science  
Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 2: Can assess clients’ fitness (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 7)**

Students will have effective fitness assessment skills  
Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 12 Quantitative Skills--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor (M: 2, 3, 5)**

Graduates of this program will be able to function at the American college of Sports Medicine health fitness instructor level  
Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
### SLO 4: Can apply knowledge with special populations (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students will be able to assist individuals with special physical needs such as those with cardiovascular disease, obesity, hypertension.

Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Technology--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 5: Has effective practical skills (M: 2, 4, 6)
Students will demonstrate a high level of practical skills related to the knowledge base of the program

Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Written Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Oral Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Quantitative Skills--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Technology--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 6: Ensures safety in physical activity settings (M: 4, 6)
Provide information about insuring the safety of clients and training in safety and first responder

Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 7: Demonstrates competence with technology (M: 4)
Students will have a level of competency that will enable them to effectively use contemporary technology to serve clients.

Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Technology--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Exam over Exercise Science content (O: 1)

Multiple analysis and discussion questions over exercise science content

Target for O1: Has knowledge of exercise and fitness science
That 90% of students taking these exams will pass the exam

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
that 95% of students in the program achieved the desired levels for courses taken. This exceeded the expected 90%.

M 2: National Health Fitness Instructor Exam (O: 2, 3, 5)

Students will take a national standardized exam over fitness and exercise science content

Target for O2: Can assess clients’ fitness
90% of the students will be expected to pass this exam

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students that complete the program are able to successfully pass this exam.

Target for O3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor
90% of the students will be expected to pass this exam

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students that complete the program are able to successfully pass this exam.

Target for O5: Has effective practical skills
90% of the students will be expected to pass this exam

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students that complete the program are able to successfully pass this exam.

M 3: Practical exams with special needs individuals (O: 2, 3, 4)

Students will take subjective and practical exams that evaluate their skills working with special needs individuals

Target for O2: Can assess clients’ fitness
That 85% of the students will successfully pass these assessments

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students are effective in working with obese and cardiac rehabilitation people.

Target for O3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor
That 85% of the students will successfully pass these assessments

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students are effective in working with obese and cardiac rehabilitation people.

Target for O4: Can apply knowledge with special populations
That 85% of the students will successfully pass these assessments

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students are effective in working with obese and cardiac rehabilitation people.

M 4: Practical labs for First Aid and Safety (O: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7)

Students will pass First Aid and Safety course that includes a practical lab on safety while working with people when exercising

Target for O2: Can assess clients’ fitness
That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students demonstrate an ability to function safely in laboratory and practical settings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Can apply knowledge with special populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an ability to function safely in laboratory and practical settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Has effective practical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an ability to function safely in laboratory and practical settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Ensures safety in physical activity settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an ability to function safely in laboratory and practical settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Demonstrates competence with technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an ability to function safely in laboratory and practical settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5**: Written exams Re: working with special populations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students must pass practical and written exams based on working with special or disables populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: Has knowledge of exercise and fitness science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That 85% of our students will pass these requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goal 90% of our students passed these tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Can assess clients’ fitness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That 85% of our students will pass these requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goal 90% of our students passed these tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That 85% of our students will pass these requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goal 90% of our students passed these tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Can apply knowledge with special populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That 85% of our students will pass these requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goal 90% of our students passed these tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6**: Exercise Science lab reports and quizzes (O: 4, 5, 6)
Reports on different content areas of Exercise Science and quizzes on the covered lab activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Can apply knowledge with special populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate a practical knowledge of Exercise Science labs as 90% of students will successfully pass the lab exam and lab reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students perform at a high level in laboratory portions of classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Has effective practical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate a practical knowledge of Exercise Science labs as 90% of students will successfully pass the lab exam and lab reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students perform at a high level in laboratory portions of classes

**Target for O6: Ensures safety in physical activity settings**
Students will demonstrate a practical knowledge of Exercise Science labs as 90% of students will successfully pass the lab exam and lab reports

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students perform at a high level in laboratory portions of classes

**M 7: Exercise Science Internships (O: 2)**
Students will be evaluated on client interaction, fitness assessment, fitness programming and ability to use exercise science information with clients in a workplace setting

**Target for O2: Can assess clients’ fitness**
100% of the students will successfully pass internships

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Reports from internship sites rate our students highly for their knowledge and independent functioning

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Class projects
Students will be asked to complete practical class projects that enhance fitness assessment skills

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Exercise Science Internships  
- Outcome/Objective: Can assess clients’ fitness  
- Measure: Exercise Science lab reports and quizzes  
- Outcome/Objective: Has effective practical skills  
**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science faculty

#### Comprehensive review
The faculty continues to review outcomes and objectives

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Exam over Exercise Science content  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of exercise and fitness science  
**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty will evaluate the review to insure that objectives are met

#### Include special population in courses
Portions of courses will include materials on special populations

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science faculty

#### Insure safety practices
Insure that students practice safety and understand appropriate safety procedures

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Written exams Re: working with special populations  
- Outcome/Objective: Can apply knowledge with special populations  
**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science faculty

#### Laboratory portions of courses
That a number of courses will have a laboratory portion where students will develop practical skills

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Exercise Science lab reports and quizzes  
- Outcome/Objective: Has effective practical skills  
**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science faculty
Refine fitness prescription skills
Provide further opportunities for students to refine their fitness assessment and prescription skills and enhance their technology skills

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessments demonstrated that the students possessed a high level of knowledge about the scientific bases of Exercise Science. They also have effective Exercise Science practical skills.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
That students have a high degree of knowledge of Exercise Science and function at a high level of competence, more practical opportunities may benefit them.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Exercise Science MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The MS degree program in exercise science seeks to contribute to the KH Department’s mission, which includes instruction, research and scholarly activity, and community service in the areas of exercise science, sports administration, sports medicine, health and physical education, and recreation. The program provides academic preparation and continuing education in exercise science while its faculty generate and communicate knowledge and serve the community with particular emphasis on the urban setting of which it is a part. The Department recognizes the necessity of cross cultural competence and actively supports international development activities in research, teaching and service. Although the department is diverse in the disciplines it embraces, the members of the faculty are united in their interdisciplinary commitment to the highest quality in all of these pursuits.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science (M: 2)
Students should have a basic understanding of the scientific principles of exercise physiology and related exercise science, including pathophysiology and risk factors and exercise prescription and programming.
Relevant Associations: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities content matter areas 1, 2, and 7. In addition, Program is seeking accreditation by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Apply knowledge to practical situations (M: 3)
Students should demonstrate practical skills related to the knowledge base of the program, including health appraisal, fitness and clinical exercise testing, electrocardiography, and diagnostic techniques.
Relevant Associations: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities content matter areas 3 and 4. In addition, Program is seeking accreditation by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing (M: 1)**
Students should demonstrate knowledge of basic equipment, facility requirements, absolute and relative contraindications, procedures, and protocols for the exercise test.

Relevant Associations: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Learning Outcomes 4.6.1.1, 4.6.1.7, and 4.6.2. In addition, Program is seeking accreditation by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Understands research and human subjects issues (M: 4)**
Students should understand and interpret research in exercise science and should understand issues associated with clinical testing and research involving human subjects, including informed consent.

Relevant Associations: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Learning Outcomes 4.6.1.6, 4.6.2.1, 4.6.2.8, 2.6.0.4, and 2.6.0.5. In addition, Program is seeking accreditation by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: GXT practical exam (O: 3)**
Practical exam assessing students’ ability to adminster graded exercise tests to various populations

**Target for O3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing**
90% of students will demonstrate proficiency.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students achieved desired levels, exceeding the target performance.

**M 2: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes (O: 1)**
Written examinations and quizzes in KH courses 6280, 7500, 7510, 7550, 7620, 82980, and 8390.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science**
75% scoring at or above 80% on exam

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
99% of students achieved desired levels, exceeding the target performance.

**M 3: Practical Exams (O: 2)**
Oral arrhythmia examination and laboratory exams

**Target for O2: Apply knowledge to practical situations**
90% of students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students achieved desired levels, exceeding the target performance.

**M 4: Case Studies and Labs (O: 4)**
Laboratory assignments associated with instrumentation and testing and written Case Studies

**Target for O4: Understands research and human subjects issues**
90% of students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students achieved desired levels, exceeding the target performance.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Monitor and maintain current strengths

Because achievement levels were met, we will monitor future achievement in order to maintain standards.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes</td>
<td><strong>Outcome/Objective:</strong> Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Case Studies and Labs</td>
<td><strong>Outcome/Objective:</strong> Understands research and human subjects issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: GXT practical exam</td>
<td><strong>Outcome/Objective:</strong> Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Practical Exams</td>
<td><strong>Outcome/Objective:</strong> Apply knowledge to practical situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing

**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science program faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Assessments demonstrated the students possessed a high level of basic and practical knowledge in exercise physiology and related exercise science.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

All target levels were met, so continued attention will monitor programs in order to continue to maintain high achievement.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Film & Video BA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST*

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Communication is firmly committed to the goals of academic excellence, strong research programs and international relevance set forth in the Georgia State University’s Strategic Plan. The Department encompasses multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students’ oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication. Note: The Department has about 1,400 undergraduate majors; about 450 are Film/video majors.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: cinema basics (M: 1)**

Students will learn the basics of cinema that will lay the ground work for upper level courses.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: cinema history (M: 1)**

Students will gain an understanding of the history of cinema.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
SLO 3: interpret cinema (M: 1)
Students will be able to understand, interpret, and coherently discuss cinema.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: exam (O: 1, 2, 3)
The average number of correct answers from a sample of exams with 17 questions about the film, "Casablanca," administered in Film 1010, Film Aesthetics and Analysis, Film 2700, History of Motion Pictures, and Film 4750, Film Theory and Criticism.

Target for O1: cinema basics
The exams from Film 4750, Film Theory and Criticism, should be higher than the other two lower-level courses to indicate that students who have progressed through the Film/video curriculum have retained knowledge about principles and concepts of cinema.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average score of the exams from Film 4750, Film Theory and Criticism, was 2.80. The average score of the sample of the exams from Film 1010, Film Aesthetics and Analysis, was 1.88. The average score of the sample of final exams from Film 2700, History of Motion Pictures, was 2.14.

Target for O2: cinema history
The exams from Film 4750, Film Theory and Criticism, should be higher than the other two lower-level courses to indicate that students who have progressed through the Film/video curriculum have retained knowledge about principles and concepts of cinema.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average score of the exams from Film 4750, Film Theory and Criticism, was 2.80. The average score of the sample of the exams from Film 1010, Film Aesthetics and Analysis, was 1.88. The average score of the sample of final exams from Film 2700, History of Motion Pictures, was 2.14.

Target for O3: interpret cinema
The exams from Film 4750, Film Theory and Criticism, should be higher than the other two lower-level courses to indicate that students who have progressed through the Film/video curriculum have retained knowledge about principles and concepts of cinema.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average score of the exams from Film 4750, Film Theory and Criticism, was 2.80. The average score of the sample of the exams from Film 1010, Film Aesthetics and Analysis, was 1.88. The average score of the sample of final exams from Film 2700, History of Motion Pictures, was 2.14.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

include production courses
The biggest dilemma still facing the Film/video faculty is how to incorporate the production courses into the assessment process.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall semester 06
Responsible Person/Group: Film faculty
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

There was little change in the results of the assessment measures from the previous year. It is clear that students are learning more about film theory and the critical analysis of film as they progress through the curriculum.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

As stated in the action plan, the assessment measures are not examining any production courses, and the film faculty must devise a way to measure curricular objectives for those courses.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Finance BBA**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the undergraduate BBA finance program is to prepare graduates to succeed in entry-level positions in finance and business in general. To achieve this goal, students should have proficiency in three general areas: (1) Communication skills. Students should be able to write and present financial business reports and presentations that are concise, to identify and evaluate key issues, and to reach supported conclusions. (2) Critical thinking skills. Students should be able to think critically. (3) Technical knowledge. Students should possess a strong technical knowledge of finance. Note: During the 2005-2006 academic year there were approximately 775 students in the BBA-Finance program. In addition, there were approximately 210 graduates of the BBA-Finance program during this interval.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: The development of foundation knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Learning Outcome Objective #1: Foundation Knowledge BBA/Finance majors should:
1. Apply the principles of macroeconomic theory and policy.
2. Illustrate the principles of microeconomic theory of the firm.
3. Assimilate a general knowledge of business and business practices outside of the area of finance.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: The development of technical skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Learning Outcome Objective #2: Technical Skills BBA/Finance majors should:
1. Be proficient in advanced capabilities in information technology as they relate to finance.
2. Demonstrate sophisticated technical capabilities for analyzing the financial condition and performance of a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity.
3. Apply the necessary conceptual and technical skills to be proficient in financial model building at an advanced level.
4. Demonstrate substantially developed computer and technology skills, including (but not limited to) spreadsheet capabilities, familiarity with those software packages employed in analyzing financial issues, and general operating procedure capabilities.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Learning Outcome Objective #3: Analytical, Conceptual, and Integrative Skills in Finance BBA/Finance majors should:
1. Demonstrate advanced knowledge and capability in subareas such as corporation finance, investments, and financial institutions.
2. Be proficient in assessing the impact of a financial transaction on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity.
3. Be able to propose, identify and/or assess the inherent valuation and risk attributes of a security, a real asset, or a portfolio or derivatives thereof.
4. Be familiar with, and capable of applying, advanced paradigms for: identifying opportunities for creating value
from financial strategies; evaluating financial alternatives, and identifying the strategy most suitable for the given financial circumstances and constraints of a particular decision; directing their technical, analytical, and conceptual skills to solve real world financial problems. 5. Be familiar with the ongoing educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance and other evolutionary processes in the discipline.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)**

To examine student performance in select courses (FI 4000, FI 4040 and FI 4300), the course-instructors selectively chose five representative questions [from the assignments, quizzes, cases, mid-term and final exams] for their courses that together represent core learning in these courses. The questions are briefly described indicating how the questions fulfill learning objectives of the course. Each instructor has also indicated student performance on these five selected, representative questions using the median and maximum score attainable. See hyperlink for Exhibit 1. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in Exhibit 2 (see hyperlink for Exhibit 2). For each objective, we have 3-4 submeasures to map these learning objectives onto each of the three courses selected for the analysis.

**Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

See Exhibit 1 for findings for Measure 1.

**Target for O2: The development of technical skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

See Exhibit 1 for findings for Measure 1.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

See Exhibit 1 for findings for Measure 1.

**M 2: Alignment: course and program learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3)**

See hyperlink for Exhibit 2 for details showing how learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align with program learning outcomes.

**Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge**

Each representative course shall cover at least one-half of all program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Inspection of Exhibit 2 confirms compliance with target performance level.

**Target for O2: The development of technical skills**

Each representative course shall cover at least one-half of all program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Inspection of Exhibit 2 confirms compliance with target performance level.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**

Each representative course shall cover at least one-half of all program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Inspection of Exhibit 2 confirms compliance with target performance level.
M 3: National performance indicator: ETS (O: 1, 2, 3)

All BBA students take the Educational Testing Service ("ETS") Major Field Test that evaluates performance of each student across all major areas in the BBA program. Performance of our finance majors are tracked relative to national performance of undergraduate BBA students. See hyperlink for Exhibit 3.

Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge

GSU Finance majors should be at the 90th or above national percentile in Finance, and above the median in all other disciplines.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

See Exhibit 3. for findings for Measure 3.

Target for O2: The development of technical skills

GSU Finance majors should be at the 90th or above national percentile in Finance, and above the median in all other disciplines.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

See Exhibit 3. for findings for Measure 3.

Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

GSU Finance majors should be at the 90th or above national percentile in Finance, and above the median in all other disciplines.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

See Exhibit 3. for findings for Measure 3.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Careers and professionalism**

We seek to expand student awareness and knowledge of career development and alternative career paths in finance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Alignment: course and program learning outcomes | **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

**Implementation Description:** continuous

**Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Craig Ruff

**Communication skills**

We seek to improve the written communication skills of students through the implementation of the Writing Across the Curriculum initiative into FI 4020.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Alignment: course and program learning outcomes | **Outcome/Objective:** The development of technical skills

**Implementation Description:** continuous

**Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Peter Eisemann

**Additional Resources:** Writing consultants

**Practical training**

The field-study in finance course "FI 4391" is found useful for providing BBA-Finance majors with real-world experience in independent project management (in both financial services firms and non-financial global business organizations). Over time, we will continue to expand the number of participating corporations to give students an increased and expanded set of opportunities to gain worthwhile practical experience and apply classroom knowledge to real world situations.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Alignment: course and program learning outcomes | **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

**Implementation Description:** continuous

**Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Milind Shrikhande

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Student performance on representative questions selected from the three major courses of FI 4000 ("Fundamentals of Valuation"), FI 4040 ("Fundamentals of International Finance"), and FI 4300 ("Advanced Corporate Finance") show that the learning objectives outlined in the assessment plan have been met.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Our analysis shows that expectations on all outcomes/objectives are currently being met. In the spirit of continuous improvement, we will pursue opportunities for refinement of curriculum and practical training.

---

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2005-2006 Finance MS

(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Science degree program with a major in Finance is designed for individuals with an undergraduate business degree seeking an advanced knowledge of Masters level finance, including particular expertise in a chosen area of specialization (one of Corporate Finance, Investments, or Financial Institutions and Markets). The goal of the program is to provide students with the skills necessary to understand the context for issues encountered in the rapidly evolving financial environment, to analyze alternative financial scenarios and to develop effective policy initiatives. The program provides graduates with the technical skills needed to support a complete understanding of advanced issues in finance as well as with the analytical, conceptual and integrative skills needed to achieve a high degree of success in their careers in finance. Note: During the 2005-2006 academic year there were approximately 60 students in the MS-Finance program. In addition, there were approximately 20 graduates of the MS-Finance program.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: The development of foundation knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Learning Outcome Objective #1: Foundation Knowledge MS/Finance graduates should: 1. Apply the principles of macroeconomic theory and policy. 2. Apply the principles of microeconomic theory of the firm. 3. Demonstrate a general knowledge of business and business practices outside of the area of finance.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: The development of technical skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Learning Outcome Objective #2: Technical Skills MS/Finance graduates should: 1. Demonstrate proficiency in advanced capabilities in information technology as they relate to finance. 2. Demonstrate sophisticated technical capabilities for analyzing the financial condition and performance of a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. 3. Demonstrate the necessary conceptual and technical skills to be proficient in financial model building at an advanced level. 4. Demonstrate substantially developed computer and technology skills, including (but not limited to) spreadsheet capabilities, familiarity with those software packages employed in analyzing financial issues, and general operating procedure capabilities.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Learning Outcome Objective #3: Analytical, Conceptual, and Integrative Skills in Finance MS/Finance graduates should: 1. Demonstrate advanced knowledge and capability in their chosen specialization. Students chose specializations from: • Corporation Finance, •Investments, or •Financial Institutions and Markets. 2. Develop substantial proficiency in financial topics outside their chosen specialization. Students must take 9 hours of coursework in their specialization area. The remaining 6 hours include courses from the other two topics areas, and the degree can accommodate a double specialization. 3. Develop proficiency in assessing the impact of a financial transaction on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. 4. Propose, identify and/or assess the inherent valuation and risk attributes of a security, a real asset, or a portfolio or derivatives thereof. 5. Demonstrate familiarity with, and capable of applying, advanced paradigms for: •identifying opportunities for creating value from financial strategies; •evaluating financial alternatives, and identifying the strategy most suitable for the given financial circumstances and constraints of a particular decision; •directing their technical, analytical, and conceptual skills to solve real world financial problems. 6. Develop familiarity with the ongoing educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance and other evolutionary processes in the discipline (such as financial engineering). 7. Demonstrate understanding of the essential themes and policy contributions of conceptual, technical and empirical articles in selected professional finance journals.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International
Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Alignment: course and program learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3)
See hyperlink for Exhibit 3 for details showing how learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8360) align with program learning outcomes.

Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge
Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Inspection of Exhibit 3 confirms compliance with target performance level.

Target for O2: The development of technical skills
Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Inspection of Exhibit 3 confirms compliance with target performance level.

Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills
Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Inspection of Exhibit 3 confirms compliance with target performance level.

M 2: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)
To examine student performance in select courses from each specialization (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8360), the course instructors selectively chose five representative questions [from the assignments, quizzes, cases, mid-term and final exams] for their courses that together represent core learning in these courses. The questions are briefly described indicating how the questions fulfill learning objectives of the course. Each instructor has also indicated student performance on these five selected, representative questions using the median and maximum score attainable. See hyperlink for Exhibit 1. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in Exhibit 2 (see hyperlink for Exhibit 2). For each objective, we have 3-4 submeasures to map these learning objectives onto each of the three courses selected for the analysis.

Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge
Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
See Exhibit 1. for findings for Measure 1.

Target for O2: The development of technical skills
Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
See Exhibit 1. for findings for Measure 1.

Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills
Median scores shall be at or above 80 percent.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
See Exhibit 1. for findings for Measure 1.

M 3: MS-Finance exit survey responses (O: 1, 2, 3)
To provide student feedback on the MS-Finance Program we conducted exit surveys at the end of each Fall semester. These exit surveys provide a perspective from graduating students that will be used by the MS-Finance Program Committee and the Department of Finance to make any necessary refinements to program design and curricular offerings. See hyperlink for Exhibit 2.

Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge
At least as high as two year moving average.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
See Exhibit 2. for findings for Measure 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: The development of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least as high as two year moving average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
See Exhibit 2. for findings for Measure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least as high as two year moving average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
See Exhibit 2. for findings for Measure 2.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Curriculum
The quality of students entering the MS-Finance Program has substantially improved with average GMAT scores during 2003-04 at 625, and during 2004-05 at 645, based on a sample-study of students admitted to the program. In keeping with the high quality of incoming students, there is need to refine certain aspects of the program based on the formal and informal student feedback received. The technical background courses in Management Science tend to overlap somewhat and could be reduced to two replacing one with an additional finance course for all MS-Finance students such as the Survey of International Finance course for global managers. This course would ensure problem-solving with a global perspective, and a discussion of recent developments, aspects identified by students as needing greater emphasis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** MS-Finance exit survey responses
  - **Outcome/Objective:** The development of technical skills
- **Implementation Description:** 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Milind Shrikhande

#### Practical training
The field-study in finance course FI 8391 is found useful for providing real-world experience in independent project management (in financial services firms and non-financial global business organizations) by MS-Finance students. Over time, to add value to the program we are increasingly making it an integral part of the program requirements.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** MS-Finance exit survey responses
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills
- **Implementation Description:** Continuous
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Milind Shrikhande

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
The specialization streams of corporation finance, investments, and financial institution are all delivering high quality instruction. The quality of incoming students continues to improve indicating strong market acceptance and recognition of the program. Student exit surveys indicate high student satisfaction on business competencies, overall preparation, program structure, and learning environment.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Our analysis shows that expectations on all outcomes/objectives are currently being met. In the spirit of continuous improvement, we will pursue opportunities for refinement of curriculum and practical training.
in international exchanges through study abroad programs, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching, business, translation and interpretation and other areas.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Ability to teach French language and culture (M: 9)**

The student majoring more specifically in Teacher Education shall demonstrate proficiency in the target language and the ability to teach the target language and culture.

Relevant Associations: Required courses will reach Degree of Emphasis 3 (Extensive: Key course focus, variety of learning activities, multiple assessments) of the Conceptual Framework of the Professional Education Faculty of Georgia State University.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication—major
2. Oral Communication—major
3. Collaboration—major
7. Critical Thinking—major
9. Contemporary Issues—major
11. Quantitative Skills—major
13. Technology—major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3. Quality professional programs
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Global, cultural perspectives
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
4. Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3. Interdisciplinary Programs
4. Technology
6. Recruitment
6. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Understanding spoken French (M: 1, 9)**

The student shall demonstrate the ability to understand the target language as spoken by a proficient speaker at normal conversational tempo on general and non-technical topics.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to understand at the ACTFL Intermediate High level.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3. Oral Communication—major
4. Oral Communication—core
5. Collaboration—major
6. Collaboration—core

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4. Technology

**SLO 3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context (M: 8)**

The student majoring in Language and International Business shall demonstrate a working knowledge of the language and concepts of business and an understanding of appropriate cross-cultural behaviors in a business context.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication—major
3. Oral Communication—major
7. Critical Thinking—major
10. Contemporary Issues—core
13. Technology—major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3. New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3. Interdisciplinary Programs
3. International Initiatives
4. Technology
6. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Speaking French (M: 2, 9)**

The student shall demonstrate the ability to speak the target language with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation and grammatical
Relevant Associations: Student will be able to speak at the ACTFL Intermediate High level.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Oral Communication--major
4 Oral Communication--core
5 Collaboration--major
6 Collaboration--core

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology

SLO 5: Reading French (M: 3, 9)
The student shall demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend general non-technical materials in the target language.
Relevant Associations: Student will be able to read at the ACTFL Advanced level.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major
10 Contemporary Issues--core

SLO 6: Writing in French (M: 4, 9)
The student shall demonstrate the ability to write in the target language with clarity and grammatical accuracy.
Relevant Associations: Student will be able to write at the ACTFL Advanced level.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology

SLO 7: Knowledge of francophone cultures (M: 7, 9)
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language cultures.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
10 Contemporary Issues--core
13 Technology--major

Strategic Plan Associations
3.3 International Initiatives
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 8: Knowledge of francophone literatures (M: 5, 6, 9)
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret literary texts, including their cultural contents.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Understanding Spoken French (O: 2)
All French majors scored 5.00.
### Target for O2: Understanding spoken French
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

### M 2: Speaking French (O: 4)
All French majors scored 5.10.

### Target for O4: Speaking French
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

### M 3: Reading French (O: 5)
All French majors scored 4.81.

### Target for O5: Reading French
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

### M 4: Writing in French (O: 6)
All French majors scored 5.00.

### Target for O6: Writing in French
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

### M 5: Knowledge of Francophone Literature (O: 8)
All French majors scored 4.24.

### Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

### M 6: Knowledge of Francophone Literature (O: 8)
French Majors whose concentration was Literature scored 5.18.

### Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

### M 7: Knowledge of Francophone cultures (O: 7)
All French majors scored 4.24.

### Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**M 8: Knowledge of French Business and Concepts (O: 3)**
French majors whose concentration was Language and International Business scored 5.83.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**M 9: Ability to teach French language and culture (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**
French Students whose concentration was Teacher Education scored 3.73.

**Target for O1: Ability to teach French language and culture**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O4: Speaking French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O5: Reading French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O6: Writing in French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
No action at this time.
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring and of the Learning Outcomes. We plan no action at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Most of our B. A. students have met our performance objectives. We plan no action at this time.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 French MA
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in French the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the French language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of France and French speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department’s mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in French, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of French and Francophone literatures and cultures, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University’s mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

Institutional Priority Associations
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Research and data collecting skills (M: 1)
Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience
SLO 3: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)
Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Acquisition of knowledge (M: 1)
Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Thesis, pedagogical project or research paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
A committee of French professors will use the thesis, pedagogical research project, and/or research paper to evaluate mastery of the skills and learning outcomes of the M.A. candidate in French. The written exam consists of three questions based on three areas from French literature and/or civilization reading list as well as on students' coursework.

Target for O1: Effective writing, communication and editing
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in French complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
2 candidates (100%) received their M.A. Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O2: Research and data collecting skills
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in French complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
2 candidates (100%) received their M.A. Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O3: Critical thinking skills
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in French complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
2 candidates (100%) received their M.A. Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O4: Acquisition of knowledge
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in French complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
2 candidates (100%) received their M.A. Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.
No action plan needed at this time.
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Our M. A. students have met our performance objectives. We plan no action at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Our M. A. students have met our performance objectives. We plan no action at this time.

mission / purpose
The geography program of the Department of Geosciences presents an integrative perspective on the relations among social, political, economic, and physical phenomena occurring across space. The program is committed to teaching the concepts and research methods of the discipline in order to prepare geography majors for professional careers or advanced study or both. Students acquire geographic knowledge and thinking skills in order to understand the complex nature of the human and environmental patterns found in the world around them. Therefore, the program is committed to excellence in both the theoretical and applied arenas. Through scholarship, teaching, and service, the geography program of the Department of Geosciences is dedicated to improving our community, nation, and world.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Acquisition of Foundational Knowledge (M: 1)
Student demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts

SLO 2: Application of Knowledge – Performance Skills (a) (M: 1)
Student develops effective scholarly written-communication skills

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication–major
2 Written Communication–core

SLO 3: Application of Knowledge – Performance Skills (b)
Student develops effective oral-communication skills

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Oral Communication–major
4 Oral Communication–core

SLO 4: Application of Knowledge – Performance Skills (c) (M: 2)
Student develops effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction)

SLO 5: Application of Knowledge – Performance Skills (d) (M: 3)
Student develops appropriate computer and information-technology skills

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
13 Technology–major
14 Technology–core

SLO 6: Application of Knowledge – Performance Skills (e)
Student develops equipment-operating skills (e.g., laboratory equipment, surveying equipment, etc.)

SLO 7: Application of Knowledge – Thinking (a)
Student demonstrates ability to develop research questions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking--major</th>
<th>Critical Thinking--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 8: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (b) (M: 1)**
Student effectively demonstrates ability to apply foundational knowledge when answering questions

**SLO 9: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (c) (M: 1)**
Student effectively demonstrates ability to use quantitative methods when answering questions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Skills--major</th>
<th>Quantitative Skills--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 10: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (e) (M: 1)**
Student accurately interprets and evaluates written statements, graphics, and tables

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking--major</th>
<th>Critical Thinking--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 11: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (g) (M: 1)**
Student justifies key results and procedures

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking--major</th>
<th>Critical Thinking--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 12: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (f) (M: 1)**
Student acknowledges and assess assumptions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking--major</th>
<th>Critical Thinking--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 13: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (h) (M: 1)**
Student draws warranted and non-fallacious conclusions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking--major</th>
<th>Critical Thinking--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 14: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (i)**
Student thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates multiple points of view

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking--major</th>
<th>Critical Thinking--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 15: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (j) (M: 1)**
Student recognizes the need for additional knowledge to answer a question

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking--major</th>
<th>Critical Thinking--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 16: Analysis of Contemporary Issues (a)**
Student effectively analyzes contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary Issues--major</th>
<th>Contemporary Issues--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 17: Analysis of Contemporary Issues (b)**
Student effectively analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 18: Integration (a)</th>
<th>Student identifies the relationships among geography and other disciplines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 19: Integration (b)</td>
<td>Student works with off-campus individuals and organizations within a knowledge-sharing context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 20: Human Dimension (a)</td>
<td>Student collaborates effectively with other people on various projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 21: Human Dimension (b)</th>
<th>Student demonstrates approaches and strategies to communicate responsibly across sociocultural boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 22: Human Dimension (c)</td>
<td>Student demonstrates awareness of ethical issues that geographers confront in their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 23: Human Dimension (d)</td>
<td>Student demonstrates awareness of “ownership” of knowledge and the role they play in the realm of knowledge production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLO 24: Application of Knowledge – Thinking (d)
Student effectively demonstrates ability to use qualitative methods when answering questions

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Exam Responses and Assignment Statements (O: 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15)
Student responses on final exam in Geography 4520 and statements by students in third assignment in Geography 4520

#### Target for O1: Acquisition of Foundational Knowledge
Fair

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.

#### Target for O2: Application of Knowledge – Performance Skills (a)
Fair

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.

#### Target for O8: Application of Knowledge – Thinking (b)
Fair

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.

#### Target for O9: Application of Knowledge – Thinking (c)
Fair

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.
**Target for O10: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (e)**

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.

**Target for O11: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (g)**

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.

**Target for O12: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (f)**

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.

**Target for O13: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (h)**

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.

**Target for O15: Application of Knowledge -- Thinking (j)**

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. Mean scores for each outcome are presented below: Outcome 1 = 1.9, Outcome 2 = 1.9, Outcome 8 = 1.9, Outcome 9 = 1.9, Outcome 11 = 1.8, Outcome 12 = 1.5, Outcome 13 = 1.8, Outcome 14 = 1.5, and Outcome 16 = 1.4.

**M 2: Assignment Statements (O: 4)**

Statements by students in third assignment in Geography 4520

**Target for O4: Application of Knowledge -- Performance Skills (c)**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. The mean score for Outcome 4 is 1.7.

**M 3: Computer-based Exercises (O: 5)**

Student proficiency with computer hardware and software during in-class exercises in Geography 4520

**Target for O5: Application of Knowledge -- Performance Skills (d)**

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good). A total of 13 students were evaluated. The mean score for Outcome 5 is 1.9.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Adopt a 5-point rating scale**
The adoption of a 5-point rating scale for the learning outcomes is mentioned in the GSU Assessment Newsletter (V.2, No.1). By adopting this scale, the geography program can begin using universal standards.

**Established in Cycle: 2005-2006**
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The learning-outcomes assessment is not an improvement over the assessment from last year. The program lost several faculty members and it merged with the Geology program to form the Department of Geosciences; therefore, it was nearly impossible to conduct a sound assessment for the 2005-2006 academic year. With a much more stable situation expected in upcoming years, the quality of the learning-outcomes assessment should improve dramatically.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The learning-outcomes assessment indicates that all measured outcomes require continued attention and all unmeasured outcomes require some attention. Only 13 of the 24 outcomes were evaluated, and, unfortunately, student performance was not adequate for any of the measured outcomes. Over half of the students did not satisfactorily achieve the programmatic learning outcomes. The worst performance was for outcomes in the "Application of Foundational Knowledge" category; thus, extra attention needs to be placed on student thinking (i.e. applied thinking, creative thinking, and critical thinking).

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Geography MA
As of: 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The geography program of the Department of Geosciences presents an integrative perspective on the relations among social, political, economic, and physical phenomena occurring across space. The program is committed to teaching the concepts and research methods of the discipline in order to prepare geography majors for professional careers or advanced study or both. Students acquire geographic knowledge and thinking skills in order to understand the complex nature of the human and environmental patterns found in the world around them. Therefore, the program is committed to excellence in both the theoretical and applied arenas. Through scholarship, teaching, and service, the geography program of the Department of Geosciences is dedicated to improving our community, nation, and world.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Acquisition of Foundational Knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3)
Student demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts

SLO 2: Application of Knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3)
Student effectively demonstrates ability to apply foundational knowledge when answering questions
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Oral Examination (O: 1, 2)
The oral portion of the comprehensive examination for M.A. candidates

**Target for O1: Acquisition of Foundational Knowledge**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good), 4 (very good), and 5 (excellent). The scores for the students on Objective 1 are 4, 4, 2, and 4. The scores for the students on Objectives 2 are 4, 4, 2, and 5.

#### M 2: Written Examination (O: 1, 2)
The written portion of the comprehensive examination for M.A. candidates

**Target for O1: Acquisition of Foundational Knowledge**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good), 4 (very good), and 5 (excellent). The scores for the students on Objective 1 are 4, 4, 2, and 4. The scores for the students on Objective 2 are 4, 3, 2, and 5.

#### M 3: Thesis or Practicum (O: 1, 2)
The thesis or practicum of the M.A. graduate

**Target for O1: Acquisition of Foundational Knowledge**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Possible scores were 1 (poor), 2 (fair), and 3 (good), 4 (very good), and 5 (excellent). The scores for the students on Objective 1 are 4, 4, 2, and 5. The scores for the students on Objective 2 are 3, 5, 2, and 5.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Increase the number of learning outcomes**
The number of learning outcomes will be increased substantially. Many of the learning outcomes for the B.A. program in Geography will be modified for use in the assessment of learning outcomes of M.A. students.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

## Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

### What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
This assessment serves as a starting point for more detailed and accurate assessments in the future.

### What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
A rubric will need to be developed so that students can be evaluated by committee members during the comprehensive examinations and during the reading of theses and practicums.

---

## Georgia State University
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

---

### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Geosciences at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in instruction and research in the Earth Sciences. We recognize that to achieve and maintain excellence we must set forth goals in the form of Learning Outcomes and put into place a way of effectively assessing and improving results. Note: Our program has around 40 majors. We expect all our graduates to possess the following:

- a thorough base of geological knowledge and skills
- effective communication skills, both written and oral
- the ability to apply critical thinking to problem solving in geology
- a thorough grounding in modern analytical and technological applications to geology
- a command of geological laboratory and field skills
- the ability to work effectively in teams to solve geological problems
- an appreciation of contemporary geological and/or environmental issues and problems

---

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Oral and Written Communication Skills (M: 2, 3)

**General Learning Outcome 1:** Each graduate shall develop communication skills, both oral and written, including some or all of the following. Specific Outcomes:

1a. Each graduate will be able to discuss geologic information in a manner consistent with professional expectations.
1b. Each graduate will be able to compose and present an oral presentation of geologic information in a manner consistent with professional expectations.
1c. Each graduate will be able to write about geologic topics in a coherent and professional manner.
1d. Each graduate will be able to read and comprehend a scientific publication such as a USGS professional paper or scientific journal article.
1e. Each graduate will be able to locate information about geologic topics using library research resources in addition to those found on the internet.
1f. Each graduate will be able to write a scientific report utilizing acceptable technical writing and organization, as well as citations to the appropriate geological literature.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

#### SLO 2: Skills in Collaborative Exercises and Activities (M: 4)

**General Learning Outcome 2:** Each graduate will have experience and develop skills in collaborative exercises and activities. Specific Outcomes:

2a. Each graduate will be capable of participating in a collaborative research project or working with others in a professional setting.
2b. Each graduate will be able to listen to others, and incorporate ideas presented by others into their own comprehension of a situation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 5 Collaboration--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

#### SLO 3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field (M: 5, 6, 7, 9)

**General Learning Outcome 3:** Each graduate shall develop skills in conducting proper laboratory and analytical procedures in geology. Specific Outcomes:

3a. Each graduate will be familiar with and understand accepted lab techniques, protocol and analytical procedures.
3b. Each graduate will understand theory as applied to laboratory exercises.
3c. Each graduate will be familiar with and understand accepted field techniques and protocol.
3d. Each graduate will be able to use a computer to perform repetitive calculations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
General Learning Outcome 4: Each graduate shall develop skills in critical thinking as it relates to science in general and to geology in particular. Specific Outcomes: 4a. Each graduate will be able to develop valid research questions and hypotheses. 4b. Each graduate will be able to use appropriate techniques of data acquisition and interpretation. 4c. Each graduate will have skills for problem solving and formulation of new questions in geosciences.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

7 Critical Thinking--major

Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

SLO 5: Understanding of contemporary Geological Issues (M: 1, 9)

General Learning outcome 5: Each graduate shall develop general geological knowledge and understanding of contemporary geological issues. Specific Outcomes: 5a. Each graduate will learn to read and comprehend a geological map and construct a geological cross section from a map. 5b. Each graduate will construct an internally consistent geological map from a set of given observations. 5c. Each graduate will construct a contour map from numerical data. 5d. Each graduate will write a scientific report utilizing acceptable technical writing and organization, and with citations to appropriate geological literature. Each student will demonstrate understanding of contemporary environmental issues as related to exploitation and stewardship of the earth.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major

7 Critical Thinking--major

9 Contemporary Issues--major

11 Quantitative Skills--major

Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

SLO 6: Physical Constitution of the Earth (M: 1, 10)

General Learning outcome 6: Each graduate shall have a general understanding of the physical constitution of the earth. Specific Outcomes: 6a. Each graduate will be able to characterize and identify common rocks and minerals in hand specimen and in thin section using the petrographic microscope. 6b. Each graduate will have seen rocks in the field, be familiar with complications associated with field-based identification (e.g. surficial weathering) and be able to comprehend large three dimensional structures. 6c. Each graduate will be able to characterize the fundamental attributes of atoms and atomic bonding as they relate to crystal structures. 6d. Each graduate will be able to relate physical properties of the rock forming minerals to the crystal structure and chemistry of the minerals. 6e. Each graduate will be able to describe the gross chemical layering of the earth (inner and outer core, mantle, crust) and explain what lines of evidence have been used to deduce this structure. 6f. Each graduate will be able to describe the distribution of continents and ocean basins, and locations of major physiographic features such as mountain belts, oceanic ridges, oceanic trenches, and oceanic island chains.

Specific Outcomes:

6c. Each graduate will be able to relate physical properties of the rock forming minerals to the crystal structure and chemistry of the minerals.

6d. Each graduate will be able to relate physical properties of the rock forming minerals to the crystal structure and chemistry of the minerals.

6e. Each graduate will be able to describe the gross chemical layering of the earth (inner and outer core, mantle, crust) and explain what lines of evidence have been used to deduce this structure.

6f. Each graduate will be able to describe the distribution of continents and ocean basins, and locations of major physiographic features such as mountain belts, oceanic ridges, oceanic trenches, and oceanic island chains.

Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

SLO 7: Earth`s Internal and external processes (M: 1, 11)

General Learning outcome 7: Each graduate shall develop a general understanding of both the internal and external dynamic processes of the earth system. Specific Outcomes: 7a. Each graduate will be able to explain the fundamental concepts of plate tectonics, including mantle convection and the dynamic layered structure of the earth. 7b. Each graduate will be able to describe the distribution and origin of magmas within the earth, including the concept of magmatic differentiation. 7c. Each graduate will be able to describe and explain rock structures at all scales ranging from intragrain deformation to orogenic belts. 7d. Each graduate will be able to describe and explain metamorphic processes that take place in the lithosphere. 7e. Each graduate will be able to explain the fundamental principles of the hydrologic cycle. 7f. Each graduate will be able to describe the distribution and origin of aqueous fluids within the earth. 7g. Each graduate will be able to explain the processes of weathering, sediment transport and deposition. 7h. Each graduate will be able to describe how igneous, metamorphic, and sedimentary phenomena relate to seafloor spreading, continental drift, and orogenic and post-orogenic events. 7i. Each graduate will be able to describe the role of erosion, uplift and sea level change in the creation of landforms. 7j. Each graduate will be able to identify various sedimentary structures, relate them to modern depositional environments, and interpret the geological significance of paleoenvironmental reconstruction. 7k. Each graduate will demonstrate an understanding of contemporary environmental issues as related to exploitation and stewardship of Earth including global climate change and natural resource depletion. 7l. Each graduate will demonstrate understanding of the relative importance of natural hazards in various geographic regions.

Specific Outcomes:

7g. Each graduate will be able to explain the processes of weathering, sediment transport and deposition.

7h. Each graduate will be able to describe how igneous, metamorphic, and sedimentary phenomena relate to seafloor spreading, continental drift, and orogenic and post-orogenic events.

7i. Each graduate will be able to describe the role of erosion, uplift and sea level change in the creation of landforms.

7j. Each graduate will be able to identify various sedimentary structures, relate them to modern depositional environments, and interpret the geological significance of paleoenvironmental reconstruction.

7k. Each graduate will demonstrate an understanding of contemporary environmental issues as related to exploitation and stewardship of Earth including global climate change and natural resource depletion.

7l. Each graduate will demonstrate understanding of the relative importance of natural hazards in various geographic regions.

Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

SLO 8: Earth and Solar System History (M: 1, 12)

General Learning outcome 8: Each graduate shall develop a general understanding of the history of the earth and the solar system. Specific Outcomes: 8a. Each graduate will be able to relate general principles of stellar nucleosynthesis and the nebular hypothesis for origin of the solar system. 8b. Each graduate will be able to explain how earth history is divided into the standard geological time scale, and relate the general historical character of each major time division. 8c. Each graduate will be able to identify some common representatives of both vertebrate and invertebrate fossils and place them correctly within the geologic time scale. 8d. Each graduate will be able to explain the fundamentals of biological evolution, particularly in regard to the fossil evidence for biological change through geologic time.

Specific Outcomes:

8a. Each graduate will be able to relate general principles of stellar nucleosynthesis and the nebular hypothesis for origin of the solar system.

8b. Each graduate will be able to explain how earth history is divided into the standard geological time scale, and relate the general historical character of each major time division.

8c. Each graduate will be able to identify some common representatives of both vertebrate and invertebrate fossils and place them correctly within the geologic time scale.

8d. Each graduate will be able to explain the fundamentals of biological evolution, particularly in regard to the fossil evidence for biological change through geologic time.

Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

SLO 9: Critical Thinking--Core (M: 13)

The objective of the Geosciences Department (Geology BS program) is to develop and implement a means of assessing our student’s ability to thinking critically within our undergraduate core courses (GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122).
Laboratory mid term and final tests from GEOL1121 and GEOL1122 were analyzed to see how well students who are likely to enter the major performed on test questions linked to the learning outcomes. From these tests, 364 multiple choice questions were selected that directly measured learning outcomes. The following learning outcomes were addressed by questions asked on the exams: 3c, 5a, 6a, 6d, 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d, 7e, 7g, 7j, 8c, 8d and 8e. The exams were analyzed at the testing center using the research analysis option. This method reports results on exam questions for the upper 27%, middle 46% and lower 27%. We examined the performance of the upper 27% of students, since majors invariably do very well in the introductory sequence.

Target for O5: Understanding of contemporary Geological Issues
Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 5 87% 29 6 94% 40 7 89% 60 8 88% 27

Target for O6: Physical Constitution of the Earth
Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 5 87% 29 6 94% 40 7 89% 60 8 88% 27

Target for O7: Earth’s Internal and external processes
Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 5 87% 29 6 94% 40 7 89% 60 8 88% 27

Target for O8: Earth and Solar System History
Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 5 87% 29 6 94% 40 7 89% 60 8 88% 27

M 2: Written Work Rubric (O: 1)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 - not assessed 1- student's writing is vague and confusing. Very little is communicated student has serious issues with grammar word usage etc. 2 - student has difficulty with organization, does best with simple concepts some of their writing is vague, there are spelling and grammar issues. 3 - student has some difficulty with organization, spelling and grammar. 4 - student can write an organized essay/report. It may lack some polish but is basically sound. 5- students can write a well organized professional quality essays/reports

Target for O1: Oral and Written Communication Skills
4 - student can write an organized essay/report. It may lack some polish but is basically sound.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Eight faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 3.2 with a standard deviation of 0.75.

M 3: Oral Communication (O: 1)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – skills not assessed 1 - verbal expression is vague and confusing. Very little is communicated student has serious issues with grammar word usage etc. 2 - student struggles with logical sequencing of ideas or are vague in their oral expression. 3 - student can articulate most of their ideas, sometimes they are vague or confusing. Their oral presentation is not well organized. 4 - student can clearly articulate their ideas and can construct a well organized, oral presentation perhaps with a few rough edges 5 - student can clearly articulate their ideas in a succinct and professional fashion and can construct a well organized, professional oral presentation.

Target for O1: Oral and Written Communication Skills
4 - student can clearly articulate their ideas and can construct a well organized, oral presentation perhaps with a few rough edges.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Five faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 3.6 with a standard deviation of 0.55.


### M 4: Skills in collaborative activities (O: 2)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – Skills not assessed 1 - student only works alone. 2 - student struggles in a group setting, is passive or otherwise contributes little to group work may distract group with chatting etc. 3 - student can work in group setting, makes contributions but may distract group from its purpose with complaints off topic chatter etc. 4 - student works well in a group making contributions to group work while being open to contributions by others. 5 - student functions as a leader in a group setting by making proactive positive contributions while honoring and encouraging the contributions of others

#### Target for O2: Skills in Collaborative Exercises and Activities
4 - student works well in a group making contributions to group work while being open to contributions by others.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Five faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 3.2 with a standard deviation of 0.45.

### M 5: Quantitative Skills (O: 3)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – Skills not assessed 1 - student is math phobic has difficulty interpreting graphs 2 - student can move between graphs and numbers with assistance and does not understand basic algebraic concepts 3 - student can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations with assistance 4 - student can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations 5 - student is comfortable with math, can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations can fit curves and or perform other advanced mathematical operations.

#### Target for O3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field
4 - student can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Seven faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 3.5 with a standard deviation of 0.79.

### M 6: Technology Skills (O: 3)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – Skill not assessed 1 - student is computer phobic does not know how to use a computer 2 - student is familiar with windows based applications, can save files, open applications and documents 3 - student is familiar with entering numbers into excel 4 - student can perform calculations in excel and make graphs 5 - student can use a variety of quantitative applications eg. arc view, rockware.

#### Target for O3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field
4 - student can perform calculations in excel and make graphs

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Six faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 3.8 with a standard deviation of 0.41.

### M 7: Field Skills (O: 3)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – Skill not assessed 1 - student is unfamiliar with field techniques and protocols 2 - student does not understand aspects of using a brunton, cannot read a topographic map reliably 3 - student can use a brunton correctly part of the time, and can tell up from down on a topographic map 4 - student can use a brunton, locate themselves using a topographic map with assistance. 5 - student can use a brunton, locate themselves using a topographic map without assistance.

#### Target for O3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field
4 - student can use a brunton, and locate themselves using a topographic map with assistance.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Two faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 4.0 with a standard deviation of 0

### M 8: Critical Thinking (O: 4)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric 0 – skill not assessed 1 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information 2 - student is not clear on how one develops valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems 3 - with extensive guidance student can develop valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems 4 - student can develop valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems with some guidance 5 - student can develop valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems.

#### Target for O4: Critical thinking in Science and Geology
4 - student can develop valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems with some guidance

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Seven faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 3.3 with a standard deviation of 0.76.

### M 9: Professional Skills (O: 3, 5)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric 0 – Skill not assessed 1 - student cannot interpret maps and cross sections 2 - student can answer questions given information in the form of maps and cross sections 3 - with difficulty student can construct maps and cross sections given numerical data or appropriate observations 4 - with some assistance
student can construct maps and cross sections given numerical data or appropriate observations. 5 - student can construct maps and cross sections given numerical data or appropriate observations.

**Target for O3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field**

4 - with some assistance student can construct maps and cross sections given numerical data or appropriate observations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Four faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 4.0 with a standard deviation of 0.

**Target for O5: Understanding of contemporary Geological Issues**

4 - with some assistance student can construct maps and cross sections given numerical data or appropriate observations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Four faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 4.0 with a standard deviation of 0.

**M 10: Knowledge of Earth’s Physical Constitution (O: 6)**

Faculty teaching majors courses rated “typical C student” according to the extent of their understanding of the physical constitution of earth: common rocks and minerals, atomic structure, mineral structure and earth’s structure 0 – Skill not assessed 1 - - >50% 2 - >60% 3 - >70% 4 - >80% 5 - >95%

**Target for O6: Physical Constitution of the Earth**

4 - >80% 

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Five faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 3.4 with a standard deviation of 0.55.

**M 11: Knowledge of Earth Processes (O: 7)**

Faculty teaching majors courses rated “typical C student” according to the extent of their understanding of internal and external earth processes: plate tectonics, distribution of magmas in earth, deformation and metamorphism, hydrologic cycle, and the rock cycle 0 – Skill not assessed 1 - - >50% 2 - >60% 3 - >70% 4 - >80% 5 - >95%

**Target for O7: Earth’s Internal and external processes**

4 - >80% 

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Six faculty scored majors using this measure. The average score is 3.7 with a standard deviation of 0.52.

**M 12: Knowledge of Earth History (O: 8)**

Faculty teaching majors courses rated “typical C student” according to their extent of their understanding of the history of the earth and solar system: the nebular hypothesis, the nature of geologic time, vertebrate and invertebrate animals, evolution and the fossil record, sedimentary structures and environments 0 – Skill not assessed 1 - - >50% 2 - >60% 3 - >70% 4 - >80% 5 - >95%

**Target for O8: Earth and Solar System History**

4 - >80% 

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

No faculty scored majors using this measure.

**M 13: Critical thinking core (O: 9)**

We measure critical thinking by devising standard geological exercises such as cross-section analysis and specially structured questions devised to take a key concept and apply it in a way that was not specifically covered within the lecture or laboratory.

**Target for O9: Critical Thinking–Core**

Our target performance is 70-80%level of success on our multiple choice questions and other selected exercises.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Our target performance has been partially met. In some cases fewer than 70-80% of our GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122 students are able to successfully complete the exercises or answer the critical thinking questions on the examinations.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Improve collaborative skills**

Strategies for guiding students through group work will be shared with faculty.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

Measure: Skills in collaborative activities | Outcome/Objective: Skills in Collaborative Exercises and Activities
**Improve critical thinking skills**
The department will create a Geoscience Learning Community which has as one of its foci, a research experience. Improvements in critical thinking skill should be realized by increasing the student's participation in research.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Critical Thinking
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Critical thinking in Science and Geology

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

**Improve oral communication**
Faculty will be encouraged to use more verbal assessments in majors courses. Faculty will meet to share strategies for guiding students towards improved oral and written communication.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Oral Communication
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Oral and Written Communication Skills

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

**Improve quantitative skills**
Faculty will meet to discuss strategies for strengthening student's quantitative skills. The department will explore collaborations with the math department to modify calculus sequence to better meet our major's needs.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Quantitative Skills
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

**Improve technology skills**
The department has recently acquired laptops for use in major's courses, which has facilitated the use of computer-based activities in classes. We anticipate that as more faculty use the computers in their courses, students technology skills will improve.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Technology Skills
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2005
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

**Increase written work**
All majors will take at least two courses that have Writing Across the Curriculum components.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Written Work Rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Oral and Written Communication Skills

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

**Reexamine Learning Outcomes for Geology Program**
We have realized that there are a number of inconsistencies and gaps within our learning outcomes document that need to be addressed. We are planning to revise the learning outcomes for the major to better represent our goals for our students. In particular learning outcomes related to learning outcome #5a, b, c, etc. and not related to the primary goal of learning outcome #5. Our assessment strategies did not cover this learning outcome very effectively. We also have noticed that learning outcome 8 is not assessed in any required major's courses. This will be the subject for further faculty reflection.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Knowledge of Earth History
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Earth and Solar System History

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair (Tim La Tour)
Review critical thinking in core
The results of the general education assessment in critical thinking will be presented to the faculty in Geosciences for review and discussion. We will explore ways to get more faculty participation in the assessment process.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical thinking core
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking--Core

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Seth Rose
Additional Resources: None

Strengthen knowledge of Earth processes
Faculty will meet to discuss strategies for strengthening students knowledge of Earth processes.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth Processes
- Outcome/Objective: Earth’s Internal and external processes

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

Strengthen knowledge of Earth’s constitution
Faculty will meet to discuss strategies for strengthening students knowledge of Earth’s constitution.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth’s Physical Constitution
- Outcome/Objective: Physical Constitution of the Earth

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our department has high standards for its majors that are reflected in our high performance target levels for our learning outcomes assessments measures. Most of our majors meet these target performance levels. However, our goal is that all of our majors meet our target performance levels. Therefore, we focused many of our assessment measures on our weakest students; the "C" students. Although the assessment has revealed that we are only meeting a few of our learning assessment measures target performance levels, we are very close to many of them. All of our students have the mapping and field skills that the faculty believe are important for working as a professional geologist. Performance on other learning outcomes is below our target levels but not far below. The average "C:" student is close to meeting target performance levels for their technology skills and content knowledge of earth processes. Our progress in moving students towards our target levels cannot be gauged because we do not have assessment data from previous years. Our assessment efforts last year primarily taught us about pitfalls in the assessment process (Link to AY-05 Geology Learning Outcomes Report). We completely revised our assessment procedures based on the lessons learned from last year. Therefore, we have meaningful data to work with this year and can move forward from here. As discussed in action #9, we are planning to further fine tune our learning outcomes and assessment procedures. However, on the whole we are pleased with the results of this year’s outcomes assessment.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The typical "C" student in our program needs most improvement in writing, critical thinking and collaboration skills. These are areas which traditionally have not been directly addressed in undergraduate geoscience courses. Therefore, most of the faculty have very few models from their own experience in lecture courses to refer to in their attempts to coach students on these skills. A number of our planned actions focus on getting faculty to share with each other, strategies for helping students with skills such as oral and written communication and quantitative work. The traditional place in the career a geoscientist where communication skills and critical thinking are addressed by geoscience faculty (as opposed to English, Philosophy or Math faculty), is at the graduate level in the context of a research project. In this context these skills are taught not through explicit instruction but through a combination of modeling, dialog and critique. As discussed in action #6 the Geoscience Department has received funding to initiate a Geoscience Learning Community which will involve undergraduates in research projects. We expect that the research context will provide faculty with a more natural setting for addressing critical thinking skills.
The Department of Geosciences at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in instruction and research in the Earth Sciences. We recognize that to achieve and maintain excellence we must set forth goals in the form of Learning Outcomes and put into place a way of effectively assessing and improving results. We expect all our graduates to possess the following: a thorough base of geological knowledge and skills, effective communication skills, both written and oral, the ability to apply critical thinking to problem solving in geology, a thorough grounding in modern analytical and technological applications to geology, a command of geological laboratory and field skills, the ability to work effectively in teams to solve geological problems, an appreciation of contemporary geological and/or environmental issues and problems.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Graduate knowledge and skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Knowledge and skills of graduate students will be assessed four ways: a. By way of (i) oral and written examinations, (ii) reports and papers, (iii) question/answer sessions in seminar-format courses, and (iv) oral presentations in classes. b. By the quality of the written thesis or research report (if non-thesis student), c. By the oral presentation of the thesis research. d. By success rates in placement in other graduate programs or in jobs.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication—major
2. Oral Communication—major
3. Critical Thinking—major
4. Quantitative Skills—major
5. Technology—major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty ratings for PhD and MS thesis students (O: 1)**

The thesis director of each thesis student that graduated in AY05-06 was asked to rate their student’s performance using the following rating scale: 5 (excellent), 4 (very good), 3 (good), 2 (fair), 1 (passable). a. The thesis proposal, the thesis, and the oral examination or thesis defense. b. Course based reports, oral presentations, and class discussions. c. Depth and sophistication of understanding of the research topic.

**Target for O1: Graduate knowledge and skills**

4 (very good)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Learning Outcome Average Score a 4.2(0.45) b 5(0) c 3.8(1)

**M 2: Faculty ratings of Non-thesis M.S. students (O: 1)**

The advisor of each non-thesis student that graduated during the academic year was asked to rate their student’s performance using the following rating scale: 5 (excellent), 4 (very good), 3 (good), 2 (fair), 1 (passable). a. The research project, b. Course based reports, oral presentations, and class discussions.

**Target for O1: Graduate knowledge and skills**

4 (Very Good)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

Only one student was evaluated. Out of concern for the student’s privacy, ratings will not be reported here.

**M 3: Alumni data (O: 1)**

The department will track employment and placement of graduates into graduate programs.

**Target for O1: Graduate knowledge and skills**

90% of students will find jobs in a profession requiring their degree or continue their graduate studies.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Of six students who graduated in AY05-06, five are employed (four in environmental consulting and one in education) and one is enrolled in a PhD program.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Gather more data**

Our program is small, graduating six or fewer graduate students per year. The small numbers necessarily limit the type of analysis that we can perform on any given class and raises issues of privacy in reporting. Therefore, we intend to aggregate our graduate data over two or three year periods for the purposes of analysis and reporting.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
Revise graduate program learning outcomes

In constructing this report, we realized that, at the time that the graduate program learning outcomes were written, there was substantial confusion about the nature of learning outcomes and their application to the graduate program in particular. The department will revise the graduate program learning outcomes to better reflect and make explicit our expectations for graduate student performance.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty ratings for PhD and MS thesis students | Outcome/Objective: Graduate knowledge and skills
- Measure: Faculty ratings for Non-thesis M.S. students | Outcome/Objective: Graduate knowledge and skills

Implementation Description: September 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Four of the six students were admitted as special status students and the faculty members directing thesis projects were appreciative of the excellent effort made by these students. There is some coherent feeling that these students needed more time for the ideas to gel before writing the proposals and the thesis. Most of these students completed the program in 2 years which included rectification of special status topics. Thus, the expectation of completion in two years might need to be relaxed somewhat for students entering the MS program under special status. All told, these students performed admirably. Their thesis directors were diligent in seeing the degree programs were completed in good time.

In terms of course work, the comments are variable from excellent to good and one passable. The student receiving excellent was very pleased and satisfied with the graduate courses offered to him. One faculty comments that the graduate courses may not be at high levels. Thus, some thought is needed from all faculty members to ensure course work is at high levels. In terms of acquiring a deep level of knowledge, the answers are variable (1-5) with three (3) being the most frequent answer. Again, given the special status concerns, the students by and large did an excellent job completing requirements with the exception of one student. However, there is some feeling that additional time is needed for the ideas to gel. Thus, the expectations for the time to complete the degree requirements should be done on a case-by-case basis to permit time for deep learning of complex ideas. In terms of Employment, most of our students became employed in the environmental consulting positions. These students receive offers shortly after graduation which speaks both to demand to fill these positions as well as the students’ serious efforts in finding good employment.

We are pleased with the matriculation of one of our alumni into the very fine Ph.D. program in hydrogeology at University of Arizona. (Submitted by: W. Crawford Elliott, Graduate Director)

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

There is some coherent feeling that these students needed more time for the ideas to gel before writing the proposals and the thesis. Most of these students completed the program in 2 years which included rectification of special status topics. Thus, the expectation of completion in two years might need to be relaxed somewhat for students entering the MS program under special status. One faculty comments that the graduate courses may not be at high levels. Thus, some thought is needed from all faculty members to ensure course work is at high levels.
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Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department is to give students majoring in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of German speaking countries, to promote their interest and involvement in international exchanges through study abroad programs, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching, business, translation and interpretation and other areas.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Knowledge of German literatures (M: 3)

The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret literary texts, including their cultural contents.
### O/O 2: Knowledge of the culture of Germanic countries

The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language cultures.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### O/O 3: Writing in German (M: 2)

The student shall demonstrate the ability to write in the target language with clarity and grammatical accuracy.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to write at the ACTFL Advanced level.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology

### O/O 4: Reading German (M: 1)

The student shall demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend general non-technical materials in the target language.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to read at the ACTFL Advanced level.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core

### O/O 5: Speaking German (M: 5)

The student shall demonstrate the ability to speak the target language with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation and grammatical accuracy.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to speak at the ACTFL Intermediate High level.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 6 Collaboration--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology

### O/O 6: Knowledge of German business concepts and context (M: 4)

The student majoring in Language and International Business shall demonstrate a working knowledge of the language and concepts of business and an understanding of appropriate cross-cultural behaviors in a business context.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
- 13 Technology--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)  
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
3.3 International Initiatives  
4.3 Technology  
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**O/O 7: Ability to teach German language and cultures**

The student majoring more specifically in Teacher Education shall demonstrate proficiency in the target language and the ability to teach the target language and culture.

Relevant Associations: Required courses will reach Degree of Emphasis 3 (Extensive: Key course focus, variety of learning activities, multiple assessments) of the Conceptual Framework of the Professional Education Faculty of Georgia State University

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major  
3. Oral Communication--major  
5. Collaboration--major  
7. Critical Thinking--major  
9. Contemporary Issues--major  
11. Quantitative Skills--major  
13. Technology--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
4.3 Technology  
6.1 Recruitment  
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**O/O 8: Understanding spoken German (M: 6)**

The student shall demonstrate the ability to understand the target language as spoken by a proficient speaker at normal conversational tempo on general and non-technical topics.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to understand at the ACTFL Intermediate High level

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3. Oral Communication--major  
4. Oral Communication--core  
5. Collaboration--major  
6. Collaboration--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Reading German (O: 4)**

All German majors scored 4.81.

**Target for O4: Reading German**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**M 2: Writing German (O: 3)**

All German majors scored 4.43.

**Target for O3: Writing in German**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

We are currently seeking information from professors about such points as the number of absences by students whose poor performance caused us not to meet the goals, poor preliminary preparation, etc. We will continue to monitor new data, as it comes along.

**M 3: Knowledge of German literature (O: 1)**

All German majors scored 4.18.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of German literatures**
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

M 4: Knowledge of German business concepts and contexts (O: 6)
German majors whose concentration was Language and International Business scored 4.38.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

M 5: Speaking German (O: 5)
All German majors scored 4.88.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
We are currently seeking information from professors about such points as the number of absences by students whose poor performance caused us not to meet the goals, poor preliminary preparation, etc. We will continue to monitor new data, as it comes along.

M 6: Understanding Spoken German (O: 8)
ALL German majors scored 5.00.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
We are currently seeking information from professors about such points as the number of absences by students whose poor performance caused us not to meet the goals, poor preliminary preparation, etc. We will continue to monitor new data, as it comes along.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
No action plan has been devised at this time.
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Many of our B. A. students have met our performance objectives, but there needs to be improvement in some. We plan no action at this time, but we are currently seeking information and will devise an Action plan when we are satisfied with what we have learned.
- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: January, February 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Robin Huff, Dr. Anja Restenberger, Dr. Stephen Carey, Dr. Kathleen Doig

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Many of our B. A. students have met our performance objectives, but there needs to be improvement in some. We plan no action at this time, but we are currently seeking information and will devise an Action plan when we are satisfied with what we have learned.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We need to monitor Learning Outcomes 1, 2 and 4 and understand what is lacking in the preparation our Majors, or if we need to change in the objectives or in the levels we require for them to be met.
## Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of Germany and German speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in German, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of German literature and culture, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

### SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)

Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and follows appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 2: Research and data collecting skills (M: 1)

Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology  
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)

Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Acquisition of knowledge (M: 1)

Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Pedagogical project or research paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
A committee of German professors will use the pedagogical research project, and/or research paper to evaluate mastery of the skills and learning outcomes of the M.A. candidate in German.

**Target for O1: Effective writing, communication and editing**
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in German complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O2: Research and data collecting skills**
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in German complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O3: Critical thinking skills**
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in German complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

**Target for O4: Acquisition of knowledge**
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in German complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**No action plan needed at this time**
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Our M. A. students have met our performance objectives. We plan no action at this time.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Our M. A. students have met our performance objectives. We plan no action at this time.
The Gerontology Institute educates students in the field of gerontology, performs research on aging problems, and serves as a community resource on aging. In cooperation with other departments and institutes across the university, the Institute: • offers a graduate degree in gerontology and graduate and undergraduate certificates in gerontology that allow students to specialize in gerontology within another degree program; • supports and performs research on the processes and problems of aging and the policy issues of an aging society, specializing in issues on health and long-term care and on ethnic families; and • serves as a resource for the university community, the older people of Georgia, their families, and the professionals who serve them by providing information and advice about aging-related concerns.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Analytical Skills

Students acquire the skills to collect data. Students demonstrate appropriate computer skills. Students are able to read and understand gerontological reports and articles.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills

Students formulate research questions and formulate testable hypotheses. Students are able to analyze and interpret data (hypothesis testing, drawing inferences, formulating conclusions). Students demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Communication Skills

Students develop effective written communication and editing skills. Students show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 4: Acquisition of Knowledge

Students articulate key gerontological concepts and theories. Students apply the most up-to-date facts and information to gerontological conditions and problems. Students utilize key data sources that provide gerontological information and research findings.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions

Students develop the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing gerontological problems. Students analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions about aging.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 6: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 1, 2)**

This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Review of Research or Administrative Internship (O: 6)
The student’s research supervisor or internship supervisor, as appropriate, will assess the student’s achievement in the required internship to determine if the student has met the program’s stated learning objectives.

Target for O6: Outcome/Objective Not Specified
All completed internships should demonstrate mastery of the program’s stated learning objectives. We expect students to be scored at least 3 (Good) on a 4-point scale (Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
When some students have completed their program, we will evaluate their achievement.

M 2: Review of Master’s Thesis (O: 6)
The student’s thesis advisor will assess the student’s thesis project to determine achievement of the program’s stated learning objectives. We expect students to be scored at least 3 (Good) on a 4-point scale (Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent).

Target for O6: Outcome/Objective Not Specified
All completed theses should demonstrate achievement of the program’s stated learning objectives. We expect students to be scored at least 3 (Good) on a 4-point scale (Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent).

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
When some students have completed their program, we will evaluate their achievement.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Collect first data on our MA program
In December 2006, the first 2-4 graduate students will graduate with MA degrees in Gerontology. An additional 2-4 students will graduate in the Spring 2007 and more in the Summer of 2007. Next year will be our first opportunity to assess the progress of our program on all measures.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2/1/07
Responsible Person/Group: Institute Director and Director of Graduate Studies

Report to Institute Curriculum Committee
In April of each year, the Director of Graduate Studies will report to the Institute Curriculum Committee on the assessments of how well students in the program and recent graduates have achieved the program’s stated learning objectives. The Committee will decide if program changes are needed to improve achievement of these outcomes and make recommendations to the faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 5/1/07
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
This assessment must await the graduation of our first students.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
This assessment must await the graduation of our first students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Health & Physical Education BSED
As of: 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 2)
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 2: Understands student development re: Learning (M: 1)**

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)**

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 4)**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)**

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

**SLO 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)**

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 14 Technology--core
### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

#### SLO 7: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 7)

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Written Communication--core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

#### SLO 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 8)

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 2 Written Communication--core |
| 4 Oral Communication--core   |
| 12 Quantitative Skills--core |

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

#### SLO 9: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 2 Written Communication--core |
| 8 Critical Thinking--core     |
| 10 Contemporary Issues--core  |

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

#### SLO 10: Involves school and community in learning (M: 10)

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 2 Written Communication--core |
| 4 Oral Communication--core   |
| 6 Collaboration--core        |

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 2)

Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O2: Understands student development re: Learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

55% of candidates met Standard 2: Understands Student Development Regarding Learning.

#### M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)

Supervising final evaluations, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

59% of candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

### M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)

Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

**Target for O3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

48% of candidates met Standard 3: Effectively Teach Diverse Groups of Learners.

### M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)

Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

**Target for O4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

51% of candidates met Standard 4: Knows and Uses Multiple Instructional Strategies.

### M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)

Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O5: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

55% of candidates met Standard 5: Can Motivate and Manage Student Learning.

### M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 6)

Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6.

**Target for O6: Uses communication skills and technology**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

55% of candidates met Standard 6: Uses communication skills and technology.

### M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 7)

Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.

**Target for O7: Can effectively plan for instruction**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

51% of all candidates have met Standard 7: Can Effectively Plan for Instruction.

### M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 8)

Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.
Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.

**Target for O8: Understands and uses assessment for learning**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
29% of all candidates have met Standard 8: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 9)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9.

**Target for O9: Practices professional reflection**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of all candidates have met Standard 9: Practices Professional Reflection.

**M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 10)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
84% of candidates have met Standard 10: Fosters Relationships Among School and Community.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Add assessment requirement to classes.**
To improve candidates use of assessments for learning the HPE program faculty will review and add an assessment component to all pedagogy classes if necessary: KH 3010, KH 3200, KH 4510, KH 4520, KH 4530, KH 4540, KH 4710 and KH 4720. All lesson plans will require an assessment component.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006 and Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HPE Program Faculty

**Examine content of KH 3610 and KH 4540.**
Program faculty will examine content in Motor Learning and Development (KH 3610) and Instructional Models for Adapted and Inclusive Physical Education (KH 4530) to determine if learning activities and assignments are appropriate and make changes when necessary.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands student development re: Learning

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Shapiro

**Increase content knowledge on assessment for HPE.**
A new course (KH 3410 - Assessment in HPE) will begin fall 2006 that focuses on assessment strategies for health and physical education. This will improve students ability to use assessments by increasing the amount of coursework dedicated to learning assessment strategies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Increase PE technology strategies in KH 3100.
The number of semester hours for KH 3100 (Instructional Technology for HPE) was increased from 1 to 3 effective Spring 2007. This increase in semester hours allows additional student coursework in technology strategies for physical education.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Ms. Sandra Owen

Maintain current level of professional reflection.
Program faculty will continue to monitor and maintain the current plans that assess candidates professional reflective practice

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: HPE Program Faculty

Maintain level of school/community involvement
The program faculty responsible for student teaching supervision will continue to monitor and maintain the current requirements for school and community involvement in student teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: HPE Program Faculty who supervise student teachers.

Require models based instruction
Teacher candidates will be required to use instructional models for all units taught during both sections of student teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HPE Student Teacher Supervisors

Review and add teaching strategies to courses
Program faculty will review and add instructional strategies for teaching diverse learners to KH 3200 (Instructional skills for HPE), KH 4510 (Contemporary Instructional Models for Pre-K and Elementary Physical Education) and KH 4520 (Contemporary Instructional Models for Secondary Physical Education).

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Implementation Description: Fall 06 for 4510 and 4520; Spring 07 for 3200
Responsible Person/Group: Mrs. Theresa Metzler and Dr. Rachel Gurvitch

Review Content Knowledge Matrix.
Program faculty will review the Content Knowledge Matrix that reflects the fall 2006 program changes to determine gaps in content knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Implementation Description: Fall semester 2006
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

Review current literature on class Mgt.
Program faculty will review literature about motivation and managing students and infuse additional management strategies into KH 3200 (Instructional Skills for HPE) and the Instructional Block classes (KH 4510, 4520, 4530 and 4540).

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: HPE Program Faculty

Review planning requirements in selected courses.
Program faculty will examine and discuss the current planning requirements in KH 3200, 4510, 4520, 4530, 4540, 4710 and 4720 to determine how to improve students ability to plan effectively.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: HPE Program Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
The assessments specifically show that the undergraduate HPE program is strong on two of the standards with teacher candidates demonstrating exceptional professional reflective practices and strong in the area of involving the school and community in learning.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The assessments specifically show that several of the outcomes need to be reviewed and will require continued attention from the program faculty. High priority will be given to making sure that teacher candidates use assessment for learning and that the program adequately prepares them to work with diverse populations. Other areas that will receive high or moderate attention are content knowledge, student development, instructional strategies, motivation and management of students, use of technology, and planning. This high number of assessments needing continued attention indicates that the recent changes in the HPE program that goes in effect fall 2006 were warranted.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 1)**
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

**O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 2)**
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

**O/O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 3)**
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

**O/O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 4)**
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.

**O/O 5: Participates in profession`s learning communities (M: 5)**
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from culminating papers, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development**

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

93% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development**

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 rating (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 rating (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Participates in profession’s learning communities**

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

0% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Advocacy for profession**

Students will be required to create an advocacy project for their school physical education program

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Lund

**Building collegiality**

Incorporate an online discussion into EDUC 8360

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
Monitor and maintain current strengths of program
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 rating | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 rating | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
- Measure: Faculty STARTS Standard 4 rating | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

Implementation Description: Summer 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund

Write responses to "Issues" section of JOPERD
Students will write responses to the "Issue" column in the Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (JOPERD)

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 rating | Outcome/Objective: Participates in profession’s learning communities

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Health and Physical Education program faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
In 2005 several changes were made to the Masters program in Health and Physical Education. From the 2006 data, it appears these changes were appropriate. We are just beginning to collect data that reflect these changes so a comparison to results from previous years is impossible on this report.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We need to address participation in the professional learning community. In addition to the changes indicated on this report, this area of concern will be discussed in upcoming program meetings held with faculty members.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Health Administration MS
As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Institute of Health Administration (IHA) within the J. Mack Robinson College of Business at Georgia State University is to prepare graduates to assume managerial and leadership positions in health services organizations through • A leading-edge curriculum that integrates business and health care knowledge, • The engagement in scholarly inquiry related to the improvement of the effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of health care services and the health care system, and • Providing and promoting professional service to the academic and health care communities.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: percent of students in good academic standing (M: 4)
percent of students in good academic standing

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience
### SLO 4: educational assessment by students during residency (M: 1)
Rating of educational preparation by student while a resident
Relevant Associations: CAHME

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 5: educational assessment by preceptor (M: 2)
Rating of educational preparation by preceptor
Relevant Associations: CAHME

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: provide CAHME educational content areas (M: 5)
Identify, analyze, and interpret economic, social, political, environmental, ethical and medical issues affecting health care organizations.
Relevant Associations: COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION OF HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 3: Rating of HA courses (M: 3)
Rating of HA courses
Relevant Associations: CAHME

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 6: assessment of residents by preceptor (M: 6)
Rating of student work performance by preceptor
Relevant Associations: CAHME

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities
Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 7: assessment of residents by HA faculty (M: 7)
assessment of residents by HA faculty in terms of final HA 8820 presentations

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 8: assessment of student’s collaborative efforts (M: 8)
Rating by preceptor of student’s ability to function cooperatively in the work setting

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: student evaluation of H.A. program (O: 4)
student evaluation of H.A. program during residency, capstone course, and on-going feedback

Target for O4: educational assessment by students during residency
4.0 out of a 5.0 scale

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Ad hoc positive feedback, rather than quantitative score in academic year `05-`06

M 2: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas (O: 5)
Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas during residency

Target for O5: educational assessment by preceptor
4.0 out of a rating scale of 5.0

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
4.02 out of a 5.0 scale in AY `05-`06

M 3: SEIP ratings for H.A. courses and instructors (O: 3)
Electronic Student Evaluation of Instructor Performance ratings for all H.A. instructors; specifically items #35 (course effectiveness), 34, 9, and 25.

Target for O3: Rating of HA courses
An overall rating of H.A. courses of 4.0 on a 5.0 scale is the desired target level.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Overall H.A. courses average of 4.5 for #35-course effectiveness.

M 4: GPA of each HA student (O: 2)
GPA of each HA graduate student

Target for O2: percent of students in good academic standing
3.0 or higher GPA for each student. 95 % of students in each HA graduate degree program should meet the desired GPA goal.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
As of academic year 2005-06, 100% of HA graduate degree students reach the target performance level of 3.0 GPA.
### M 5: % CAHME educational content areas provided (O: 1)
% CAHME educational content areas provided.

**Target for O1: provide CAHME educational content areas**
100% CAHME educational content areas provided

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
As of academic year 2005-06, 100 % of CAHME required educational content areas have been met.

### M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance (O: 6)
Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency

**Target for O6: assessment of residents by preceptor**
4.0 out of a 5.0 scale

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
4.39 out of a 5.0 scale in AY `05-`06

### M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty (O: 7)
Assessment of residents by HA faculty during residency, on-site visits, and residency presentations

**Target for O7: assessment of residents by HA faculty**
4.0 out of a 5.0 scale

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Ad hoc positive feedback, rather than quantitative score in AY `05-`06

### M 8: Assessment of students’ collaborative efforts (O: 8)
Assessment of students’ collaborative efforts during residency

**Target for O8: assessment of student’s collaborative efforts**
4.0 out of a 5.0 scale

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
4.67 out of a 5.0 scale during AY `05-`06

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Improve quantitative data for measure 4
Improve quantitative data for measure 4, which is student evaluation of H.A. program

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** student evaluation of H.A. program
- **Outcome/Objective:** educational assessment by students during residency

**Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** H.A. faculty curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** none

#### Improve quantitative data for measure 7
Improve quantitative data for measure 7, which is assessment of residents by h.a. faculty

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty
- **Outcome/Objective:** assessment of residents by HA faculty

**Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** H.A. faculty curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** none

#### Improve specific content areas
Improve epidemiology and population health content areas

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** % CAHME educational content areas provided
- **Outcome/Objective:** provide CAHME educational content areas
Implementation Description: Add to HA 8160 in Fall '06
Responsible Person/Group: HA faculty curriculum committee
Additional Resources: none

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The assessment demonstrates that students, preceptors, HA faculty, and stakeholders continue to value the HA graduate program highly. However, it was recognized that the residency, health policy, epidemiology, and population health need to be emphasized.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Our CAHME accreditation site visit, new CAHME competency areas, AACSB outcomes, and this program assessment have served to emphasize that meeting the required CAHME content and competency areas will be challenging.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Health Science-Nutrition MS
As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Division of Nutrition at Georgia State University is to prepare professionals who enhance individual and community health through dietetics practice and to contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge in the fields of nutrition and dietetics.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Design, interpret, and conduct ethical research (M: 1)
Demonstrate entry-level competence in the design, interpretation and ethical conduct of research

SLO 2: Demonstrate communication skills (M: 1)
Demonstrate technical and scientific oral and written communication skills; use current and emerging technologies for information and communication to enhance the practice and delivery of nutrition care in a professional manner

SLO 3: Design and evaluate nutrition care plans (M: 1)
Design and evaluate nutrition care plans and interventions for health promotion and disease prevention and management for individuals and subpopulation groups based on the efficacy and strength of scientific evidence

SLO 4: Comprehend nutrient intakes and impact on health (M: 2)
Comprehend the interrelationships between macro- and micronutrient intakes as they impact human health in normal and disease states

SLO 5: Evaluate health policy (M: 3)
Evaluate contemporary principles of health policy in the U.S. and other countries to better understand the essential components of delivering health services

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Capstone project (O: 1, 2, 3)
There are three possible capstone projects: thesis, project, or portfolio. Evaluation of oral communication competence is evaluated by faculty members during the defense of the thesis or project and the presentation of the portfolio. Formative evaluation of the thesis and research-focused projects for the other objectives is by rubric-guided evaluation of proposals. Final evaluation of other competencies is successful completion of the capstone experience.

Target for O1: Design, interpret, and conduct ethical research
Meets requirements

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Two students completed and defended their theses. Six students completed and defended their portfolios at an exemplary level

Target for O2: Demonstrate communication skills
Meets requirements

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Two students completed and defended their theses. Six students completed and defended their portfolios at an exemplary level

Target for O3: Design and evaluate nutrition care plans
Meets requirements

M 2: Coursework -- Advanced Normal Nutrition (O: 4)
Examinations and projects (grades) from Advanced Normal Nutrition courses

Target for O4: Comprehend nutrient intakes and impact on health
80% or better score

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
One graduate student did not meet this objective.

M 3: Coursework -- Trends (O: 5)
Examinations and projects (grades) from Health Trends courses

Target for O5: Evaluate health policy
80% or better score

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met this objective.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Develop rubric for MS project and thesis proposals
To further examine the academic preparation of students for planning and conducting their project and thesis capstone activities, we will develop a rubric for evaluating these documents.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone project | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate communication skills
  Design, interpret, and conduct ethical research

Implementation Description: January 15, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: M. Cody, with assistance from other faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
In this year’s cycle, two students successfully completed and defended their M.S. theses, and six students successfully completed and presented their M.S. portfolios.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We did not note any specific outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention, but we plan to strengthen our evaluation of the thesis/project proposals. Information from those evaluation will likely point to areas for further development.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 History BA
As of: 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of History at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge through the study of various aspects of humanity’s recorded past. Some members of the department explore the rise and fall of empires, while others describe the everyday lives of men and women. The department is interested in every period of the past and all parts of the world. The department also seeks to advance knowledge by examining the principles and theories that influence the writing of history.
seeking to understand the forces that have structured human life and the ideas that have shaped the way people perceive and experience their worlds. The department is concerned with change and continuity within societies, and interactions among cultures. The department pays particular attention to the effect of perspectives and values because the discipline of history involves the interpretation of findings, not just the collection of facts. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Contemporary Issues (M: 1)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of contemporary issues in questions from final exams in world history and U. S. history that require analysis of contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.3 International Initiatives

#### SLO 2: Historiography (M: 2)

The student, knowing that history is the interpretation of data, can demonstrate awareness of conflicting interpretations of the same data.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness (M: 3)

The student knows how to appreciate, critique, and use material from other fields such as geography, economics, history of art, literature, psychology, philosophy, statistics, dependant upon their area of specialization.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

#### SLO 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective (M: 4)

The student is able to compare historical developments/problems across cultural/geographical boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions effect historical responses.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 5: Professional Values (M: 5)

Student is able to employ methods of historical research and modes of historical discourse that emphasize high standards of fidelity
to evidence, tolerance of alternative approaches to obtaining, interpreting, and applying historical knowledge, and an appreciation
and articulation of the indebtedness historians have to the work of others.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 6: Professional Skills (M: 6)
Student is able to use effectively such resources as the library, archives, and oral interviews. He/she demonstrates computer skills
appropriate to the discipline. Student is able to evaluate the relative worth of different types of evidence-- (textual, material, media,
oral, quantitative and statistical, and visual); to exchange information and ideas and present arguments persuasively; to evaluate and
question different historical perspectives and explanations within a conversational setting; to listen to and learn from others; and to
write clearly, economically, imaginatively and persuasively about historical facts, issues, and interpretations. He/she is able to
document sources properly.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Essay Answer on Term Exam (O: 1)
The History Department assessed each of these sub-goals in each of the history courses in Area E.1: History 1111-The World to
1500; History 1112-The World Since 1500; History 2110-Survey of American History. In these sections, a question from an end-of-
term exam that addresses one of the three sub-goals will be selected by the instructor.

Target for O1: Contemporary Issues
90% of students receiving an evaluative grade of 60% or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
In four sections of world history to 1500, two sections of world history since 1500, and four sections of U. S. history, success
rates were 97%, 91%, and 95%. The department will consider raising the bar to an evaluative grade of 70% or higher for

M 2: Preparation of coherent research paper with depth (O: 2)
History majors take a senior seminar in which they prepare a research paper that uses primary sources to analyze an historical
problem within an historical context.

Target for O2: Historiography
The student, knowing that history is the interpretation of data, can demonstrate awareness of conflicting interpretations of the
same data.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Undergraduate Committee found that some students succeeded better than others in contextualizing their sources and
documenting them correctly.

M 3: Preparation of coherent research paper with depth (O: 3)
History majors take a senior seminar in which they prepare a research paper that uses primary sources to analyze an historical
problem within an historical context.

Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness
The student knows how to appreciate, critique, and use material from other fields such as geography, economics, history of art,
literature, psychology, philosophy, statistics, dependant upon their area of specialization.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Undergraduate Studies Committee found that students did not exhibit sufficient Interdisciplinary Awareness and
Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives in their papers. These are areas currently being addressed with plans to offer a new topic in the senior research seminar in the coming year. This fall, a section on the History of Work will offer students an opportunity to examine this subject within the broad context of the Americas.

**M 4: Preparation of coherent research paper with depth (O: 4)**
History majors take a senior seminar in which they prepare a research paper that uses primary sources to analyze an historical problem within an historical context.

**Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective**
The student is able to compare historical developments/problems across cultural/geographical boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions effect historical responses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
"Interdisciplinary Awareness" and "Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective" are areas currently being addressed with plans to offer a new topic in 4990 in the coming year. This fall, a section on the History of Work will offer students an opportunity to examine this subject within the broad context of the Americas.

**M 5: Preparation of coherent research paper with depth (O: 5)**
History majors take a senior seminar in which they prepare a research paper that uses primary sources to analyze an historical problem within an historical context.

**Target for O5: Professional Values**
The student is able to employ methods of historical research and modes of historical discourse that emphasize high standards of fidelity to evidence, tolerance of alternative approaches to obtaining, interpreting, and applying historical knowledge, and an appreciation and articulation of the indebtedness historians have to the work of others.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
"Professional Values" emphasizes "fidelity to evidence, tolerance of alternative approaches to obtaining, interpreting, and applying historical knowledge, and an appreciation and articulation of the indebtedness historians have to the work of others." Our students met this standard.

**M 6: Preparation of coherent research paper with depth (O: 6)**
History majors take a senior seminar in which they prepare a research paper that uses primary sources to analyze an historical problem within an historical context.

**Target for O6: Professional Skills**
The student is able to use effectively such resources as the library, archives, and oral interviews. He/she demonstrates computer skills appropriate to the discipline. Student is able to evaluate the relative worth of different types of evidence-- textual, material, media, oral, quantitative and statistical, and visual; to exchange information and ideas and present arguments persuasively; to evaluate and critique different historical perspectives and explanations within a conversational setting; to listen to and learn from others; and to write clearly, economically, imaginatively and persuasively about historical facts, issues, and interpretations. He/she is able to document sources properly.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The Undergraduate Studies Committee initiated a discussion on the need to work with majors in emphasizing good writing skills, including teaching them to evaluate evidence in terms of its limits and biases, documenting sources in line with the highest standards of professional historians. In the fall of 2005 the Undergraduate Studies Committee plans a major reconsideration of the undergraduate curriculum with an eye towards considering ways to help students improve their writing skills.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Develop Writing Skill Improvement Plan**
In addition to offering a new section on the History of Work, the department plans in the future to include a section of 4990 devoted to viewing the Cold War in a transnational perspective. This will further implement the departmental standard concerning Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. When presenting its report to the department, the Undergraduate Studies Committee initiated a discussion on the need to work with majors in emphasizing good writing skills, including teaching them to evaluate evidence in terms of its limits and biases, documenting sources in line with the highest standards of professional historians. In the fall of 2005 the Undergraduate Studies Committee plans a major reconsideration of the undergraduate curriculum with an eye towards considering ways to help students improve their writing skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Studies Committee

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Our report finds that graduating seniors in the Department of History are meeting the History Standards adopted by the department in January 2003. By and large, our students succeeded in selecting a topic of importance, constructing a thesis statement, and using
a variety of types of evidence to make an argument. They demonstrated analytical skills in their writing. The Undergraduate catalog describes History 4990’s goal as "composition of a coherent research paper with depth." The majority of papers in our pool met this goal.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Writing Skills

Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary

Our report finds that graduating seniors in the Department of History are meeting the History Standards adopted by the department in January 2003. By and large, our students succeeded in selecting a topic of importance, constructing a thesis statement, and using a variety of types of evidence to make an argument. They demonstrated analytical skills in their writing. The Undergraduate catalog describes History 4990’s goal as "composition of a coherent research paper with depth." The majority of papers in our pool met this goal.

Challenges

In addition to offering a new section on the History of Work, the department plans in the future to include a section of 4990 devoted to viewing the Cold War in a transnational perspective. This will further implement the departmental standard concerning Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. When presenting its report to the department, the Undergraduate Studies Committee initiated a discussion on the need to work with majors in emphasizing good writing skills, including teaching them to evaluate evidence in terms of its limits and biases, documenting sources in line with the highest standards of professional historians. In the fall of 2006 the Undergraduate Studies Committee plans a major reconsideration of the undergraduate curriculum with an eye towards considering ways to help students improve their writing skills.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
Gathering evidence from MA and MHP Exams to present to Graduate Committee.

M 2: Research Paper Analysis (O: 2)
Students are required to take a research seminar as part of their coursework. In this seminar, they prepare research papers based on primary research. These papers are analyzed to assess student success in clarity of written expression and historical analysis.

Target for O2: Historical Writing
Successful pass rate of 90%

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
Selecting papers from research seminar for review by the Graduate Committee.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Assess MA and MHP Oral Exam Performance
Have faculty chairs of MA and MHP examination committees prepare assessments of exam performance for submission to program directors, who will present a cumulative record to the graduate committee for assessment report and recommendations.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Knowledge Acquisition | Outcome/Objective: Historical Interpretation

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Research Paper Assessment
Gather sample of research papers from Graduate Research Seminars for review by Graduate Committee and preparation of assessment report and recommendations.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Paper Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Historical Writing

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
TBA Spring 2007

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
TBA Spring 2007

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 History PhD
As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of History at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge through the study of various aspects of humanity's recorded past. Some members of the department explore the rise and fall of empires, while others describe the everyday lives of men and women. The department is interested in every period of the past and all parts of the world. The department also seeks to advance knowledge by examining the principles and theories that influence the writing of history, seeking to understand the forces that have structured human life and the ideas that have shaped the way people perceive and experience their worlds. The department is concerned with change and continuity within societies, and interactions among cultures. The department pays particular attention to the effect of perspectives and values because the discipline of history involves the interpretation of findings, not just the collection of facts. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Historical Knowledge and Interpretation

Knowledge of the historical literature for four specific historical fields, the ability to synthesize the literature in a field, understanding of major theoretical and analytical influences, critical reading skills, and the ability to apply this knowledge to answer broad synthetic and historiographical questions.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Historical Writing (M: 1)

The ability to define a research problem in relation to the current literature in a field, to synthesize secondary literature, to conduct original research with primary documents, the ability to organize, interpret and present this research.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Dissertation Assessment (O: 2)
Assessment of student ability to create a coherent narrative that incorporates current literature in a field, synthesizes secondary literature, and creates original research from primary documents in a coherent and cohesive argument and interpretation.

Target for O2: Historical Writing
100% of dissertation

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
TBA Spring 2007

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Dissertation Assessment
Review dissertations and prepare a report for review by the Graduate Committee for assessment recommendations.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Dissertation Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Historical Writing
Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Graduate Studies committee has recently added a research seminar requirement to the coursework for all M.A. and Ph.D. students. The goal is to provide more early experience with conducting original research on a smaller project early in their graduate careers so that students are better prepared when they begin the thesis or dissertation. A research seminar has been a required component of coursework for all students who began the program in Fall 2005.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Department is exploring ways to improve the timeliness of student completion of program milestones and to encourage more professional activism among students such as presentation of original work at conferences.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)
Mission / Purpose

The Cecil B. Day School of Hospitality Administration is committed to academic excellence in the development of students for leadership roles in the hospitality industry. We prepare students by pursing ethical, innovative and value-enhancing strategies in a culturally diverse and technologically advanced world. We serve our local, national and international constituencies through research, teaching and outreach activities. The School achieves its mission by offering a relevant, up-to-date curriculum in a teaching and learning environment that emphasizes continuous improvement. The School of Hospitality is located in the Robinson College of Business. There are about 250 majors in the School.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Hospitality Work Experience (M: 2, 4)

Students will demonstrate professional work behaviors and an application of the necessary interpersonal skills for effectiveness in entering managerial-level hospitality positions.

Relevant Associations: This standard relates to ACPHA’s requirement for work experience in the industry.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities
3.5 Fiscal accountability

Strategic Plan Associations

4.4 External Relations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Understanding of ethical standards (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)

Students will be able to explain the ethical challenges faced in the hospitality industry and application of ethical principles in real-life business situations.

Relevant Associations: ACPHA Standards include a curriculum that addresses “ethical considerations.”

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities
3.5 Fiscal accountability

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Understanding of applied technology in hospitality (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)

Students will be able to describe technological advances in the hospitality industry in addition to evaluating and analyzing the impact of applied technology.

Relevant Associations: ACPHA standards require coursework to include “management information systems” and “computers role in management processes.”

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

Strategic Plan Associations
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 4: Develop industry-specific specializations (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Through the hospitality elective courses, students will develop specializations in industry-specific areas such as hotel management, restaurant management, event planning, tradeshow/convention services management, club management and venue management.
Relevant Associations: ACPHA standards address providing coursework for industry specializations meeting the mission of the program.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

Strategic Plan Associations
4.4 External Relations
6.7.1 Financial Support

SLO 5: Application of human resource principles (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students will be able to evaluate, analyze and determine how to apply human resource theories and principles in maximizing employee performance, employee retention and customer (internal and external) service in hospitality businesses.
Relevant Associations: ACPHA Standard - Coursework that addresses the legal environment, ethical considerations, management information systems, the role of computers in management processes, supervision of human resources, organizational behavior, interpersonal communication, management processes policy and values/norms.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
**SLO 6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of various facets of hospitality law aimed at minimizing hospitality business liabilities.

Relevant Associations: ACPHA Standard: Requires that curriculum include courses that address the legal environment and ethical considerations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Collaboration--major
4. Critical Thinking--major
5. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 7: Knowledge of strategic management principles (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

The students will be able to apply strategic principles to hospitality business operations in maximizing the accomplishment of the organization’s goals and objectives and ultimately the organization’s mission and vision.

Relevant Associations: ACPHA Standard: Coursework includes operations goods/services; economic environment; legal environment; ethical considerations; management information systems; computers role in management processes; supervision human resources; organizational behavior; management processes policy; values and norms. This course also incorporates learning experiences from the required work study for majors.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Critical Thinking--major
4. Contemporary Issues--major
5. Quantitative Skills--major
6. Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities
3.5 Fiscal accountability

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Students will be able to define foodservice and culinary terms, explain the application in operating foodservice establishments and evaluate and critique the effectiveness of such applications. These processes will reflect a comprehensive understanding and application of food safety and sanitation principles.

Relevant Associations: Relates to ACPHA standards that require coursework in operating of goods/services as well as material on the legal and ethical environment of a business.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Critical Thinking--major
4. Contemporary Issues--major
5. Quantitative Skills--major
6. Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 9: Describe hospitality/tourism industry segments (M: 2, 4, 5, 6)

Students are able to explain the different segments of the hospitality industry and explain specific ways that these segments work together to the benefit of internal and external guests and customers.

Relevant Associations: ACPHA (Accreditation Commission of Programs in Hospitality Administration) requires curriculum to include the historical overview of the hospitality industry.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Collaboration--major
4. Critical Thinking--major
5. Contemporary Issues--major
6. Quantitative Skills--major
7. Technology--major

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1. Global, cultural perspectives
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
5. Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

#### Strategic Plan Associations

1. External Relations
2. Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 10: Application of service marketing theories (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Students will be able to evaluate, analyze and determine how to apply service marketing theories and principles in promoting hospitality businesses.

Relevant Associations: ACPHA Standard: Coursework that addresses marketing of goods/services, economic environment, legal environment, ethical considerations, management information systems, computers role in management, interpersonal communication, management processes and values/norms.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Collaboration--major
4. Critical Thinking--major
5. Contemporary Issues--major
6. Quantitative Skills--major
7. Technology--major

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1. Global, cultural perspectives
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
5. Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

#### Strategic Plan Associations

1. External Relations
2. Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Complete with a passing grade in food sanitation (O: 6, 8)

Complete the Training Achievement Programs’ written test on food safety and sanitation with a passing score (minimum 70%).

**Target for O6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations**

For all hospitality majors to pass this written test

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

For the 2006 academic year, 100% of the hospitality majors taking this written exam have passed with scores of 100.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms**

For all hospitality majors to pass this written test

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

For the 2006 academic year, 100% of the hospitality majors taking this written exam have passed with scores of 100.
M 2: Written performance evaluations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)
As part of HADM 4900, the required work study course, supervisors submit directly to the School formal, written performance reviews of the students.

### Target for O1: Hospitality Work Experience
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

### Target for O2: Understanding of ethical standards
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

### Target for O3: Understanding of applied technology in hospitality
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

### Target for O4: Develop industry-specific specializations
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

### Target for O5: Application of human resource principles
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

### Target for O6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

### Target for O7: Knowledge of strategic management principles
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

### Target for O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.
M 3: Course projects (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10)
Course projects reflect the application of the knowledge and skill areas covered in class. These projects range from team projects in developing marketing plans, to classes conceptually developing event themes and carrying the process through to execution.

Target for O9: Describe hospitality/tourism industry segments
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

Target for O10: Application of service marketing theories
For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

Target for O2: Understanding of ethical standards
For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

Target for O3: Understanding of applied technology in hospitality
For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

Target for O4: Develop industry-specific specializations
For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

Target for O5: Application of human resource principles
For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

Importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc. have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.

For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
To date, approximately 98% of the written supervisory evaluations have been at least at the satisfactory level. Changes have been made in HADM 4900, effective fall semester 2006, to incorporate more coaching time with students to discuss the importance of professional working behaviors such as punctuality, attendance, demeanor, etc.
**Target for O6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations**

For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of strategic management principles**

For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms**

For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

**Target for O10: Application of service marketing theories**

For success in the hospitality industry, students must be able to adequately apply the knowledge learned in class. Students also must work as team members which is reflective of necessary human relations and interpersonal skills.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Overall, this is a very successful approach involving students demonstrating their knowledge and skills and the majority of students are very successful in demonstrating their application ability. Being an effective team member is typically the most difficult part of the project experience. Most hospitality courses have factored in time to debrief and learn from the teams’ interaction experiences. The School is consistently working on more experiential learning experiences and ways to more effectively debrief. Students are regularly involved in self-evaluations as well as critiquing team members.

**M 4: HADM 4900 Work Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**

As part of the work requirement, students must submit a work portfolio. The work portfolio requires students to evaluate their learning experiences throughout their work experiences.

**Target for O1: Hospitality Work Experience**

The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

**Target for O2: Understanding of ethical standards**

The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

**Target for O3: Understanding of applied technology in hospitality**

The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Develop industry-specific specializations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Application of human resource principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Knowledge of strategic management principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O9: Describe hospitality/tourism industry segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O10: Application of service marketing theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Students fulfilling their work hours typically show significant real-life learning experiences that support the hospitality curriculum. When there are problems with the work portfolio, it is typically involving meeting the required deadline. Work will continue in revamping the portfolio format to further compliment the School’s learning objectives.

**M 5: Written examinations (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**

Students are tested in each course using a variety of testing formats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Understanding of ethical standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.
### Target for O3: Understanding of applied technology in hospitality

For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.

### Target for O4: Develop industry-specific specializations

For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.

### Target for O5: Application of human resource principles

For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.

### Target for O6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations

For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.

### Target for O7: Knowledge of strategic management principles

For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.

### Target for O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms

For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.

### Target for O9: Describe hospitality/tourism industry segments

For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.

### Target for O10: Application of service marketing theories

For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The majority of students perform above the satisfactory level on written examinations showing comprehension of the specified areas of knowledge included in the objectives. This process is ongoing as the School strives to build a very sound business foundation in hospitality.
M 6: Senior Exit Exam (O: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)

A Senior Exit Exam is administered to graduating Seniors in measuring learning outcomes for the required hospitality courses.

**Target for O5: Application of human resource principles**

The goal is for hospitality seniors who will be graduating within the semester to pass the exit exam with a 70 or higher score.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

This is an area in which almost all hospitality majors do very well. The classroom information is supplemented by guest lectures, field trips and work experience in which students get first-hand knowledge of industry segments and the importance of the interaction between the segments.

**Target for O6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations**

The goal is for hospitality seniors who will be graduating within the semester to pass the exit exam with a 70 or higher score.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

This is an area in which almost all hospitality majors do very well. The classroom information is supplemented by guest lectures, field trips and work experience in which students get first-hand knowledge of industry segments and the importance of the interaction between the segments.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of strategic management principles**

The goal is for hospitality seniors who will be graduating within the semester to pass the exit exam with a 70 or higher score.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

This is an area in which almost all hospitality majors do very well. The classroom information is supplemented by guest lectures, field trips and work experience in which students get first-hand knowledge of industry segments and the importance of the interaction between the segments.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms**

The goal is for hospitality seniors who will be graduating within the semester to pass the exit exam with a 70 or higher score.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

This is an area in which almost all hospitality majors do very well. The classroom information is supplemented by guest lectures, field trips and work experience in which students get first-hand knowledge of industry segments and the importance of the interaction between the segments.

**Target for O9: Describe hospitality/tourism industry segments**

The goal is for hospitality seniors who will be graduating within the semester to pass the exit exam with a 70 or higher score.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

This is an area in which almost all hospitality majors do very well. The classroom information is supplemented by guest lectures, field trips and work experience in which students get first-hand knowledge of industry segments and the importance of the interaction between the segments.

**Target for O10: Application of service marketing theories**

The goal is for hospitality seniors who will be graduating within the semester to pass the exit exam with a 70 or higher score.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

This is an area in which almost all hospitality majors do very well. The classroom information is supplemented by guest lectures, field trips and work experience in which students get first-hand knowledge of industry segments and the importance of the interaction between the segments.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Address interpersonal and other "soft skill" needs**

In addition to having a sound knowledge base, it is important for students to have a high level of professional skills including effective interpersonal skills, problem-solving/conflict resolution, teamwork and service-related abilities.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Course projects | Outcome/Objective: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
- Measure: Application of human resource principles | Outcome/Objective: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
- Measure: HADM 4900 Work Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
- Measure: Application of human resource principles | Outcome/Objective: Hospitality Work Experience
- Measure: Written performance evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
- Measure: Application of human resource principles | Outcome/Objective: Hospitality Work Experience

**Implementation Description:** On-going  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All HADM faculty
## Applied technology in hospitality

The Hospitality Learning Center will feature several types of state-of-the-art technology which will be utilized starting spring 2007.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Course projects
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding of applied technology in hospitality

### Implementation Description:
May 2007

### Responsible Person/Group:
All HADM faculty

### Additional Resources:
Hospitality Learning Center - slated to open late fall 2006

## Continue to utilize real-life industry situations

The application of knowledge from the classroom to one’s hospitality position is of vital importance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Course projects
- **Outcome/Objective:** Application of hospitality laws/regulations
- Application of human resource principles
- Application of service marketing theories
- Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms
- Knowledge of strategic management principles

### Implementation Description:
End of fall semester 2006

### Responsible Person/Group:
Dave Pavesic and other culinary team members

### Additional Resources:
Continued updating of industry contacts and their areas of specialization

## Provide extended food lab experiences

The food lab will be expanded with two sections added to cover the demand, in numbers, for the course. With a dedicated food lab, planned for spring 2007, the students will have the opportunity to apply their knowledge/skills through more culinary events.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Course projects
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms

### Implementation Description:
By end of spring 2007

### Responsible Person/Group:
Dave Pavesic and other culinary team members

### Additional Resources:
The completion of the dedicated food lab involving renovation of lab area and needed equipment/supplies

## Utilize guest lectures/field trips

The application of knowledge and skills is important for all of the identified learning objectives. Hearing and seeing industry representatives has been an effective way to show students how the classroom connects with industry.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Course projects
- **Outcome/Objective:** Application of hospitality laws/regulations
- Application of human resource principles
- Application of service marketing theories
- Describe hospitality/tourism industry segments
- Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms
- Knowledge of strategic management principles

### Implementation Description:
Each semester

### Responsible Person/Group:
All HADM faculty

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Through a series of curriculum review meetings, the hospitality faculty have more clearly identified content areas for each course and eliminated unnecessary areas of overlap. We are trying to avoid duplicity with guest lecturers and industry projects to provide...
students with a wide scope of learning experiences. Our extended facilities will, in the near future, be a very important part of supporting our programmatic objectives. Hospitality majors demonstrate a combination of a sound knowledge base along with important industry work experience. Feedback from industry recruiters has been very positive about our curriculum combined with the required work experience.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

We will increase the emphasis on professional skills including job searching skills through revamping the work study course to include student meetings throughout the semester the student is taking HADM 4900. We are also encouraging students to work with Career Services inside the Robinson College of Business in building their job searching skills. Starting fall semester 2006, students will have faculty available as "career advisors" who can also help with the above areas of soft skills and job searching skills. Based on the results of the assessment process, changes will also be made to the Senior Exit Exam. The exam presently addresses content from major hospitality courses. Exam items will be expanded to include material on ethics, technology and specific industry disciplines. The Work Portfolio, which is used to certify the completion of required work hours in the hospitality industry, will be also be revised to better reflect the delineated outcomes and objectives of the program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Human Resource Management MS**

(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Human Resource Management MS degree prepares students in the functional areas of the field such as selection, compensation, and employment law. A variety of educational experiences both in the classroom and the business community are offered.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Basic Principles (M: 1)**

Students will be able to know and understand the basic principles, laws, practices, and concepts of the HRM field, be able to apply HRM laws, concepts, practices, and principles to business settings, and be able to read, understand, and express an informed opinion about HRM research activities.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking—major
- 9 Contemporary Issues—major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Compensation Comprehension (M: 2)**

Students will be able to understand the basic concepts and developments in the compensation management field and be able to apply these concepts and techniques to produce a high-quality compensation plan for an organization.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication—major
- 5 Collaboration—major
- 7 Critical Thinking—major
- 9 Contemporary Issues—major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking and Analysis (M: 3)**

Students will be able to apply HR practices and techniques to real business organizations, identify and use various legitimate sources of HR information, demonstrate proficiency in HR research methodology, and use analytical and critical thinking skills to synthesize information and make recommendations for implementation of HR practices.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication—major
- 3 Oral Communication—major
- 7 Critical Thinking—major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Application of Concepts (M: 4)**

Students will be able to recognize and apply concepts of recruitment and selection, and use the recruitment and selection concepts to develop a recruitment and selection plan.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Basic Principles (O: 1)

(1) Likert scale evaluations by faculty of student performance on projects and papers in MGS 8300 and 8320. (2) Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) Certification exam results. (3) survey of students after graduation.

**Target for O1: Basic Principles**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

None to date with the new approach. First assessment with new approach will be done in the 2006-2007 academic year.

---

#### M 2: Compensation Comprehension (O: 2)

(1) Likert scale evaluations by faculty of student performance on projects and assignments in MGS 8300 and MGS 8390; (2) Results of SHRM and WorldatWork certification exams; (3) Survey of Beebe graduates; (4) Sample of student projects.

**Target for O2: Compensation Comprehension**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

None to date with the new approach. First assessment with new approach will be done in the 2006-2007 academic year.

---

#### M 3: Critical Thinking and Analysis (O: 3)

Students in MGS 8395 work on solutions to problems defined by their corporate sponsors. Each team designs, implements, and reports orally and in writing to executives of the sponsoring corporation and the instructor the results of their study. This learning objective will be evaluated by clients’ and faculty members’ judgment of knowledge and application of skills via the oral report and the written report. A rating system for judging projects will be completed by clients and instructors.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking and Analysis**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

None to date with the new approach. First assessment with new approach will be done in the 2006-2007 academic year.

---

#### M 4: Application of Concepts (O: 4)

(1) Likert scale evaluations of student projects and assignments in MGS 8360; (2) SHRM certification exam results; (3) survey of recent Beebe graduates.

**Target for O4: Application of Concepts**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

None to date with the new approach. First assessment with new approach will be done in the 2006-2007 academic year.

---

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Assessment Implementation**

Using the revised assessment tools the HR group will conduct assessment throughout the 2006-2007 Academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Application of Concepts</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Application of Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Basic Principles</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Basic Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Compensation Comprehension</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Compensation Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Critical Thinking and Analysis</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

---

## Georgia State University

### Assessment Data by Section

**2005-2006 Instructional Technology MS**

*As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST*

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

The mission for the Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology is to provide students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as an instructional technologist. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working with adults in a wide variety of training and development areas such as those found in education, business and industry. We seek to further this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles, theories, and research associated with instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.

Relevant Associations: AECT Standards

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences by applying principles, theories, and research related to print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies.

Relevant Associations: AECT

**O/O 3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to media utilization, diffusion, implementations, and policy-making.

Relevant Associations: AECT

**O/O 4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles, theories and research related to project, resource, delivery system, and information management.

Relevant Associations: AECT

**O/O 5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.

Relevant Associations: AECT
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 1-4. 96% achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standard 5.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 1-4. 96% achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standard 5.

**Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 1-4. 96% achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standard 5.

**Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 1-4. 96% achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standard 5.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 1-4. 96% achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standard 5.

**M 2: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**

100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the course curricula and syllabi reflected current practice in sufficient depth.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the course curricula and syllabi reflected current practice in sufficient depth.

**Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**

100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the course curricula and syllabi reflected current practice in sufficient depth.

**Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**

100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the course curricula and syllabi reflected current practice in sufficient depth.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the course curricula and syllabi reflected current practice in sufficient depth.

### M 3: End of Course Assessments (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

96% of students achieved 80% or better in every course.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

96% of students achieved 80% or better in every course.

**Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

96% of students achieved 80% or better in every course.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

96% of students achieved 80% or better in every course.

### M 4: Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds on standards 1-3. 96% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 4 and 5.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds on standards 1-3. 96% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 4 and 5.

**Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds on standards 1-3. 96% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 4 and 5.

**Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds on standards 1-3. 96% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 4 and 5.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 1-3. 96% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on standards 4 and 5.

**M 5: Internship Report (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Monitor Admissions**
We will carefully monitor admissions to ensure that only fully qualified students are admitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam  | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measures:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measures:** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measures:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
- **Measure:** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measures:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
- **Measure:** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measures:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

**Implementation Status:** Spring 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty
**Additional Resources:** none

**Monitor Standards**
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mission / Purpose
The mission for the doctoral program in instructional technology is to provide specialization for instructional technologists in all aspects of the field, including instructional design, alternative instructional delivery systems, research, management, evaluation, and consulting for the betterment of education and human development. We seek to bring about this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

### Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Demonstrates research expertise (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student demonstrates a general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology  
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 2: Understands foundations of education (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Engages in scholarship (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Develops an extended knowledge base (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student develops an extended knowledge base that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Develops a professional identity (M: 1, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student develops an identity as a professional and contributes to a professional community of scholars and educators.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 6: Develops leadership for the profession (M: 1, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student provides leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 7: Understands and uses technology (M: 1, 4, 5, 6)
The Ph.D. student understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Residency Report (O: 1, 3, 5, 6, 7)
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Target for O1: Demonstrates research expertise
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
### Target for O3: Engages in scholarship
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O5: Develops a professional identity
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O6: Develops leadership for the profession
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O7: Understands and uses technology
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

#### M 2: Written Comprehensive Examination (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

### Target for O1: Demonstrates research expertise
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O2: Understands foundations of education
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O3: Engages in scholarship
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

#### M 3: Oral Comprehensive Examination (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

### Target for O1: Demonstrates research expertise
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O2: Understands foundations of education
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Engages in scholarship**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates research expertise**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Understands foundations of education**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Engages in scholarship**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Develops a professional identity**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Develops leadership for the profession**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Understands and uses technology**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be
approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates research expertise**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O2: Understands foundations of education**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O3: Engages in scholarship**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O5: Develops a professional identity**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O6: Develops leadership for the profession**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O7: Understands and uses technology**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**M 6: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates research expertise**
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the faculty were satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O2: Understands foundations of education**
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the faculty were satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O3: Engages in scholarship**
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the faculty were satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the faculty were satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Target for O5: Develops a professional identity
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the faculty were satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Target for O6: Develops leadership for the profession
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the faculty were satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Target for O7: Understands and uses technology
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the faculty were satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Annual Review
We are instituting an annual review process in which all Ph.D. students will annually prepare and submit a brief narrative detailing their progress over the past year in scholarship, research and service.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Develops a professional identity | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Develops an extended knowledge base | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Develops leadership for the profession | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Engages in scholarship | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Understands and uses technology | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Understands foundations of education | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise

Implementation Description: 10/15/2006
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Faculty in the IT Ph.D. program.
Additional Resources: None needed

Monitor Standards
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Develops a professional identity | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Develops an extended knowledge base | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Develops leadership for the profession | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Engages in scholarship | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Understands and uses technology | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Measure: Understands foundations of education | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Faculty in the IT Ph.D. program.
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on
Students are generally meeting or exceeding our criteria in every category. Program completers’ written products, residency reports, and comprehensive exams indicate students have a strong background in the major and are successful completing independent research.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Some students are taking too long to finish the program. We collect data from Ph.D. students when they reach certain milestones (i.e. comprehensive exams or admission to candidacy). However we have realized that this leaves large gaps in our assessments and allows students to sometimes go several years before we assess their progress.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 International Business MS**

(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The MIB program is designed for individuals who aspire to organizational or entrepreneurial leadership positions across functional areas in firms with significant presence or activity in international markets. The primary objectives of the MIB program are to: develop an in-depth understanding of the international business environment, extend functional skills to deal with managerial issues in the global marketplace, demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language, develop intercultural awareness and sensitivity, develop leadership skills to function successfully in a multi-cultural environment, develop team skills to be contributing members of an effective global team, and complete an extended work experience outside of the student’s native country.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understanding of Int’l Business Environment (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate through mastery of the cornerstone and capstone courses an understanding of the international business environment. This understanding includes: institutional difference across nations (e.g., legal, political and economic differences), differences in business practices and cross-national differences in industries and organizational structures.

**SLO 2: Extend Functional Skills**

Students will demonstrate expertise in a functional area.

**SLO 3: Foreign Language Proficiency (M: 3)**

Students will demonstrate proficiency in a non-native language.

**SLO 4: Intercultural Awareness (M: 4)**

Students will demonstrate an improvement in their intercultural awareness and sensitivity.

**SLO 5: Team Skills (M: 5)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to contribute functional expertise and serve as a productive member of a team.

**SLO 6: Extended Work Experience (M: 2, 6)**

Students will successfully complete an internship providing foreign business experience, cultural awareness and functional expertise.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Review of Case Analysis (O: 1)**

Faculty will assess specific projects that track the three levels of understanding at the cornerstone and capstone levels.

**Target for O1: Understanding of Int’l Business Environment**

Students should pass each project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Aligning the projects with these objectives is in development. All students passed the courses, but we are in the process of gathering data on the specific projects that demonstrate overall understanding.

**M 2: Internship supervisor and student survey (O: 6)**

While students are on their functionally-based internship, we will survey the students and their internship supervisor for functionally proficiency.

**Target for O6: Extended Work Experience**

Students should pass the internship portion. All students to date have passed.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target:
Findings to be added during the 2006-2007 assessment cycle

**M 3: Language immersion or exam (O: 3)**

There are three assessment methods: 1) Completed of language requirement at a foreign institution 2) Passing an examination approved by the GSU MCL department 3) Sit for an examiner as determined by IIB

**Target for O3: Foreign Language Proficiency**

Students should pass the evaluation. All students assessed to date have passed.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Findings to be added during the 2006-2007 assessment cycle

**M 4: Pre and post-test (O: 4)**

Students will engage in a pre and post test administered before the cornerstone course and after the capstone course.

**Target for O4: Intercultural Awareness**

Students should demonstrate improved awareness and sensitivity between the pre and post test.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Findings to be added during the 2006-2007 assessment cycle

**M 5: Capstone Project (O: 5)**

Students will engage in a team-based project in the capstone that will be self-assessed, team-assessed and faculty assessed.

**Target for O5: Team Skills**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Findings to be added during the 2006-2007 assessment cycle

**M 6: Supervisor evaluation (O: 6)**

Internship supervisors will provide an evaluation at the midpoint and completion of the internship.

**Target for O6: Extended Work Experience**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Findings to be added during the 2006-2007 assessment cycle

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**develop survey**

Develop an outcome-related survey that tracks functional expertise

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Joan Gabel and Assistant Director

**Pre and post test**

Develop process for implementing the pre and post test at the outset of the cornerstone and the end of the capstone.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Joan Gabel and IB 8090 faculty

**projects**

Modify the projects within the cornerstone and capstone to capture and then assess the components of an understanding of international business.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

To date, our students demonstrate strong integrated understanding of international business, language proficiency, team skill and the ability to successfully engage in extended work projects/internships.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

We need better data on intercultural awareness.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Journalism BA
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Communication is firmly committed to the goals of academic excellence, strong research programs and international relevance set forth in the Georgia State University's Strategic Plan. The Department encompasses multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students' oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication. Note: The Department has about 1,400 undergraduate majors, about 840 are Journalism majors.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: written and oral communication (M: 1)
1. Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.
2. Students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats

Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
7. Critical Thinking--major
8. Critical Thinking--core

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: critical thinking (M: 1)
1. Students formulate appropriate questions for research.
2. Students effectively collect appropriate evidence.
3. Students appropriately evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses.
4. Students use the results of analysis to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new questions.

Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7. Critical Thinking--major
8. Critical Thinking--core
9. Contemporary Issues--major
10. Contemporary Issues--core

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
**SLO 3: contemporary issues (M: 1)**

1. Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.
2. Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.

Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: technology (M: 1)**

Students effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to the discipline.

Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC, BEA

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 13 Technology--major
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: critical and ethical communication (M: 1)**

Students will be critical and ethical communicators and consumers of communication.

Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Industry contexts (M: 1)**

Students will understand the development of communication industries in their political, legal, social and economic environments.

Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
- 13 Technology--major
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: research papers (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

A sample of research papers assigned in Jour 3060, Communication Law and Regulation, and Jour 3070, Introduction to Theories of Mass Communication.

Target for O1: written and oral communication

An average of 70 (out of 100) or better for the assigned grades for research papers in Jour 3060. The research papers in Jour 3070 graded by an eight-item rubric will have an average of 70 (out of 100) or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The average grade for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 78%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 75%.

Target for O2: critical thinking

An average of 70 (out of 100) or better for the assigned grades for research papers in Jour 3060. The research papers in Jour 3070 graded by an eight-item rubric will have an average of 70 (out of 100) or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The average grade for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 78%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 75%.

Target for O3: contemporary issues

An average of 70 (out of 100) or better for the assigned grades for research papers in Jour 3060. The research papers in Jour 3070 graded by an eight-item rubric will have an average of 70 (out of 100) or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The average grade for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 78%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 75%.

Target for O4: technology

An average of 70 (out of 100) or better for the assigned grades for research papers in Jour 3060. The research papers in Jour 3070 graded by an eight-item rubric will have an average of 70 (out of 100) or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The average grade for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 78%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 75%.

Target for O5: critical and ethical communication

An average of 70 (out of 100) or better for the assigned grades for research papers in Jour 3060. The research papers in Jour 3070 graded by an eight-item rubric will have an average of 70 (out of 100) or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The average grade for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 78%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 75%.

Target for O6: Industry contexts

An average of 70 (out of 100) or better for the assigned grades for research papers in Jour 3060. The research papers in Jour 3070 graded by an eight-item rubric will have an average of 70 (out of 100) or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The average grade for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 78%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 75%.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

additional measures

New measures should be considered for the curricular assessment as a single measure does not adequately assess all of the goals and outcomes. For example, the use of research papers does not adequately assess the use of technology goal.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: research papers
- Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
- critical and ethical communication
- critical thinking
- Industry contexts
- technology
- written and oral communication
Implementation Description: Fall semester 06
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism and Mass Communication faculty

goal revision
The Journalism and Mass Communication faculty plan a comprehensive review of the curriculum and one aspect will be to determine if goals should be revised, added and/or deleted.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: research papers | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
| critical and ethical communication | critical thinking | Industry contexts | technology | written and oral communication

Implementation Description: January 07
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism and Mass Communication faculty
Additional Resources: Review of peer and aspirational schools' curricula

measure revision
The eight-point rubric for assessing the research paper in Jour 3070, Introduction to Theories of Mass Communication, had a high correlation with the grades assigned to research papers in Jour 3060, Mass Communication Law and Policy. The Journalism and Mass Communication faculty will consider using both measures in the future.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: research papers | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
| critical and ethical communication | critical thinking | Industry contexts | technology | written and oral communication

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Law
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Georgia State University College of Law is committed to providing a high quality legal education in its full time and part time, day and evening programs. In order to fully prepare students for a professional life as attorneys, the College of Law uses a variety of teaching methodologies, including the case study method, the socratic method, lectures, seminars, and clinical education. In the academic year 2005-06, beginning with Summer 2005 and ending in Spring 2006, 181 students earned J.D. degrees from the College of Law. Nine of those students earned joint degrees; a breakdown follows. JD/MPA - 1 JD/MBA - 4 JD/MA-PHL - 1 JD/MPA - 3
As of September 1, 2006, 701 students are enrolled in our JD program. Of those 701 students, 23 are enrolled in a joint degree program: a breakdown follows. JD/MBA - 16 JD?MPA - 3 JD/MCRP - 3 JD/MA-PHL - 1

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
The College of Law is committed to teaching students how to research and analyze case law, statutory law, regulatory and administrative law, and constitutional law. We seek to produce professionals whose knowledge, performance and behavior are consistent with the best traditions of the legal profession.
Relevant Associations: ABA Standards for Legal Education, 301, 302, 303

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Preparing students for the practice of law is the underlying focus of every aspect of the College of Law Program. In addition to competency in legal research and analysis, students must learn to write effectively and they must master myriad aspects of relationships with clients and other actors in the legal landscape. This is accomplished by adding clinical experiences and externship experiences to the substantive academic curriculum; by requiring significant legal writing course work; and by offering an array of courses in methods of alternative dispute resolution.

Relevant Associations: ABA Standards of Legal Education, 301, 302, 305

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Quality professional programs
3. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
4. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
5. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
6. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Trial and Appellate Competition Teams (O: 1, 2)**

The success of our trial and appellate advocacy teams in national competition is another gauge of the success of the program in transmitting advocacy skills. Georgia State was the first law school in the state to win both a national mock trial (two competitions in 1994; others in 1996, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2003 and 2004) and moot court competition (1988). In the 2004-2005 academic year, the Student Trial Lawyers Association's (STLA) mock trial teams won the William Daniel National Competition and placed second in the Lone Star Classic National Competition. Our Moot Court teams won the John J. Gibbons National Criminal Procedure Moot Court Competition and the Georgia Intrastate Moot Court Competition. We also placed third in the Saul Leffkowitz Southern Regional Moot Court Trademark Competition. In the 2005-2006 academic year, our STLA teams finished 2nd in the ABA National Mock Trial Competition, 3rd in the National Trial Advocacy Competition, 2nd and 3rd in the ATLTA Competition, and were semi-finalists in the Buffalo-Nagara Mock Trial Invitational. The Moot Court sent teams to the John Marshall Law School International Moot Court Competition in IT and Privacy, the SIU National Health Law Competition, the Pepperdine University School of Law National Entertainment Law Moot Court Competition, the National Moot Court Competition, the Dominick Gabrielli National Family Law Moot Court Competition, the Saul Leffkowitz Moot Court Competition, the Jerome Prince Memorial Evidence Competition, the John J. Gibbons Criminal Procedure Moot Court Competition, and the Georgia Intrastate Moot Court Competition (in which they competed in the finals).

**Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis**

Through our Moot Court and Trial Advocacy programs, we seek to utilize the students’ ability to compete in local, regional, and national forums as a method of improving their analytical, writing, and advocacy skills -- and to win as many competitions as possible. the more success our students have in competitions, the more competitions they are invited to join. Our goals are: (i) to be invited to enough quality competitions to gain national prominence (thereby increasing the reputation of the school and our students’ employment opportunities); (ii) to win or perform well in as many competitions as possible; and (iii) to afford as many of our students who wish to compete in a quality competition an opportunity to do so.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Georgia State University’s College of Law won the 1st Annual NCCU Bioethics Mock Trial Competition Nov. 11 in Durham, North Carolina. Also, Georgia State University’s College of Law won the 10th Annual William W. Daniel National Invitational Mock Trial Competition Nov. 19 in Atlanta. The competition is hosted by the Young Lawyers Division (YLD) of the State Bar of Georgia as an annual criminal mock jury trial competition for U.S. law students.

**Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law**

Through our Moot Court and Trial Advocacy programs, we seek to utilize the students’ ability to compete in local, regional, and national forums as a method of improving their analytical, writing, and advocacy skills -- and to win as many competitions as possible. the more success our students have in competitions, the more competitions they are invited to join. Our goals are: (i) to be invited to enough quality competitions to gain national prominence (thereby increasing the reputation of the school and our students’ employment opportunities); (ii) to win or perform well in as many competitions as possible; and (iii) to afford as many of our students who wish to compete in a quality competition an opportunity to do so.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Georgia State University’s College of Law won the 1st Annual NCCU Bioethics Mock Trial Competition Nov. 11 in Durham, North Carolina. Also, Georgia State University’s College of Law won the 10th Annual William W. Daniel National Invitational Mock Trial Competition Nov. 19 in Atlanta. The competition is hosted by the Young Lawyers Division (YLD) of the State Bar of Georgia as an annual criminal mock jury trial competition for U.S. law students.

**M 2: Grade Reports (O: 1, 2)**

ADD 2005 Unlike much other graduate education, legal education proceeds with many classes being taught to large sections of students. The entering classes have improved each year, albeit incrementally. The Average LSAT for 2003 was 158.17 and the median LSAT was 158; the Average LSAT for 2004 was 158.65 and the median LSAT was 159; the average LSAT for 2005 was 159.08 and the median LSAT was 159. The average GPA for 2003 was 3.32 and the median GPA was 3.31; the average GPA for 2004 was 3.31 and the median GPA was 3.35; the average GPA for 2005 was 3.38, and the median GPA was 3.32. Over the past
several years, applications have routinely exceeded 3000; in 2005 that number dropped to 2910. As a result of the high volume of applications, a large percentage of the class is grouped fairly closely around the mean and median LSAT and GPA. Because of these factors, in order to ensure fairness in the assessment of students, the College of Law faculty has agreed on mandatory means in first year courses and upper level required courses. Moreover, in order to inform the faculty of their colleagues grading practices, each semester the Registrar prepares a report which groups classes by class size and provides the mean and median grade for each section. The data is provided to the full time faculty but is not otherwise distributed or available. Because of these practices, we do not expect grades to rise, and rising grades are therefore not useful to assess the effectiveness of the program.

Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
Grade Reports are used to monitor the educational achievement of students.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Grades remain stable, which is not surprising given that the characteristics of the class remain stable, or improve. The fact that their academic indicators indicate that every student can successfully complete the program makes it disappointing that not all students do successfully complete the program. On the other hand, that is not surprising given the appropriate rigors of this professional program.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law
Grade Reports are used to monitor the educational achievement of students.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Grades remain stable, which is not surprising given that the characteristics of the class remain stable, or improve. The fact that their academic indicators indicate that every student can successfully complete the program makes it disappointing that not all students do successfully complete the program. On the other hand, that is not surprising given the appropriate rigors of this professional program.

M 3: Annual Assessment of RWA Program (O: 1, 2)
Because research, writing, and advocacy skills are critical components of legal education, Research, Writing and Advocacy is a first year, two semester, required course, taught by a dedicated faculty. Last year, for the first time we had five full time instructors, obviating the need for an adjunct in this critical and fundamental area. Having five full time RWA instructors allows each instructor an average load of 45 students [taught in three sections]. Each instructor teaches from the same syllabus, which requires the entire group to agree on the sources and problems used. The RWA faculty meets regularly to assess the effectiveness of the program and the materials. Each year the RWA faculty develops a problem that requires the students to address two distinct substantive or procedural issues in a series of exercises. The problem and the supporting materials that are distributed to the students are reviewed by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. First the students write a memo, then an appellate brief, then in teams they participate in a mock appellate argument. RWA instructors, other members of the faculty, and upper level student members of Moot Court participate as judges for the mock appellate arguments; each team of students argues before a panel of three judges. This provides an opportunity for community wide assessment of the effectiveness of the program. In addition, a questionnaire that will assess how confident upper level students who hold summer clerkships are with the research and writing skills obtained in RWA has been developed and will be conducted this Fall [2006].

Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
Developing excellence in written and oral advocacy skills.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The RWA Program has been strengthened by our ability to retain five full time instructors. Student achievement as revealed by grading remains consistent.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law
Developing excellence in written and oral advocacy skills.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The RWA Program has been strengthened by our ability to retain five full time instructors. Student achievement as revealed by grading remains consistent.

M 4: Annual Assessment of Externship Program (O: 1, 2)
The College of Law places students in externships at approximately 40 locations per semester. Placements include judges’ chambers, state and federal agencies, and non-profit legal organizations. Two faculty members supervise the program/semester. They conduct mid-semester and end of semester interviews with each student in order to evaluate the placement. In addition, the on-site supervisor completes a lengthy evaluation of the student which the supervising faculty member reviews with the student at the exit interview. If a student does not report sufficient engagement with legal issues as part of their responsibilities, the faculty member contacts the on-site supervisor with a view to remedying the situation. This does occur, at a rate of perhaps one or two sites a year. The supervising faculty member sends each on-site supervisor a mid-semester e-mail asking them to confirm that the student extern’s work is satisfactory; also, each student must have the on-site supervisor sign a form confirming that the student is on track for passing the class and must bring that form to the mid-semester interview. If an on-site director reports that a student is not fulfilling the responsibilities assigned to the student, the faculty member meets with the on-site director and with the student. If the student’s performance does not improve, the student fails. This has occurred, but only once in the last 15 years.

Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
Externship placements allow students to hone analytical and advocacy skills, to put substantive learning to practical use, and to confront professionalism issues under the guidance of an experienced mentor. The constant monitoring of the externship sites and the student externs permits ongoing assessment and adjustment with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The Externship Program provides a capstone experience for a large number of students. Its success is evidenced in part by the
number of Judges, Agencies, and Not for Profit Organizations that seek to participate, and by the enthusiasm of the students, who enroll in high numbers and report exceptional experiences.

**Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law**

Externship placements allow students to hone analytical and advocacy skills, to put substantive learning to practical use, and to confront professionalism issues under the guidance of an experienced mentor. The constant monitoring of the externship sites and the student externs permits ongoing assessment and adjustment with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Externship Program provides a capstone experience for a large number of students. It success is evidenced in part by the number of Judges, Agencies, and Not for Profit Organizations that seek to participate, and by the enthusiasm of the students, who enroll in high numbers and report exceptional experiences.

**M 5: Georgia State Bar Examination (O: 1, 2)**

The assessment method most significant to the program of legal education at the College of Law is the Georgia Bar Examination given by the Office of Bar Admissions, an administrative arm of the Georgia Supreme Court. The Georgia Bar Examination is taken by virtually every graduate of the College of Law. It consists of three sections: A. Essay Questions B. A Case File/Performance & Analysis Problem C. The Multistate Bar Examination (MBE) - a day long Multiple Choice Test The State Board of Bar Examiners reports overall pass rates, first time taker pass rates, repeat taker pass rates, and average MBE score by College of Law for each Georgia law school. The Board does not report essay grades, or performance problem grades.

**Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis**

Historically, graduates of the College of Law have performed exceptionally well on the State Bar Exam. The data from the last two examinations bear witness to this. Results from the February 2006 Exam were released at the end of May. Overall, 63.1% of those who took the Bar passed; overall, 67.8% of the takers from GSU passed. Overall, 79.2% of first time takers passed. The average MBE score for GSU graduates was 141.8, the highest among the Georgia law schools. The results from the July 2005 Bar were reported in late October, 2005. Overall, 76.6% of those who took the Bar passed; overall, 91.5% of the takers from GSU passed, and this represented the second highest pass rate among the Georgia law schools.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

While a 100% pass rate is desirable, it is not realistic; law student performance on the Georgia Bar Exam continues to affirm the strength of the program.

**Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law**

Historically, graduates of the College of Law have performed exceptionally well on the State Bar Exam. The data from the last two examinations bear witness to this. Results from the February 2006 Exam were released at the end of May. Overall, 63.1% of those who took the Bar passed; overall, 67.8% of the takers from GSU passed. Overall, 79.2% of first time takers passed. The average MBE score for GSU graduates was 141.8, the highest among the Georgia law schools. The results from the July 2005 Bar were reported in late October, 2005. Overall, 76.6% of those who took the Bar passed; overall, 91.5% of the takers from GSU passed, and this represented the second highest pass rate among the Georgia law schools.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

While a 100% pass rate is desirable, it is not realistic; law student performance on the Georgia Bar Exam continues to affirm the strength of the program.

**M 6: Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam (MPRE) (O: 1, 2)**

Students who wish to sit for any state Bar must also take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam (MPRE), a nationally administered multiple choice exam that tests in the area of Professional Responsibility.

**Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis**

Results are not reported to the College of Law, but to our knowledge, only one student in the past five years failed this test, and that student passed upon retaking it.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Virtually every law student passes the MPRE. That perfect record not withstanding, the COL continues to devote considerable resources to tutelage in Ethics and Professionalism.

**Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law**

Results are not reported to the College of Law, but to our knowledge, only one student in the past five years failed this test, and that student passed upon retaking it.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Virtually every law student passes the MPRE. That perfect record not withstanding, the COL continues to devote considerable resources to tutelage in Ethics and Professionalism.

**M 7: Exit Survey - Placement (O: 1, 2)**

Each year, our Career Services office surveys the graduates six months after graduation. CSO waits six months in order to allow the students time to sit for the Bar and obtain their results. Survey figures are reported to the ABA, the NALP, and US News & World Report. Survey participation is excellent – in 2006, 97.79% of our graduates responded; in 2005, 94.74% responded.

**Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis**

in 2004, 88.65 of the respondents reported having obtained full time legal employment; 10.27% reported full time non-legal
employment; and .54% reported both part time legal and part time non-legal employment. In 2005 the numbers were all but identical, with 87.04% reporting having obtained full time legal employment. In addition, 9.26% reported full time non-legal employment; and 3.71% reported both part time legal and part time non legal employment. Another measure of the effectiveness of legal instruction received as a student at Georgia State's College of Law is the success of graduates in achieving partner in prestigious law firms, appointment or election to the bench, and service as legal counsel for major corporations. Georgia State graduates are now partners in Alston & Bird; Arnall, Golden & Gregory; Holland & Knight; Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue; Kilpatrick & Stockton; Powell, Goldstein, Frazier & Murphy; McKenna Long Aldridge; and others. A number of Georgia State College of Law graduates serve as assistant district attorneys and magistrate judges, and several hold State Court and Superior Court judgeships. Numerous corporate legal offices employ College of Law graduates including AT&T, BellSouth, Cox Enterprises, Equifax, Federal Reserve Bank, Georgia Power, and Georgia-Pacific. The class of 2005 has an overall employment rate of 95.29%, with 22.2% employed in large to very large [50+] firms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement rates, especially placement rates in legal positions, remain high. Moreover, the quality of the placements affirms the strength of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law**

in 2004, 88.65% of the respondents reported having obtained full time legal employment; 10.27% reported full time non-legal employment; and .54% reported both part time legal and part time non-legal employment. In 2005 the numbers were all but identical, with 87.04% reporting having obtained full time legal employment. In addition, 9.26% reported full time non-legal employment; and 3.71% reported both part time legal and part time non legal employment. Another measure of the effectiveness of legal instruction received as a student at Georgia State's College of Law is the success of graduates in achieving partner in prestigious law firms, appointment or election to the bench, and service as legal counsel for major corporations. Georgia State graduates are now partners in Alston & Bird; Arnall, Golden & Gregory; Holland & Knight; Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue; Kilpatrick & Stockton; Powell, Goldstein, Frazier & Murphy; McKenna Long Aldridge; and others. A number of Georgia State College of Law graduates serve as assistant district attorneys and magistrate judges, and several hold State Court and Superior Court judgeships. Numerous corporate legal offices employ College of Law graduates including AT&T, BellSouth, Cox Enterprises, Equifax, Federal Reserve Bank, Georgia Power, and Georgia-Pacific. The class of 2005 has an overall employment rate of 95.29%, with 22.2% employed in large to very large [50+] firms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement rates, especially placement rates in legal positions, remain high. Moreover, the quality of the placements affirms the strength of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Assess First Year Research & Writing Course**
Research and writing skills are critical to the successful practice of law. As a result, the College of Law requires all first year students to take a year long course, “Research, Writing and Advocacy.” The RWA faculty have developed a survey instrument to be administered to students who have held summer clerkships; the survey will allow the students to assess the effectiveness of the RWA curriculum in the context of their ability to perform on the job.

| Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 |
| Implementation Status: Planned |
| Priority: Medium |
| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
| Measure: Annual Assessment of RWA Program | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis |
| Prepare Students for the Practice of Law |
| Implementation Description: Fall [Sept.-Oct.] 2006 |
| Responsible Person/Group: RWA Faculty |

**Assess Summer Skills Program**
In the summer before their enrollment, selected students are invited to a Summer Skills program directed at improving their chances of succeeding in law school by providing and early, intense introduction to the pedagogy of law school. This year we revamped the program. We will assess the success of the new format - in part by a Report from the Director; in part by evaluation of the student assessments; and in part by tracking the progress of the participants, and comparing it to the progress of invited students who did not attend.

| Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 |
| Implementation Status: Planned |
| Priority: Medium |
| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
| Measure: Annual Assessment of Externship Program | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis |
| Measure: Grade Reports | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis |
| Implementation Description: Nov. 1 for first report; tracking will be ongoing. |
| Responsible Person/Group: Director of the Summer Skills Program |

**Monitor Progress of Students in the Program**
As the credentials of entering classes rise, it is our expectation that classroom and exam performance will improve, and that attrition [already slight] will diminish. In order to evaluate the students’ performance, we determine the means, medians, # of grades below 73 [a student with a GPA below 73 is not in good standing] and % of grades below 73.

| Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 |
| Implementation Status: Planned |
| Priority: Medium |
| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
| Measure: Georgia State Bar Examination | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis |
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Our assessments continue to indicate that we have developed a strong program and that we are effective in teaching legal research, writing, and analysis, and in preparing students for the practice of law. The most compelling measure is the pass rate/average score on the Georgia Bar Examination. Our students perform as well as those from any College of Law, and the pass rate is consistently over 90% -- still, because virtually every student who enrolls has the ability to succeed, we would like a 100% pass rate.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The price of success is eternal vigilance.

---

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2005-2006 Library Media Technology MLM**

*As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST*

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1:</strong> Understands student development re: learning (M: 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 2:</strong> Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge. (M: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 3:</strong> Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners. (M: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 4:</strong> Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies. (M: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 5:</strong> Can motivate and manage students for learning. (M: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 6:</strong> Uses communication skills and technology. (M: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 7:</strong> Can effectively plan for instruction. (M: 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 8:</strong> Understands and uses assessment for learning. (M: 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 9:</strong> Practices professional reflection. (M: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 10:</strong> Involves school and community in learning. (M: 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 2)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% have met the standard.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 1)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O1: Understands student development re: learning**
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% have met the standard.

**M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

**Target for O3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.**
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% have met the standard.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

**Target for O4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies.**
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% have met the standard.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O5: Can motivate and manage students for learning.**
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% have met the standard.
M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 6)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6.

Target for O6: Uses communication skills and technology.
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% have met the standard.

M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 7)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.

Target for O7: Can effectively plan for instruction.
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% have met the standard.

M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 8)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O8: Understands and uses assessment for learning.
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% have met the standard.

M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 9)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9.

Target for O9: Practices professional reflection.
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% have met the standard.

M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 10)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.

Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning.
93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% have met the standard.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.
Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessments show that program content is well aligned with national standards and that students are being well-prepared for their school careers. Changes made over the past two years have strengthened the program and resulted in high student achievement.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Assessments did not reveal any outcomes or objectives that need attention at this time. Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Managerial Science BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Management Department seeks to provide its undergraduate majors with fundamental principals in general management principles, human resource management, operations management, entrepreneurship, and the concepts that underlie the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Student Performance (M: 1, 2)
Students majoring in Managerial Sciences will master a range of capabilities in human, group, and organizational behavior.

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students (O: 1)
BBA students majoring in Managerial Sciences will meaningfully outperform other students in the Robinson College of Business on standardized questions relating to management.

Target for O1: Student Performance
Students will perform in high percentiles on the ETS standardized assessment exam that greatly exceed the percentiles of students in other majors and the students as a whole.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Managerial Sciences students as a group on the Fall 2005 ETS Assessment exam performed in the 90th percentile. Other student majors in the Robinson College of Business performed in the 15th percentile to 95th percentile on the same group mean measures. As a whole the RCB students body performed in the 70th percentile. Managerial Sciences students as a group on the Spring 2006 ETS Assessment exam performed in the 90th percentile. Other student majors in the Robinson College of Business performed in the 55th percentile to 90th percentile on the same group mean measures. As a whole the
RCB student body performed in the 75th percentile.

**M 2: Performance Relative to Other Schools (O: 1)**
As a group students majoring in Managerial Sciences will outperform on an outstanding level compared other student bodies in other business programs on standardized questions relating to management

**Target for O1: Student Performance**
Students will perform in high percentiles on the ETS standardized assessment exam that greatly exceed the percentiles of students in other majors and the students as a whole.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Managerial Sciences students as a group on the Fall 2005 ETS Assessment exam performed in the 90th percentile. This percentile is from among group performance levels of over 1000 institutions over a period of three years on the same standardized ETS exam. Managerial Sciences students as a group on the Spring 2006 ETS Assessment exam performed in the 90th percentile. This percentile is from among group performance levels of over 1000 institutions over a period of three years on the same standardized ETS exam.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of Levels of Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Sciences will institute action in all four of the areas of the major to improve the quality of instruction. This will consist of an initial review of the consistency of teaching effectiveness across sections of courses. It will then proceed to review the content of courses to look for the re-emphasis and further development of the management concepts that were initially presented to all RCB students in MGS 3400, the core class in Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
- Measure: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006

**Responsible Person/Group:** William Bogner

**Additional Resources:** Financial resources to hire and retain top faculty that can teach senior level courses in this area in an excellent manner so that part time instructors can be replaced.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Students’ high performance was consistent across both administration of the exam.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Students did do very well in the management area, however their performance was not highest among student majors in the RCB and there are a number of institutions that, including many non-management majors, are out performing our majors.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Marketing BBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST*

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of Marketing of Georgia State University is to be a pre-eminent thought leader in marketing and in managerial communication. The department will achieve this mission through delivering high quality instruction in marketing and managerial communication, conducting original and highly respected research in marketing and publishing that research in premier marketing journals and providing effective services to Georgia State University and beyond.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Students will demonstrate an ability to critically analyze an organization’s marketing problems and formulate effective marketing solutions in the key decision areas of price, promotion, product policy and distribution.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
2. Critical Thinking--major
### Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 2: Understand strategic marketing planning (M: 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of strategic marketing planning through development of a comprehensive marketing plan or participation in a comprehensive marketing project sponsored by a client organization.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (M)</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Identify actual marketing problems (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Target: Met Avg. Score 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Explore Alternative Marketing Solutions (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</td>
<td>3.0 out of 5.0</td>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met 2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Evaluate pros and cons of alternative solutions (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</td>
<td>3.0 out of 5.0</td>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met 2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Apply quantitative and qualitative data (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</td>
<td>3.0 out of 5.0</td>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met 2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Develop appropriate recommendations (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</td>
<td>3.0 out of 5.0</td>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met 2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### M 6: Support decisions with data (O: 1)
Students will provide support for their marketing recommendations with relevant and accurate quantitative and qualitative data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 7: Develop a Situation Analysis (O: 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to produce a situation analysis that identifies and analyzes the major internal and external forces affecting a marketing organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 8: Product positioning (O: 2)
Students will be able to produce an appropriate positioning statement for a product/brand that covers target market segment, key benefits and warrant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 9: Identify target segments (O: 2)
Students will be able to identify appropriate target segments whose needs can be successfully served by the marketing organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 10: Establish Measurable Objectives (O: 2)
Students will demonstrate ability to establish measurable, achievable, relevant marketing objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 11: Recommend marketing strategy (O: 2)
Students will be able to describe and recommend a sound marketing strategy through application of the 4 P’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 12: Budgeting (O: 2)
Students will establish a feasible budget for the marketing plan they have proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>2.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 13: Recommend Evaluative Controls/Metrics (O: 2)
Students will be able to recommend control processes for monitoring and assessing progress of marketing plans as they are put into
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>2.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 14: B1. Employ Primary Research (O: 2)**
Students will be able to design and execute primary research on behalf of sponsoring organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 15: B2. Apply the 4 P’s to Marketing Problems (O: 2)**
Students will develop solutions to marketing problems of sponsoring organizations that encompass the four strategic bases of product policy, pricing, promotion and distribution (place)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 16: B3. Apply appropriate promotional tools (O: 2)**
Students will be able to apply the promotional tools (Advertising, Sales Promotion, Direct Marketing, Personal Selling, and Public Relations) as appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 17: B4. Demonstrate sound financial planning (O: 2)**
Students will demonstrate their understanding of the relationship between marketing decision making and sound financial principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 18: Execute Strategy and Evaluate Success (O: 2)**
Students will demonstrate ability to execute the strategy they recommend, and to evaluate its effects via primary research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 19: Develop a feasible budget (O: 2)**
Students will be able to develop and recommend a marketing budget appropriate to the plan and reasonable for the sponsoring organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>3.0 out of 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Introduce case analysis
The undergraduate curriculum committee will begin to encourage faculty to begin introducing case analysis exercises in all required marketing courses.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Apply quantitative and qualitative data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Evaluate pros and cons of alternative solutions | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Explore Alternative Marketing Solutions | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Identify actual marketing problems | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Support decisions with data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Assessment/Curriculum Committee

Introduce Marketing Math
Encourage faculty to provide examples and problems to be solved via using marketing math as appropriate for particular course content

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Apply quantitative and qualitative data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Evaluate pros and cons of alternative solutions | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Explore Alternative Marketing Solutions | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Identify actual marketing problems | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Assessment/Curriculum Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Because this is our first assessment of these particular course objectives, we have no progress to report.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Several objectives are in need of improvement in order to move them from "partially met" or "met" to "exceeds" on our internal rating scales. Particular areas we will concentrate on are: 1. Critical thinking skills to aid students in identifying problems and appropriate solutions 2. More practice in organizing and analyzing data and drawing appropriate inferences 3. More practice in using common "marketing metrics" 4. More practice in defending their claims/recommendations with logic and supporting qualitative and quantitative data

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Marketing MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The MS in Marketing Program is designed to provide the in-depth theoretical and applied training needed to excel in a leadership position in Marketing. The MS in Marketing Program extends the students’ previously acquired basic business and marketing skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in a selected area. The MS Program, therefore, allows students to distinguish themselves as marketing specialists capable of making decisions in an increasingly complex marketing environment.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions (M: 1, 10, 11)
The MS-MKT graduate will be able to fashion appropriate and effective marketing solutions.

O/O 2: Collect, Analyze and Interpret Marketing Research (M: 7, 8, 9)
The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate the ability to collect, analyze and interpret marketing research information for solving marketing problems.

O/O 3: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities (M: 15, 16, 17)
The MS-MKT graduate will be able to identify marketing problems and opportunities.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience
O/O 4: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation (M: 2, 3, 4)
The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate a customer/client orientation.

O/O 5: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information (M: 5, 6)
The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate the ability to analyze and interpret appropriate information for solving marketing problems.

O/O 6: Recognize and discuss ethical issues (M: 12, 13, 14)
The MS-MKT graduate will be able to recognize the ethical issues in a marketing environment and discuss their implications.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Realistic Implementation Plan (O: 1)
Student(s) selected realistic implementation plan for selected solution.

Target for O1: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The mean score was 3.50, exceeding the basic requirement and achieving the 3.5 goal.

M 2: Use of Appropriate Marketing Information (O: 4)
Student(s) used appropriate marketing information to assess customer/client's needs or wants.

Target for O4: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The mean score was 3.67, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

M 3: Changes Targeted at Customers’ Wants/Needs (O: 4)
Student(s) designed new product/service or modified existing product/service targeted at customer/client's needs or wants.

Target for O4: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The mean score was 3.83, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

M 4: Attention to Customer Satisfaction (O: 4)
Student(s) monitored customer/client's satisfaction or needs/wants over time.

Target for O4: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The mean score was 3.67, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

M 5: Identify Sources of Competitive Advantage (O: 5)
Student(s) used marketing research effectively to identify sources of competitive advantage.

Target for O5: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The mean score was 4.33, significantly exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

M 6: Assess Change in a Dynamic Environment (O: 5)
Student(s) used marketing research to assess change in a dynamic environment.

Target for O5: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets
**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 4.17, significantly exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

**M 7: Identify Necessary Information (O: 2)**
Student(s) identifies information necessary to address question.

**Target for O2: Collect, Analyze and Interpret Marketing Research**
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.2, exceeding the basic requirement but falling short of the goal of 3.5.

**M 8: Use of Appropriate Statistical Tools (O: 2)**
Student(s) uses appropriate statistical tools to analyze data.

**Target for O2: Collect, Analyze and Interpret Marketing Research**
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.6, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

**M 9: Conclusions Consistent with Analysis (O: 2)**
Student(s) generates conclusions consistent with analysis.

**Target for O2: Collect, Analyze and Interpret Marketing Research**
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.4, exceeding the basic requirement but falling short of the goal of 3.5.

**M 10: Solution Consistent with Abilities/Objectives (O: 1)**
Student(s) devised solution consistent with firm's abilities/objectives.

**Target for O1: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions**
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.50, exceeding the basic requirement and meeting the goal of 3.5.

**M 11: Solution Consistent with Analysis (O: 1)**
Student(s) solution is consistent with their analysis of the situation.

**Target for O1: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions**
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.67, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

**M 12: Identification of Relevant Rights at Issue (O: 6)**
Student(s) identified relevant rights at issue.

**Target for O6: Recognize and discuss ethical issues**
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 2.83, falling short of both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

**M 13: Identify Relevant Stakeholders and Consequences (O: 6)**
Student(s) identified relevant stakeholders and consequences to each of action.
**Target for O6: Recognize and discuss ethical issues**

The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mean score was 3.33, exceeding the basic requirement but falling short of the goal of 3.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 14: Proposal of Alternative Strategies (O: 6)**

Student(s) proposed alternative strategies consistent with evaluation.

**Target for O6: Recognize and discuss ethical issues**

The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mean score was 3.17, falling short of both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 15: Segmentation Analysis (O: 3)**

Student(s) applied segmentation analysis

**Target for O3: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**

The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mean score was 3.75, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 16: Viable Target Markets/Positioning (O: 3)**

Student(s) chose viable target market(s)/positioning

**Target for O3: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**

The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mean score was 3.75, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 17: Impact of Competition (O: 3)**

Student(s) determined impact of competition on firm's actions

**Target for O3: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**

The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mean score was 3.75, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Our students continue to demonstrate competence on the majority of the performance objectives measured. About 70% exceeded the goal of an average score of 3.5 (3= meets basic requirement (demonstrates a technical understanding and ability to use) and 4 = exceeds requirement (demonstrates true competence with the concept)). Additionally, about 47% of the mean scores, compared with the 2004/2005 report, showed improvement. Finally, the mean score improved on four of the six objectives, while declining on only one.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

There was a dip on objective 5 (The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate the ability to collect, analyze and interpret marketing research information for solving marketing problems.) Given the small sample size and the relatively high scores from the prior round of assessment, it is not possible to identify a trend. At the same time, attention on this objective is required.
### Mission / Purpose

The Master of Public Administration (MPA) program of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies prepares students to become leaders in public service careers as executives, managers, analysts, and policy specialists in government and nonprofit organizations.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Core Requirements (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

To learn and to apply core concepts, techniques, and analytical skills of public management and administration identified in course learning objectives.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs & Administration (NASPAA) requires programs to "produce professionals capable of intelligent, creative analysis and communication, and action in public service" (section 4.2, NASPAA Commission on Peer Review & Accreditation Guidelines).

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 2: Specialization Requirements

To learn and to apply concepts and skills associated with one of the MPA career tracks: Human Resources, Management and Finance, Nonprofit Management, Planning and Economic Development, or Policy Analysis and Evaluation identified in course learning objectives.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs & Administration (NASPAA) requires programs to offer competencies in the following general areas: "Management of Public Service Organizations, the components of which include: - Human resources - Budgeting and financial processes - Information management, technology applications, and policy. Application of Quantitative and Qualitative Techniques of Analysis, the components of which include: - Policy and program formulation, implementation and evaluation - Decision-making and problem-solving Understanding of the Public Policy and Organizational Environment, the components of which include: - Political and legal institutions and processes - Economic and social institutions and processes - Organization and management concepts and behavior." (section 4.21, NASPAA Commission on Peer Review & Accreditation). The program learning objectives articulated above satisfy these requirements.

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Communication 1 (O: 1)

Students will be able to develop an effective memo.

**Target for O1: Core Requirements**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the last academic year, 85.07% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

#### M 2: Communication 2 (O: 1)

Students will be able to develop a strategic communications plan.

**Target for O1: Core Requirements**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During the previous academic year, 98.51% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

#### M 3: Organizations 1 (O: 1)

Students will be able to describe historical development of public administration thought in America.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Core Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 83.75% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

---

**M 4: Organizations 2 (O: 1)**
Students should be able to describe and explain the political context of public administration, including the institutions, processes, and major actors that affect public administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Core Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 83.75% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

---

**M 5: Organizations 3 (O: 1)**
Students will be able to identify major ethical issues that arise in public service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Core Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 87.50% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

---

**M 6: Research Methods & Statistics 1 (O: 1)**
Students will be able understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and related fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Core Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 74.32% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 95.95% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

---

**M 7: Research Methods & Statistics 2 (O: 1)**
Students will be able to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Core Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 78.05% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 97.56% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

---

**M 8: Research Methods & Statistics 3 (O: 1)**
Students will be able to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Core Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 86.05% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 97.67% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Target for O1: Core Requirements</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 9: Microeconomics 1 (O: 1)</td>
<td>Students will describe the basic tools of government intervention in the economy, including the supply of public goods, subsidy and taxation of the private sector, regulation of markets, and the fostering of property rights and new markets.</td>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 63.64% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10: Public Personnel Administration 1 (O: 1)</td>
<td>Students will be able to describe the major functions in human resource management in the public and private sectors.</td>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 87.50% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11: Public Personnel Administration 2 (O: 1)</td>
<td>Students will be able to define the challenging role of human resource managers in public and nonprofit organizations.</td>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 75.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 98.21% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: Public Budgeting &amp; Finance 1 (O: 1)</td>
<td>Students will be able to describe political, legal, economic, social, and cultural factors influencing budgets and budget making in America.</td>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 71.15% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 96.15% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13: Public Budgeting &amp; Finance 2 (O: 1)</td>
<td>Students will be able to describe and explain the technical nature of public budgeting in the United States, including the timetable and rules of process typical at the three levels of government.</td>
<td>Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 73.08% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 96.15% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M 14: Public Management 1 (O: 1) | Students will be able to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks as they apply to public and nonprofit sectors. | Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill. | **Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**  
During the previous academic year, 73.08% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 96.15% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.
students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 84.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 15: Public Management 2 (O: 1)**

Students will learn advantages and disadvantages of various models of organizational structure and design.

**Target for O1: Core Requirements**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 80.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Faculty group meetings**

We will split the faculty into work groups that are responsible for teaching in our three main areas of focus: (1) Public administration and organizations, (2) Economics, finance, and budgeting, and (3) Data analysis and statistics. Faculty groups will be responsible for considering ways of improving outcomes specific to their courses. These groups of faculty will be expected to meet informally, with formal meetings at the discretion of each group.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Communication 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Communication 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Microeconomics 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Organizations 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Organizations 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Organizations 3</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Budgeting &amp; Finance 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Budgeting &amp; Finance 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Management 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Management 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Personnel Administration 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Personnel Administration 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Research Methods &amp; Statistics 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Research Methods &amp; Statistics 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Research Methods &amp; Statistics 3</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implementation Description: October 1, 2006 - February 15, 2007 |
| Responsible Person/Group: All PAUS faculty |

**Initial faculty meeting to discuss outcomes**

We will meet as a faculty to talk about all of the results of this endeavor. We will highlight areas of particular strength, as well as areas where improvement is needed. We will formulate a plan through which we will examine ways to improve upon all indicators.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Communication 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Communication 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Microeconomics 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Organizations 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Organizations 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Organizations 3</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Budgeting &amp; Finance 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Budgeting &amp; Finance 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Management 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Management 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Personnel Administration 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Public Personnel Administration 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Research Methods &amp; Statistics 1</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Research Methods &amp; Statistics 2</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Research Methods &amp; Statistics 3</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implementation Description: October 30, 2006 |
| Responsible Person/Group: All PAUS faculty |

**Second faculty meeting to discuss outcomes**

After faculty groups have had a prolonged opportunity to discuss objectives and issues related to their areas of expertise, we will again convene as a faculty to share ideas. We will, from this meeting, formulate a written plan for the department to implement over
Research, working in the area of historical preservation with a two-century-old hospital. Four students studied at UNN during the fall 2005, PAUS had five students take advantage of the UNN exchange. One student interned with the Centre for Public Policy students will be awarded credit for 12 hours of coursework toward the graduation requirements of their MPA or M.S.-UPS degree. In these modules converts to 6 hours of Georgia State University semester hours. Upon successful completion of these modules, have completed at least three courses in the MPA or M.S.-UPS program. Students will enroll in two modules of study at UNN. Each of students in the Public Administration and Urban Studies department of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Students must faculty and students at UNN, some of whom will travel to Georgia the following spring term. The program is open to graduate and learning in a new cultural setting. Participation permits Georgia State students to establish a collegiate relationship with the will travel to UNN, where they will take courses examining public administration and policy analysis and will reap the benefits of living will travel as a faculty to improve outcome scores. The most challenging objectives involve the use of quantitative methods, e.g., economics, finance, budgeting, and statistics. We are working on this weakness in two ways: First, we are working to recruit a highly-qualified student population with strong backgrounds in mathematics. Second, we are considering ways that faculty can address deficiencies in mathematics and make students more comfortable with quantitative methods. That is, to improve our teaching methods. We did apply for a retention grant to fund a student assistance center, but this request was not funded. We will continue to seek ways to provide this kind of service.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
While only one outcome was fully met, many outcomes were very close to being met, and we will be talking about ways that we can work as a faculty to improve outcome scores. The most challenging objectives involve the use of quantitative methods, e.g., economics, finance, budgeting, and statistics. We are working on this weakness in two ways: First, we are working to recruit a highly-qualified student population with strong backgrounds in mathematics. Second, we are considering ways that faculty can address deficiencies in mathematics and make students more comfortable with quantitative methods. That is, to improve our teaching methods. We did apply for a retention grant to fund a student assistance center, but this request was not funded. We will continue to seek ways to provide this kind of service.

Annual Report Section Responses

Highlights
* The Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies (PAUS) hired three new faculty members in 2005, including Dennis Young as the new Bernard B. and Eugenia A. Ramsey Chair of Private Enterprise. These new hires add momentum to our goal of developing one of the nation's very best programs in nonprofit management, and they also reinforce programs that are already highly rated. * The Department has welcomed the creation of a new student organization, the PAUS Network, and a revitalization of the PAUS Alumni Club. Both of these organizations sponsored student events in the fall of 2005. * In the fall of 2005, the Department published the first issue of the PAUS Informer, which promoted department and college events and provided new students with additional information about our academic programs. * The Department began a series of regular lunch hour seminars. Two were offered during the fall of 2005 that focused on career development issues: one focused on economic development and the other on international policy. PAUS Director of International Student and Faculty Exchanges is Carol D. Hansen. Through this semester-long exchange between two prominent research universities, graduate students in the fields of Public Administration and Urban Policy Studies will gain an awareness of international policy and practice, the tools necessary for work within foreign cultures, and the core requirements needed to function effectively in a global setting. In learning about British institutions, participants will also learn about the U.K. and its role within the European Union. The program has a one-semester duration, and occurs each fall. Participants will travel to UNN, where they will take courses examining public administration and policy analysis and will reap the benefits of living and learning in a new cultural setting. Participation permits Georgia State students to establish a collegiate relationship with the faculty and students at UNN, some of whom will travel to Georgia the following spring term. The program is open to graduate students in the Public Administration and Urban Studies department of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Students must have completed at least three courses in the MPA or M.S.-UPS program. Students will enroll in two modules of study at UNN. Each of these modules converts to 6 hours of Georgia State University semester hours. Upon successful completion of these modules, students will be awarded credit for 12 hours of coursework toward the graduation requirements of their MPA or M.S.-UPS degree. In 2005, PAUS had five students take advantage of the UNN exchange. One student interned with the Centre for Public Policy Research, working in the area of historical preservation with a two-century-old hospital. Four students studied at UNN during the fall 2005.
Carol Hansen traveled to Newcastle in December to encourage recruitment to PAUS.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mission / Purpose</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2004, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics adopted the following Mission Statement: Mathematics is one of the great unifying themes in our modern culture. It is a language, a science, an art form, and a tool of tremendous power. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics, in its courses for both majors and nonmajors, seeks to introduce students to this vast area of knowledge and to show them how mathematics can be used to solve problems. Graduate education should deepen and intensify that knowledge, preparing its graduates to enter society as creative, scientifically literate citizens. The overarching goals of any program in mathematics are that mathematics instruction should: (from MAA's Source Book for College Mathematics Teaching, Schoenfeld, 1990) Provide students with a sense of the discipline of mathematics. Develop student's understanding of important concepts in core areas of mathematics. Develop student's ability to explore problem situations in a range of settings, at several levels of difficulty, and with a variety of methods. Help students to develop a mathematical point of view – perceive and represent structure and structural relationships. Help student's to develop the ability to read and use mathematical literature and reference material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Quantitative Literacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal V. Quantitative Literacy 1. Students effectively perform arithmetic operations, as well as reason and draw appropriate conclusions from numerical information. 2. Students effectively translate problem situations into their symbolic representations and use those representations to solve problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Quantitative Skills--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 3: Apply techniques to solving applied problems (M: 2, 3, 4)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to solve applied problems using mathematics demands solid understanding of related mathematics subjects and various other skills needed to apply mathematics effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Written Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Quantitative Skills--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Technology--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Technology--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 4: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs (M: 2, 3, 4)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical proofs are the heart and foundation of mathematics. It is necessary that a successful mathematics major must be able to read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Written Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 Quantitative Skills--core
13 Technology--major
14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Written communication (M: 2, 3, 4)**
This is a General Education Outcome

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Critical thinking (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
This is a General Education Outcome

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 7: Quantitative skills (M: 2, 3, 4)**
This is a General Education Outcome.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 8: Contemporary issues (M: 2, 3, 4)**
This is a General Education Outcome.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 9: Technology (M: 2, 3, 4)**
This is a General Education Outcome

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Uniform Assessment**

Develop a more uniform and equitable assessment plan in all of the core courses.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2 Written Communication--core  
4 Oral Communication--core  
6 Collaboration--core  
8 Critical Thinking--core  
12 Quantitative Skills--core  
14 Technology--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Quantitative Literacy Quizzes (O 6)**

Pre- and Post-course QL quizzes comprised of 7 questions. These questions attempt to measure our students ability to perform arithmetic operations, as well as reason and draw appropriate conclusions from numerical information. Some of these problems will ask students to translate problem situations into their symbolic representations and use those representations to solve problems.

**Target for O6: Critical thinking**

Quizzes are administered to 1101, 1111, 1113, and 2211 students. An overall 75% "correctness" is the target.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Spring 2006: Pre- and Post-Quizzes administered online to MATH 1111 and 1113 students. Results varied with the aspect of QL being measured. Part 1 (Students effectively perform arithmetic operations, as well as reason and draw appropriate conclusions from numerical information.) was met by most students, while part 2 (Students effectively translate problem situations into their symbolic representations and use those representations to solve problems.) was not met by many students. Full Report

---

**M 2: Tests and the Final Exam (O 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Carefully designed problems are used that take into account the discipline specific and general education learning outcomes. In particular, there is a balance between problems involving the following: 1 Apply techniques to solving applied problems 2 Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs 3 Written communication 4 Critical thinking 5 Qualitative skills 6 Contemporary issues 7 Technology

**Target for O3: Apply techniques to solving applied problems**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the material that matches the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

In terms Learning Outcome 1, 65% of the students can use the new techniques with enough flexibility to solve a broader range of applied problems than the ones presented in class. In terms of Learning Outcome 2, about 70% students can read, analyze and reproduce proofs presented in class as examples. However, only about 30% can write new proofs based on known results and ideas. In terms of Learning Outcome 3, 70% of the students can write mathematics correctly. In terms of Learning Outcome 4, many students have a tendency to mimic and reproduce examples given in class instead of developing their own approach to solve problems and write proofs. In terms of Learning Outcome 5, all students demonstrated basic quantitative skills. In terms of Learning Outcome 6, we do not have enough information on students’ understanding of related contemporary issues. However, there were applied problems and examples involving contemporary issues. In terms of Learning Outcome 7, most students mastered some kind of suitable technology (including graphing calculators and mathematical programs such as MATLAB and MAPLE). However, mathematical software is not always introduced and demonstrated in class.

**Target for O4: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the material that matches the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

In terms Learning Outcome 1, 65% of the students can use the new techniques with enough flexibility to solve a broader range of applied problems than the ones presented in class. In terms of Learning Outcome 2, about 70% students can read, analyze and reproduce proofs presented in class as examples. However, only about 30% can write new proofs based on known results and ideas. In terms of Learning Outcome 3, 70% of the students can write mathematics correctly. In terms of Learning Outcome 4, many students have a tendency to mimic and reproduce examples given in class instead of developing their own approach to solve problems and write proofs. In terms of Learning Outcome 5, all students demonstrated basic quantitative skills. In terms of Learning Outcome 6, we do not have enough information on students’ understanding of related contemporary issues. However, there were applied problems and examples involving contemporary issues. In terms of Learning Outcome 7, most students mastered some kind of suitable technology (including graphing calculators and mathematical programs such as MATLAB and MAPLE). However, mathematical software is not always introduced and demonstrated in class.
Target for **O5: Written communication**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the material that matches the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
In terms Learning Outcome 1, 65% of the students can use the new techniques with enough flexibility to solve a broader range of applied problems than the ones presented in class. In terms of Learning Outcome 2, about 70% students can read, analyze and reproduce proofs presented in class as examples. However, only about 30% can write new proofs based on known results and ideas. In terms of Learning Outcome 3, 70% of the students can write mathematics correctly. In terms of Learning Outcome 4, many students have a tendency to mimic and reproduce examples given in class instead of developing their own approach to solve problems and write proofs. In terms of Learning Outcome 5, all students demonstrated basic quantitative skills. In terms of Learning Outcome 6, we do not have enough information on students’ understanding of related contemporary issues. However, there were applied problems and examples involving contemporary issues. In terms of Learning Outcome 7, most students mastered some kind of suitable technology (including graphing calculators and mathematical programs such as MATLAB and MAPLE). However, mathematical software is not always introduced and demonstrated in class.

Target for **O6: Critical thinking**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the material that matches the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
In terms Learning Outcome 1, 65% of the students can use the new techniques with enough flexibility to solve a broader range of applied problems than the ones presented in class. In terms of Learning Outcome 2, about 70% students can read, analyze and reproduce proofs presented in class as examples. However, only about 30% can write new proofs based on known results and ideas. In terms of Learning Outcome 3, 70% of the students can write mathematics correctly. In terms of Learning Outcome 4, many students have a tendency to mimic and reproduce examples given in class instead of developing their own approach to solve problems and write proofs. In terms of Learning Outcome 5, all students demonstrated basic quantitative skills. In terms of Learning Outcome 6, we do not have enough information on students’ understanding of related contemporary issues. However, there were applied problems and examples involving contemporary issues. In terms of Learning Outcome 7, most students mastered some kind of suitable technology (including graphing calculators and mathematical programs such as MATLAB and MAPLE). However, mathematical software is not always introduced and demonstrated in class.

Target for **O7: Quantitative skills**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the material that matches the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
In terms Learning Outcome 1, 65% of the students can use the new techniques with enough flexibility to solve a broader range of applied problems than the ones presented in class. In terms of Learning Outcome 2, about 70% students can read, analyze and reproduce proofs presented in class as examples. However, only about 30% can write new proofs based on known results and ideas. In terms of Learning Outcome 3, 70% of the students can write mathematics correctly. In terms of Learning Outcome 4, many students have a tendency to mimic and reproduce examples given in class instead of developing their own approach to solve problems and write proofs. In terms of Learning Outcome 5, all students demonstrated basic quantitative skills. In terms of Learning Outcome 6, we do not have enough information on students’ understanding of related contemporary issues. However, there were applied problems and examples involving contemporary issues. In terms of Learning Outcome 7, most students mastered some kind of suitable technology (including graphing calculators and mathematical programs such as MATLAB and MAPLE). However, mathematical software is not always introduced and demonstrated in class.

Target for **O8: Contemporary issues**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the material that matches the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
In terms Learning Outcome 1, 65% of the students can use the new techniques with enough flexibility to solve a broader range of applied problems than the ones presented in class. In terms of Learning Outcome 2, about 70% students can read, analyze and reproduce proofs presented in class as examples. However, only about 30% can write new proofs based on known results and ideas. In terms of Learning Outcome 3, 70% of the students can write mathematics correctly. In terms of Learning Outcome 4, many students have a tendency to mimic and reproduce examples given in class instead of developing their own approach to solve problems and write proofs. In terms of Learning Outcome 5, all students demonstrated basic quantitative skills. In terms of Learning Outcome 6, we do not have enough information on students’ understanding of related contemporary issues. However, there were applied problems and examples involving contemporary issues. In terms of Learning Outcome 7, most students mastered some kind of suitable technology (including graphing calculators and mathematical programs such as MATLAB and MAPLE). However, mathematical software is not always introduced and demonstrated in class.

Target for **O9: Technology**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the material that matches the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
In terms Learning Outcome 1, 65% of the students can use the new techniques with enough flexibility to solve a broader range of applied problems than the ones presented in class. In terms of Learning Outcome 2, about 70% students can read, analyze and reproduce proofs presented in class as examples. However, only about 30% can write new proofs based on known results and ideas. In terms of Learning Outcome 3, 70% of the students can write mathematics correctly. In terms of Learning Outcome 4, many students have a tendency to mimic and reproduce examples given in class instead of developing their own approach to solve problems and write proofs. In terms of Learning Outcome 5, all students demonstrated basic quantitative skills. In terms of Learning Outcome 6, we do not have enough information on students’ understanding of related contemporary issues. However, there were applied problems and examples involving contemporary issues. In terms of Learning Outcome 7, most students mastered some kind of suitable technology (including graphing calculators and mathematical programs such as MATLAB and MAPLE). However, mathematical software is not always introduced and demonstrated in class.
Learning Outcome 7, most students mastered some kind of suitable technology (including graphing calculators and mathematical programs such as MATLAB and MAPLE). However, mathematical software is not always introduced and demonstrated in class.

**M 3: Homework and Projects (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Selected homework problems and projects are assigned to develop the critical thinking and writing skills necessary for solving applied problems and for reading, analyzing and writing mathematical proofs.

**Target for O3: Apply techniques to solving applied problems**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The findings here coincide with those from Measure 1.

**Target for O4: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The findings here coincide with those from Measure 1.

**Target for O5: Written communication**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The finding here coincide with those from Measure 1.

**Target for O6: Critical thinking**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The finding here coincide with those from Measure 1.

**Target for O7: Quantitative skills**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The finding here coincide with those from Measure 1.

**Target for O8: Contemporary issues**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The finding here coincide with those from Measure 1.

**Target for O9: Technology**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The finding here coincide with those from Measure 1.

**M 4: Class participation and individual contact (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

By observing class participation and through individual contacts, the professor evaluates the students’ mathematical oral communication skills as well as other skills related to the learning outcomes.

**Target for O3: Apply techniques to solving applied problems**

Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The findings here are consistent with those from Measure 1.

**Target for O4: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs**

Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The findings here are consistent with those from Measure 1.
### Target for O5: Written communication

Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The findings here are consistent with those from Measure 1.

### Target for O6: Critical thinking

Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The findings here are consistent with those from Measure 1.

### Target for O7: Quantitative skills

Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The findings here are consistent with those from Measure 1.

### Target for O8: Contemporary issues

Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The findings here are consistent with those from Measure 1.

### Target for O9: Technology

Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The findings here are consistent with those from Measure 1.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Enhancing students proof writing skills

Make Math 3000 (Bridge to Higher Mathematics) more effective so that students can easily integrate what they learn from Math 3000 with their previous and subsequent mathematics courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Class participation and individual contact | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical thinking
- **Measure:** Quantitative skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical thinking
- **Measure:** Homework and Projects | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical thinking
- **Measure:** Quantitative skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Written communication
- **Measure:** Tests and the Final Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical thinking
- **Measure:** Quantitative skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Written communication

**Implementation Description:** 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Johan Hattingh

#### Improve QL in core courses

Include 1101 and 2211 students in the online evaluation of QL through the use of WebCT. In order to include MATH 1101 and 2211 in the common assessment plan, a plan to utilize WebCT is underway. Since a single assessment course can not be created that has all of these students automatically loaded, the plan is to have the course designer section of both classes be given the assessment (though it'll be static, not algorithmic as WebCT is not as sophisticated as MyMathLab with its assessment software) so that the instructors of the individual sections may download it. Then, we will ask the instructors to have their students complete the quiz and report the data. In this manner it is hoped to get a better sense of how quantitatively literate a large portion of our students are both before they take our classes and after.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006

**Responsible Person/Group:** Valerie Miller

#### Improving instruction involving applied problems

By nature, applied problems are more complicated to solve, since one must be able to understand the background information to
formulate the problem into a mathematical question first. It is time consuming to present real world examples that require a lot of background information from other areas. However, to help students do better in solving applied problems, the department must begin to spend a little more time on this in most mathematics courses, such as Math 2211, Math 2212, Math 3435, and Math 4435.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Class participation and individual contact | Outcome/Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems
- Measure: Homework and Projects | Outcome/Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems
- Measure: Tests and the Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems

Implementation Description: 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Johan Hattingh

Introduction to mathematical software
Appropriate technology, such as MATLAB, MAPLE or graphic calculator, should be introduced and demonstrated in class. Students should be asked to do some homework problems and/or projects using technology.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Class participation and individual contact | Outcome/Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems
- Measure: Homework and Projects | Outcome/Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems
- Measure: Tests and the Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems

Implementation Description: 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Johan Hattingh
Additional Resources: All upper level math classes should be taught in classrooms with computer facility.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
This is the first year such assessment is done in the department, with the help of Associate Provost Joan Carson. We'll make year to year comparisons in the future to better evaluate our proven strengths or progress.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We found that many students have trouble writing proofs in Math 4435. Most students would take other advanced mathematics courses beyond Math 4435, which would help them improve their skills of writing proofs. The department intends to use our newly created capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) for undergraduate Learning Outcomes Assessment, starting 2007.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 4)
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 5)
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

O/O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 3)
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

O/O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 2)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.
O/O 5: Participates in profession’s learning communities (M: 1)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 5 rating (O: 5)
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

Target for O5: Participates in profession’s learning communities
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating (O: 4)
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 rating (O: 3)
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)
A summary rating derived from culminating papers, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings (O: 2)
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Can apply expertise for learning and development
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Is committed to student learning and development
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Manages and monitors student learning/development
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Participants in profession’s learning communities
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Reflects on & learns from professional experience
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**O/O 2: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)**
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

**O/O 3: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)**
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**O/O 4: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 7)**
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**O/O 5: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 8)**
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

**O/O 6: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)**
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

**O/O 7: Involves School and Community in student learning (M: 10)**
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

**O/O 8: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 1)**
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

**O/O 9: Understands student development re: learning (M: 2)**
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

**O/O 10: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)**
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 8)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O8: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**
65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
79% of candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 9)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O9: Understands student development re: learning**
65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
58% of candidates met Standard 2: Understands Student Development Regarding Learning.

**M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 10)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

64% of candidates met Standard 3: Effectively Teach Diverse Groups of Learners.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

70% of candidates met Standard 4: Knows and Uses Multiple Instructional Strategies.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

75% of candidates met Standard 5: Can Motivate and Manage Student Learning.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Uses communication skills and technology**

65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

58% of candidates met Standard 6: Uses communication skills and technology.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Can effectively plan for instruction**

65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

70% of all candidates have met Standard 7: Can Effectively Plan for Instruction.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
56% of all candidates have met Standard 8: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning.

M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 rating (O: 6)
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9.

Target for O6: Practices professional reflection
65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
77% of all candidates have met Standard 9: Practices Professional Reflection.

M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 rating (O: 7)
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.

Target for O7: Involves School and Community in student learning
65% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
60% of candidates have met Standard 10: Fosters Relationships Among School and Community.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Maintain and Monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Maintain and Monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction

Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Maintain and Monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Maintain and Monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 rating | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify sequence of activities
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor and address the observed needs of diverse learners during the 2006-2007 academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify sequence of activities
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify sequence of activities
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, systematically document data collected, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify sequence of activities
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year. Faculty across methods and technology courses have modified their syllabi and discourse collaboratively for improvement in the academic 2006-2007.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify sequence of activities
School and Community Involvement: We will modify the syllabi and discourse in the student teaching practices in the spring semester. Students understand and acknowledge the value of school and community but lack practice.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 10 rating | Outcome/Objective: Involves School and Community in student learning
Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify Syllabi and Discourse
Monitor the content and methods courses taken. Continue to modify syllabi and discourse in the methods courses to meet the needs of teachers and their students.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Based on the assessments, program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program. Faculty will make modifications in the methods courses, systematically document data, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Based on the assessments, program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program. Faculty will make modifications in the methods courses, systematically document data, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

Department of Mathematics and Statistics' Mission Statement Mathematics is one of the great unifying themes in our modern culture. It is a language, a science, an art form, and a tool of tremendous power. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics, in its courses for both majors and nonmajors, seeks to introduce students to this vast area of knowledge and to show them how mathematics can be used to solve problems. Graduate education should deepen and intensify that knowledge, preparing its graduates to enter society as creative, scientifically literate citizens.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Analytical Skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The analytical skills in Statistics include skills to collect data, computer skills, and understanding research reports/articles.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline. (M: 7, 8, 10, 11)**

• Graduates should demonstrate knowledge of the discipline. This includes the ability to understand research problems in one or more areas of mathematics and statistics. Students should have an appreciation for the history of the subject, and the sequence of results that has led to the current state of development of one or more areas of mathematics and statistics.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate quant reasoning and prob solving. (M: 9, 12)**

• Graduates should demonstrate advanced quantitative reasoning and problem solving ability. This includes numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills. (M: 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16)**

• Graduates should demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills. This includes the ability to see connections across fields within mathematics and statistics as well as the ability to see applications of mathematics and statistics to other disciplines. Students should develop a mathematical intuition about “how things work” in one or more field within the discipline. This also includes the ability to draw conclusions from data, and to develop an appropriate approach to solving problems. Students should be able to extend solution methods to problems not exactly like in the book, both in a theoretical and applied setting.

**SLO 5: Demonstrate communication skills, oral and written (M: 6, 17)**

• Graduates should demonstrate communication skills, both oral and written. This includes the ability to explain ideas to nonspecialists.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Show skills to collect data. (O: 1)**

Students should have the skills to collect data.

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Analytical Skills**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**M 2: Show computer skills. (O: 1)**

Students should be familiar with some major statistics computer packages, such as SAS, S-plus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3:</th>
<th>To read and understand the research articles. (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to read and understand the research reports/articles in statistics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Analytical Skills**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4:</th>
<th>To formulate research hypothesis. (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to formulate research questions and/or formulate hypotheses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5:</th>
<th>Analyze and interpret data through proofs. (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to analyze and interpret data through either proofs or algorithms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6:</th>
<th>Show effective written communication. (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to write technical reports or articles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Demonstrate communication skills, oral and written**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7:</th>
<th>Show key knowledges in statistical theories. (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should articulate key mathematical/statistical concepts and theories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline.**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8:</th>
<th>Know the update knowledges in statistics. (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to apply the most up-to-date information and knowledges in the field of statistics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline.**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9:</th>
<th>Show the ability to solve problems. (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to identify, analyze and solve the statistical problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Demonstrate quant reasoning and prob solving.**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10:</th>
<th>Understand research problems. (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students show the ability to understand research problems in one or more areas of mathematics and statistics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline.**

At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11:</th>
<th>Show an appreciation for history of mathematics. (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.
Students should have an appreciation for the history of the subject, and the sequence of results that has led to the current state of development of one or more areas of mathematics and statistics.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline.**
At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

**M 12: Demonstrate numerical competency. (O: 3)**
Students demonstrate numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate quant reasoning and prob solving.**
At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

**M 13: See connections across fields. (O: 4)**
Students the ability to see connections across fields within mathematics and statistics as well as the ability to see applications of mathematics and statistics to other disciplines.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.**
At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

**M 14: Develop a mathematical intuition. (O: 4)**
Students should develop a mathematical intuition about "how things work" in one or more field within the discipline.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.**
At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

**M 15: Draw conclusions from data. (O: 4)**
Students show the ability to draw conclusions from data, and to develop an appropriate approach to solving problems.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.**
At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

**M 16: Extend solution methods. (O: 4)**
Students should be able to extend solution methods to problems not exactly like in the book, both in a theoretical and applied setting.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.**
At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

**M 17: Explain ideas to nonspecialists. (O: 5)**
Students show the ability to explain ideas to nonspecialists.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate communication skills, oral and written**
At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8110**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8110 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of final exams for each semester.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of Math 8110

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8120**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8120 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of final exams for each semester.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of Math 8120

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8200**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8200 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8220
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8220 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8220

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8310
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8310 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8310

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8420
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8420 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8420

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8440
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8440 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8440

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8510
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8510 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8510

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8520
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8520 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8520

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8530
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8530 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8530

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8610
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8610 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8610
Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8620

At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8620 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8620

Evaluation at thesis defense for statistics

An evaluation form should be used to evaluate each student’s thesis.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Thesis advisor

Evaluation at thesis defense

For each thesis student, the thesis advisor will evaluate all eight measures of achieved student program outcomes on a 4 point scale.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Thesis advisor for each student.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

We specifically evaluated the extent to which students fulfilled the learning outcomes in three 8000 level courses this past Fall: Math 8110, Math 8440 and Math 8510. We found in 8110: On a 4 point scale, students fulfilled the outcomes in the range of 2.4 to 2.9. We found in 8440: On a 4 point scale, students fulfilled the outcomes in the range of 3.2 to 3.7. We found in 8510: On a 4 point scale, students fulfilled the outcomes in the range of 1.8 to 3.1. Statistics assessments: Among 11 graduates (fall2005 to summer 2006), ten of them wrote thesis. All outcomes are ranging from 2 to 4 with 1 to 4 scale. The mean scores for each assessment range from 3.1 to 3.7. Therefore, all thesis students are somewhere between “very good” and “excellent”. For courses assessments, the following statements are furnished by the instructor who taught the courses: Stat 8561 - Twenty five homework and projects were assigned and graded. Three exams including two in-class exams were given. The homework, projects and exams covered all items listed in the "learning outcomes" of the course. The grade distribution is 17A, 11B and 2C. Stat 8440 - In this course, Homework problems, Written Exams, and Final Project were used to assess the learning outcomes of students. Homework problems based on the learning objects were given to students regularly. Students used Splus software extensively to do homework. Almost all the students can successfully solve the homework problems before the due date. Mid-term Written Exams were used to evaluate students' ability to solve problems independently within a given time. Most of the students fared very well in the exams. Each student in the class did a final project. Students had to collect real lifetime data satisfying certain constraints for the project. They wrote Splus code to analyze the survival data by using parametric or semi-parametric regression models. Most of students were able to write clear and structured reports. They found funs and gained real experience in analyzing survival data from medical or biological sciences. There were 18 students registered in this course. Fourteen of them got grade “A”, three of them got grade “B”, and one student got grade “F” because he didn't turn in the final project on time. Overall, the learning of students in this course was successful. Stat 8540 - Classroom discussion is used to assess students' understanding of newly presented material. Homework assignments are used to ensure that students' learning is current and to provide timely assessment of students' levels of understanding. Take-home examinations, projects, and programming assignments can be used to enable them to work on more complicated problems and to assess students' ability to use S-Plus to implement methods covered in the course. The project is used to assess student's ability to use statistical package such as S-Plus to conduct data analysis. Basically, they need to use the learned skill and advanced biostatistical methods to real data problem. 19 students took the course. Most of them got A. Two students received B and one student got C. Two students withdrew. Stat 8630 - In this course, Homework problems, Written Exams, and Final Project were used to assess the learning outcomes of students. Homework problems based on the learning objects were given to students regularly. Students used Splus software extensively to do homework. Almost all the students can successfully solve the homework problems before the due date. Mid-term Written Exams were used to evaluate students' ability to solve problems independently within a given time. Most of the students fared very well in the exams. Each student did a final experimental design project. They were able to design an experiment according to the goal of the experiment. They used SAS to analyze the data from experiment, and wrote project report. Some students did real experiments including design of experiments, collection and analysis of experimental data. They found funs and gained real experience in the process of designing experiments. Among 28 students registered in the course, 18 students got grade “A” and 9 students got grade “B”, one student withdrawn the course. It indicated that the learning of this course was successful Stat 8674 - Homework assignments serve as both learning and assessment tools for understanding and getting familiar with the Monte Carlo and Markov chain methods. The take-home examinations was taken to evaluate the effectiveness of students learning. The exams provide opportunities for students to apply the MCMC to practical problems. Computer project is used to assess student’s ability to use statistical package such as Matlab to conduct data analysis. The project consists of data sets from real applications. It is designed to facilitate independent and creative analysis of real life situation. 19 students took this course. Most students got A. 4 students received B.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Not all classes directly address all outcomes uniformly. For example, in math 8510, statistical estimation theory may not play as large a role as in other classes, and therefore had one of the lower marks. These kinds of conclusions are helping us refine our learning outcomes.
### Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 1)**
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

**SLO 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 2)**
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

**SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 3)**
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

**SLO 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 4)**
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.

**SLO 5: Participates in profession’s learning communities (M: 5)**
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)**
A summary rating derived from culminating papers, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met the target performance level.

**M 2: Faculty STARS standard 2 rating (O: 2)**
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met the target performance level.

**M 3: Faculty STARS standard 3 rating (O: 3)**
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

**Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met the target performance level.

**M 4: Faculty STARS standard 4 rating (O: 4)**
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

**Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met the target performance level.

**M 5: Faculty STARS standard 5 rating (O: 5)**
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O5: Participates in profession’s learning communities**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers met the target performance level.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Maintain and monitor**
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Is committed to student learning and development
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS standard 2 rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Can apply expertise for learning and development
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS standard 3 rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Manages and monitors student learning/development
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS standard 4 rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Reflects on & learns from professional experience
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS standard 5 rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in profession’s learning communities

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
The Middle Childhood Education Advanced Master's underwent a program change in 2004. Our current assessments indicated positive progression toward a program that offers comprehensive knowledge and skills relevant to the middle school concept and concentration area competency as identified by the National Middle School Association (NMSA) and by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Based on our assessments, continued attention will be given to the refinement of the critical points along the newly implemented longitudinal assessment measures in place for the program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Middle Grades Education (LA and SS) TEEMS MAT**

As of: 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 9)**
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**SLO 2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 2)**
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
**SLO 3: Understands student development re: learning (M: 3)**
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

**SLO 4: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 10)**
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**SLO 5: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 5)**
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**SLO 6: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 6)**
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

**SLO 7: Practices professional reflection**
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

**SLO 8: Involves school and community in learning (M: 8)**
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

**SLO 9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 4)**
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**SLO 10: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 1)**
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 7)**
This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating (O: 10)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

**Target for O10: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
73% of candidates met Standard 4:Knows and Uses Multiple Instructional Strategies.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 2)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
68% of candidates met Standard 1:Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Understands student development re: learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

84% of candidates met Standard 2: Understands Student Development Regarding Learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

68% of candidates met Standard 3: Effectively Teach Diverse Groups of Learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 7 rating (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Can effectively plan for instruction**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

68% of all candidates have met Standard 7: Can Effectively Plan for Instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 8 rating (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

56% of all candidates have met Standard 8: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 9 rating (O: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

69% of all candidates have met Standard 9: Practices Professional Reflection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 10 rating (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Involves school and community in learning**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

46% of candidates have met Standard 10:Fosters Relationships Among School and Community.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 5 rating (O: 1)**

Supervisors’ final evaluations, final exams, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O1: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

64% of candidates met Standard 5:Can Motivate and Manage Student Learning.

**M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 6 rating (O: 4)**

Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6.

**Target for O4: Uses communication skills and technology**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

69% of candidates met Standard 6:Uses communication skills and technology.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Maintain and monitor program strengths**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- **Implementation Description:** May 1, 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics/Science Division

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

As the MCE TEEMS program is a new program implemented last academic year, the initial findings indicate that in most standards, the program is close to meeting its goals. Continual faculty monitoring and specific course attention to the standards should result in greater success and improvement.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

The exception to the statement involved standard 10 which addresses community involvement (only 46% met this standard). But this is perhaps to be expected given the infancy of the program.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Multiple and Severe Disabilities MEd**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the five concentrations in Multiple and Severe Disabilities (Autism, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood Special Education, Moderate, severe, and profound Mental Retardation, and Physical and Health Disabilities), is to prepare graduate level teachers who are grounded in research-based curriculum development, instructional technology, data collection and interpretation, and the ethical foundations of the profession. The program prepares teachers to be responsive to the learning needs of students, the concerns and questions of parents, and the collaborative needs of related professionals. The program provides students with recommendations for certification in Special Education: General Curriculum or Special Education: Adapted Curriculum. New program plans were developed and approved during 05-06 for this program. During 05-06 the program had approximately 120 students; 28 students completed the program.

### Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students. |
| Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Understands student development regarding learning (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development. |
| Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners. |
| Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills. |
| Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation. |
| Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom. |
| Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O/O 7: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 7)
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 8)
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 9: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 10: Involves school and community in learning (M: 10)
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)
Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
88% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 2)
Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Target for O2: Understands student development regarding learning
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)</th>
<th>Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners</strong></td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>90% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)</th>
<th>Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance at the final practicum rating are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</strong></td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor at the last practicum evaluation rating. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>77% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)</th>
<th>Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Can motivate and manage students for learning</strong></td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>85% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 6)</th>
<th>Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Uses communication skills and technology</strong></td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>90% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 7)</th>
<th>Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Can effectively plan for instruction</strong></td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>83% of students were rated at or above the expected level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 8) | |
Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.

**Target for O8: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

87% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 9)**

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9.

**Target for O9: Practices professional reflection**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

88% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 10)**

Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

88% of students were rated at or above the expected level.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Add Rubric**

Easterbrooks will indicate on her syllabus that students need to use a 4 x 4 rubric for their student change project (for consistency).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** January 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Susan Easterbrooks

**Lesson Plans**

Gallagher will change her EXC 7660 syllabus so that students list in their lesson plans the specific number of the Georgia Performance Standard that the lesson addresses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** January 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Peggy Gallagher

**Monitor Data in New Program**

The EPSE graduate program faculty in MSD will implement the new approved highly qualified programs, monitor the STARS data collection process, assess whether or not the new program data collection process matches the new program, and make recommendations for appropriate changes as needed.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Implementation Description:** June 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSD Program Coordinator

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Indicators are positive in all areas. Students continue to meet the program learning outcomes.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2005-2006 Music Bachelors**  
(Assessment Data by Section)  
(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that is consistent with the urban context and mission of Georgia State University, and that serves the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellence through experiences of lasting value to all stakeholders.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music (M: 8, 12)
Perceives, analyzes, and explains the theoretical structure of music in styles and genres from pre-Renaissance through contemporary eras, and demonstrates independent synthesis of this knowledge when listening, creating, and performing.

**Relevant Associations:** National Association of Schools of Music, Ga Professional Standards Commission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication--major
2. Collaboration--major
3. Critical Thinking--major
4. Critical Thinking--core
5. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2. Quality professional programs
3. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Learning-centered environment that supports individual learning
2. Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Places music in historical and cultural context (M: 9)
Places Western and non-Western music in historical and cultural context.

**Relevant Associations:** National Association of Schools of Music, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, GA Professional Standards Commission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication--major
2. Critical Thinking--major
3. Critical Thinking--core
4. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2. Quality professional programs
3. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Learning-centered environment that supports individual learning
2. Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Technology in listening, performing, creating (M: 7, 11)
Uses appropriate applications of technology in listening, creating, and performing music.

**Relevant Associations:** National Association of Schools of Music, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, GA Professional Standards Commission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Performs in ensembles and as a soloist (M: 10)**
Performs diverse repertoire with advanced levels of musicianship in large ensembles, small ensembles, and as a soloist
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty
4.3 Technology
4.4 External Relations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Composes and improvises music (M: 6)**
Using knowledge of instruments and the voice, composes and improvises music in imitation, in original works, and/or with non-traditional sounds
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Oral Communication--major
4 Oral Communication--core
5 Collaboration--major
6 Collaboration--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major
10 Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies (M: 3, 5)**
Demonstrates functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 7: Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians (M: 4)
Demonstrates skills of oral, written, and verbal presentation and teaching to support sharing music with lay audiences and other musicians
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 8: Knowledge and skills for career development (M: 2)
Demonstrates knowledge, synthesis, skills, problem-solving, and application consistent with careers relevant to a selected concentration within the School of Music
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 9: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 1)
This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Critical thinking Assessments (O: 9)
Student tests and papers will employ aspects of, or the entire above described rubric, for analysis of critical thinking skills with respect to music within society. The projected number of students to be assessed is 240 from three different sections and instructors. A rubric will be used in order for students to determine the functions of music within a given society. It will be applied whenever appropriate to the course content.

**Target for O9: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
To be determined

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
Findings to be added in Summer of 2007

**M 2: knowledge/skills for career development (O: 8)**
Admission to upper-division by qualifying exam indicates progress toward career development; capstone experiences and portfolios indicate relevant exit competencies

**Target for O8: Knowledge and skills for career development**
90 percent or better of students who complete first 2 years satisfactorily admitted to upper division at satisfactory or higher levels; 95% of exiting students complete capstone requirements with ratings of "very good" or better

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
60 of 65 students (92%) admitted to upper division performance for Fall 2006; exiting composition projects rated very good or better for 10 of 11 students; exiting music management and technology projects rated very good or better for 12 of 18 students

**M 3: Proficiency in advanced conducting (O: 6)**
Student evidences advanced conducting knowledge and proficiency as evidenced by satisfactory or better performance on rubric-based grading system.

**Target for O6: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies**
At least 80 percent of students receive ratings of satisfactory, excellent, or outstanding in Mus 4480 and/or Mus 4490 (advanced conducting classes).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
2 students received satisfactory, 4 received excellent, and 4 received outstanding assessments in Mus 4490. In MUS 4480, 100 percent of students (6 enrolled) received outstanding ratings.

**M 4: Teaching music (O: 7)**
Student demonstrates oral, written, verbal, and musical skills in sharing and teaching others through satisfactory or better performance in student teaching

**Target for O7: Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians**
80 percent of students achieve satisfactory or better progress in instrumental techniques, pedagogy classes, and student teaching

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
38 or 47 enrolled students in relevant classes earned "outstanding" ratings; 8 received "very good" ratings, and 3 received "satisfactory" ratings

**M 5: Piano and conducting proficiency (O: 6)**
Students demonstrate satisfactory or better proficiency in Piano IV (MUS 2720) and Basic Conducting (MUS 2490) as indicated by rubric-based grades.

**Target for O6: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies**
80 percent or better of students demonstrate satisfactory, excellent, or outstanding performance in functional keyboard and conducting as evidenced by rubric-based grades of C or better on final evaluations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100 percent of students received ratings of excellent or outstanding in Piano IV and 100 percent received ratings of satisfactory or better in Conducting.

**M 6: Analysis of improvisation and composition (O: 5)**
The student improvises and composes music at a satisfactory or better standard as indicated by rubric-based evaluations in Mus 3010 (Basic Improvisation) and Composition Seminar (Mus 4210).

**Target for O5: Composes and improvises music**
AT least 80 percent of students demonstrate satisfactory or better progress in composing and improvising as indicated by rubric-based grades in Mus 3010 and Mus 4820.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100 percent of students received very good or outstanding assessments of work for Mus 3010, and 100 percent received assessments of "outstanding" in Mus 4820.
M 7: Technology proficiency (O: 3)

Students meet or exceed minimum satisfactory standard in computer applications in music class (Mus 4730) as demonstrated by grade of C or higher, defined qualitatively by rubrics.

**Target for O3: Technology in listening, performing, creating**

At least 80 percent of students satisfy the computer music proficiency as demonstrated by a grade of C or better in Mus 4730.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100 percent of students enrolled earned a grade of B or better in Mus 4730, SP 2006.

M 8: Satisfactory completion of Theory IV (O: 1)

Student will demonstrate prescribed knowledge and proficiency as indicated by grade of C or better in Theory IV.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music**

At least 80 percent of enrolled students will show satisfactory (grade of C) or better performance in Theory IV and Music History II.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

44/52 enrolled students scored C or better in Theory IV (84.6%), with 9 As, 16 Bs, and 19 Cs. 18/19 (94.7%) students in Music History II received grades of C or higher, with class mean of 2.6.

M 9: Music History and World Music (O: 2)

Student completes Music History II and World Music with satisfactory or better achievement as stipulated by rubric.

**Target for O2: Places music in historical and cultural context**

80 percent of students earn grade of C or better in Mus 4810 and Mus 4820.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In SP 06, 18/19 (94.7%) students in Mus History II scored grade of C or better. 12 of 13 students (92.3%) received grades of C or better in Mus 4820 (world music).

M 10: Repertoire analysis (O: 4)

Programs are reviewed for diversity of genres, eras, composers, and styles.

**Target for O4: Performs in ensembles and as a soloist**

Through large ensemble, small ensemble, and solo performance, students perform music representing at least 5 or more composers, genres, styles, and eras.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Systematic review of programs indicates the standard is far exceeded in the breadth of composers, styles, genres, and eras represented in student performances.

M 11: Advanced computer for music technology students (O: 3)

Music technology students demonstrate satisfactory or better progress in MUS 4981 (Advanced Topics in Computer Music), as indicated by grading rubric.

**Target for O3: Technology in listening, performing, creating**

At least 80 percent of students earn grades of C or better (satisfactory or better as defined by grading rubric) in Mus 4981.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100 percent of enrolled students showed satisfactory or better progress in Mus 4981. 3/5 were acceptable; 1 was very good; and 1 was excellent.

M 12: Semester juries (O: 1)

Each student is rated on his or performance by a panel (jury) of faculty at the end of each semester. Ratings provide qualitative evidence of progress and indicate readiness for advancement to next level.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music**

Music Management: must progress satisfactorily or beyond through at least 4 performance levels Music technology and composition: must progress satisfactorily or beyond through at least 6 performance levels Music education: must progress satisfactorily or beyond through at least 7 performance levels Performance: must progress satisfactorily or beyond through at least 8 performance levels

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Jury placement level distributions for SP06: Juries performed F06: 182 individual performance juries Placements: Level I: 7 Level II: 53 Level III: 5 Level IV: 47 Level V: 12 Level VI: 35 Level VII: 5 Level VIII: 18 Of 182 juried students, 175 were advanced and 7 were retained. Of those advanced, ratings were: 40 satisfactory advancement 100 excellent advancement 42 outstanding advancement
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Critical Thinking Assessment
Periodic meetings will be held of the humanities(core) music faculty during the fall semester of 2006 in order to finalize the critical thinking course content and assessment methodology. Implementation of any curricular or instructional changes will take place during the spring semester of 2007.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: January 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Marva Carter

Improve learning outcomes and rubrics
Increase faculty use of measurable student learning outcomes and rubrics in courses and for non-course requirements, e.g., juries, recitals, exit projects, etc.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Advanced computer for music technology students | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating
Measure: Analysis of improvisation and composition | Outcome/Objective: Composes and improvises music
Measure: Knowledge/skills for career development | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge and skills for career development
Measure: Music History and World Music | Outcome/Objective: Places music in historical and cultural context
Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting efficiencies
Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting efficiencies
Measure: Repertoire analysis | Outcome/Objective: Performs in ensembles and as a soloist
Measure: Satisfactory completion of Theory IV | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music
Measure: Semester juries | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music
Measure: Teaching music | Outcome/Objective: Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians
Measure: Technology proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating

Implementation Description: AY07
Responsible Person/Group: faculty; ad hoc assessment committee
Additional Resources: Sufficient faculty in SOM to provide incentives and release time for this additional service

Targeted assessments
Select targeted areas, e.g., technology, conducting, etc., for more focused longitudinal assessment of student progress.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Advanced computer for music technology students | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating
Measure: Analysis of improvisation and composition | Outcome/Objective: Composes and improvises music
Measure: Knowledge/skills for career development | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge and skills for career development
Measure: Music History and World Music | Outcome/Objective: Places music in historical and cultural context
Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting efficiencies
Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting efficiencies
Measure: Repertoire analysis | Outcome/Objective: Performs in ensembles and as a soloist
Measure: Satisfactory completion of Theory IV | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music
Measure: Semester juries | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music
Measure: Teaching music | Outcome/Objective: Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians
Measure: Technology proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating

Implementation Description: AY07
Responsible Person/Group: faculty; ad hoc assessment committee
Additional Resources: Sufficient SOM faculty and release time to provide incentives and release time for this additional service

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The SOM has been strengthening admission requirements and refining audition assessments to provide a clearer picture of entering students' abilities. Increasing selectivity has resulted in a stronger student body, a larger percentage of whom are now making consistent sequential success through their programs. The assessment data give evidence that SOM faculty are highly engaged, often one-on-one with their students, and that performance criteria are consistently met at high levels because of the intensity of faculty oversight and involvement. In addition, data indicate that students are well-prepared with historical, theoretical, and pedagogical knowledge.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The SOM needs to continue to refine the bases of assessment. The challenge in the arts is that reductionistic approaches generally fail to provide for the qualitative and expressive dimensions of achievement that are the sine qua non of career success in music. Quantified knowledge and skills are often surpassed by artists who possess extremely strong expressive capacity. The School needs to continue to differentiate between knowledge/skills that can be subjected to quantitative data, those that can be assessed using rubrics, and those that require non-typical assessments that are inherent to the arts.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Music Masters
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that is consistent with the urban context and mission of Georgia State University, and that serves the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellence through experiences of lasting value to all stakeholders.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Applications of technology (M: 6)
Demonstrates accurate applications of technology in theoretical, performance, analytical, research, and pedagogical dimensions of music.
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style (M: 1)
Demonstrates advanced levels of repertoire knowledge, technique, artistry, and style appropriate to a diverse representation of composers, historical eras, performance practices, and interpretive guidelines.
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill (M: 2)
Demonstrates advanced analytical knowledge and skill for tonal and/or post-tonal music.
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience
6.7.1 Financial Support

SLO 4: Research and literature/reertoire knowledge (M: 3)
Demonstrates research skills in music and advanced understanding of the literature and repertoire appropriate for his or her concentration.

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.1 Faculty
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Historical-cultural understanding in context (M: 4)**
Demonstrates advanced historical-cultural understanding of music from one or more historical periods and in global context.

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.1 Faculty
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 6: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts (M: 5)**
Demonstrates advanced levels of understanding and skill for teaching music in studio, classroom, and community settings.

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.1 Faculty
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
4.4 External Relations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Juries and public performances (O: 2)**
Student progress in performance is assessed by a faculty panel at the end of each semester; all solo and chamber performances are pre-assessed in a jury and assessed by faculty during the public performance.

**Target for O2: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style**
90 to 95 percent of admitted students successfully matriculate through performance expectations with ratings of very good or better as described by rubrics

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
11 master’s students performed public recitals, of which 10 were judged excellent or outstanding and 1 very good. Of 33 end-of-semester juried performances, 28 were rated as excellent or outstanding, and 5 as very good.

**M 2: proficiency in tonal and post-tonal analysis (O: 3)**
Student evidences analytical ability at satisfactory or higher levels in analysis of both tonal and post-tonal music.
Target for **O3**: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill

80 percent or more of students evidence achievement at satisfactory or higher levels in Mus 6450 (tonal) and Mus 6460 (post-tonal music)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In Mus 6450, 6 students were rated as satisfactory, 6 as very good, and 2 as excellent. In Mus 6460, 1 student demonstrated satisfactory progress, 1 very good progress, and 4 excellent progress.

**M 3: Research skills/knowledge of literature (O: 4)**

Courses, recital repertoire, and exit projects indicate very good or better knowledge of research skills and literature

**Target for O4: Research and literature repertoire knowledge**

90 to 95 percent of students demonstrate achievement at the very good or excellent level in research courses, recital repertoire, and comprehensive exams/exit projects

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Of 25 students in research, 20 were excellent, 3 were very good, 1 was satisfactory, and 1 was unsatisfactory. Recital repertoire selection was rated as very good or outstanding for 100 percent of performed recitals (10). Comprehensive exams and exit projects were rated very good or outstanding for 100 percent of students.

**M 4: Historical-cultural understanding of music (O: 5)**

Students demonstrate satisfactory or better achievement in relevant course work as indicated by rubric-based grading

**Target for O5: Historical-cultural understanding in context**

90 to 95 percent of students achieve at the very good or outstanding levels in relevant course work

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Of 7 enrolled students, 100 percent were rated as having made excellent or outstanding progress.

**M 5: Individual and class teaching skills (O: 6)**

Students evidence satisfactory or better progress in pedagogy classes and other course work related directly to teaching, as indicated by rubric-based grades

**Target for O6: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts**

90 to 95 percent of students achieve very good or outstanding ratings in coursework and/or experiences directly related to music teaching

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

5/5 students received excellent or outstanding assessments in pedagogy of music theory

**M 6: accurate application of technology (O: 1)**

Student demonstrates satisfactory or better achievement on relevant courses and projects as indicated by rubric-based assessment/grades

**Target for O1: Applications of technology**

90 to 95 percent of students achieve very good or outstanding ratings on technology-specific courses and technology-related projects

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Of 7 students enrolled in the music technology class, 1 was satisfactory, 1 was very good, and 5 were outstanding

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Rubrics and measurable student learning outcomes**

Continue to develop rubrics and measurable student learning outcomes for more precise assessment; will require professional development for faculty unaccustomed to these items

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: accurate application of technology | Outcome/Objective: Applications of technology
- Measure: Historical-cultural understanding of music | Outcome/Objective: Historical-cultural understanding in context
- Measure: Individual and class teaching skills | Outcome/Objective: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts
- Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style
- Measure: proficiency in tonal and post-tonal analysis | Outcome/Objective: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill
- Measure: Research skills/knowledge of literature | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature repertoire knowledge

**Implementation Description:** AY 07

**Responsible Person/Group:** faculty and ad hoc assessment committee

**Additional Resources:** Time release is essential -- it is impossible to complete this work given the workloads of faculty in the school of music
Student Portfolios
Begin process of electronic portfolios for students based on program objectives

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: accurate application of technology | Outcome/Objective: Applications of technology  
Measure: Historical-cultural understanding of music | Outcome/Objective: Historical-cultural understanding in context  
Measure: Individual and class teaching skills | Outcome/Objective: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts  
Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style  
Measure: Proficiency in tonal and post-tonal analysis | Outcome/Objective: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill  
Measure: Research skills/knowledge of literature | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

**Implementation Description:** AY07  
**Responsible Person/Group:** faculty; ad hoc assessment committee  
**Additional Resources:** Sufficient faculty in SOM to carry standard workloads plus this additional service

Targeted Data Collection
Choose select areas for more targeted analysis, e.g., recital program notes analysis for both content and writing

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style  
Measure: Research skills/knowledge of literature | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

**Implementation Description:** AY07  
**Responsible Person/Group:** faculty and ad hoc assessment committee  
**Additional Resources:** Release time, sufficient faculty in SOM to cover loads as well as these additional expectations

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
SOM assessments indicate that the growing selectivity of graduate students is effecting high-level performance that is consistent across programs, and that students are making sequential progress through their degrees. Most students complete the master’s in two full-time years of study. Ph.D. students (not assessed in this program) are also representing extremely high levels of competence. Indicators suggest that the intensity of faculty oversight of performance instruction is yielding extraordinarily strong achievement in that area.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The School of Music needs to continue its efforts to refine and articulate clearly student learning outcomes and the data analysis needed to make the achievement of students transparent. While performance standards are high, music students (in all schools) tend to shortchange theoretical and research-based study in favor of performing. The SOM needs to develop systematic student documentation to strengthen the balance between students’ performing and academic pursuits.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing (BFLSON) is to: educate nurse clinicians, practitioners, scholars, educators, leaders, and researchers; develop health-related community partnerships; and engage in research and other forms of scholarship. This education is provided in a multi-cultural urban setting, and is accomplished through a unique professional and academic interdisciplinary environment. This community-focused approach enriches student learning, fosters leadership development, and furthers the pursuit of science. The BFLSON admits 56 students twice a year and graduates approximately 100 students a year.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Standards of Professional Nursing (M: 4)**
Apply current standards of professional nursing practice in providing care to individuals, families, groups, and the community.

Relevant Associations: CCNE

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major  
3 Oral Communication--major  
7 Critical Thinking--major
**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Quality professional programs
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6. Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: Value of Professional Commitment (M: 5, 6)**
Demonstrate an awareness of the value of professional commitment.

Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
5. Collaboration--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Quality professional programs
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6. Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 3: Collaborate (M: 15)**
Collaborate with individuals, families, groups, the community and other health care providers to maximize positive health patterns.

Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3. Oral Communication--major
5. Collaboration--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6. Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 4: Respect for Diversity (M: 8, 16, 18)**
Demonstrate respect for human diversity when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups, or the community.

Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Global, cultural perspectives
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6. Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces (M: 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17)**
Incorporate knowledge of the effects of sociopolitical, economic and ecological forces on nursing and provision of health care.

Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3. Oral Communication--major
5. Collaboration--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
9. Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6. Undergraduate Experience
### SLO 6: Ethical and legal issues (M: 1, 14)
Incorporate knowledge of ethical and legal issues in providing nursing care.
Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication--major
- Oral Communication--major
- Collaboration--major
- Critical Thinking--major
- Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 7: Nursing Research (M: 2, 3)
Integrate knowledge from nursing research in caring for individuals, families, groups and the community.
Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication--major
- Oral Communication--major
- Collaboration--major
- Critical Thinking--major
- Contemporary Issues--major
- Quantitative Skills--major
- Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 8: Knowledge of self, science and humanities (M: 20, 21)
Integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups or the community.
Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication--major
- Oral Communication--major
- Critical Thinking--major
- Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Quality professional programs
- Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 9: Critical Thinking (M: 9, 19)
Apply concepts and theories as a basis for problem solving, decision-making, and critical thinking in nursing.
Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication--major
- Oral Communication--major
- Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings
### M 1: Clinical Evaluation Tool - ethical and legal (O: 6)
The Clinical Performance Evaluation tool is used to assess student performance in the clinical setting.

**Target for O6: Ethical and legal issues**
95% of the students will receive a grade of satisfactory for their performance in the clinical practica courses (NURS 3510, NURS 3610, NURS 3710, NURS 3810, NURS 3910, NURS 4610) in the section: incorporate knowledge of the ethical and legal issues in providing nursing care.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- Fall semester 2005: 100%
- Spring semester 2006: 100%

### M 2: NUR 3500 (O: 7)
Students will receive a grade of C or higher in NUR 3500 Nursing Research.

**Target for O7: Nursing Research**
95% of the students will receive a C or higher in a selected research course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- Fall semester 2005: 100%
- Spring semester 2006: 100%
- Summer semester 2006: 100%

### M 3: Alumni Nursing Research (O: 7)
Graduates will participate in quality assurance and/or research initiatives.

**Target for O7: Nursing Research**
10% of the graduates will report participating in quality assurance and/or research initiatives within 3 years of graduation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
- Data collection in progress.

### M 4: Clinical Evaluation Tool - Professional Standards (O: 1)
The Clinical Performance Evaluation tool is used to assess student performance in the clinical setting.

**Target for O1: Standards of Professional Nursing**
95% of the students will receive a grade of satisfactory for their performance in the clinical practica courses (NURS 3510, NURS 3610, NURS 3710, NURS 3810, NURS 3910, NURS 4610) in the section: Demonstrate application of current standards of professional nursing practice.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- Fall semester 2005: 100%
- Spring semester 2006: 99%
- Summer semester 2006: 100%

### M 5: Sigma Theta Tau (O: 2)
Students will be eligible for membership in Sigma Theta Tau International, the honor society for nurses.

**Target for O2: Value of Professional Commitment**
35% of the juniors and seniors will be eligible for membership in Sigma Theta Tau International.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- Fall semester 2005: 35% were eligible and invited to join.
- Spring semester 2006: 35% were eligible and invited to join.

### M 6: Professional Nursing Organization Involvement (O: 2)
Graduates will be actively involved in professional nursing organizations.

**Target for O2: Value of Professional Commitment**
15% of the graduates will be actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
- Data collection in progress.

### M 7: Clinical Evaluation Tool - Sociopolitical etc. (O: 5)
The Clinical Performance Evaluation tool is used to assess student performance in the clinical setting.

**Target for O5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces**
95% of the students will receive a grade of satisfactory for their performance in the clinical practica portion of their courses (NURS 3510, NURS 3610, NURS 3710, NURS 3810, NURS 3910, NURS 4610) where they incorporate their knowledge of the effects of sociopolitical, economic and ecological forces on nursing and the provision of health care.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- Fall Semester 2005: 100%
- Spring Semester 2006: 99%
- Summer Semester 2006: 99%
### M 8: End of Program Evaluation - Culturally Competent (O: 4)
Graduating seniors will complete the EBI End of Program Evaluation in the last semester of their nursing program.

**Target for O4: Respect for Diversity**
The graduating seniors will achieve a mean score of 5 or greater (range 1-7; range greater than moderately to extremely) on EBI End of Program Evaluation on the following items: To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: #35. provide culturally competent care.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
2005-2006: Mean 5.66

### M 9: End of Program Evaluation - Integrate Theory (O: 9)
Graduating seniors will complete the EBI End of Program Evaluation in the last semester of their nursing program.

**Target for O9: Critical Thinking**
The graduating seniors will achieve a mean score of 5 or greater (range 1-7; range greater than moderately to extremely) on EBI End of Program Evaluation: #57 To what degree did the nursing program teach you to integrate theory to develop a foundation for practice.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
2005-2006: Mean 4.41

### M 10: End of Program Evaluation - Health Policies (O: 5)
Graduating seniors will complete the EBI End of Program Evaluation in the last semester of their nursing program.

**Target for O5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces**
The graduating seniors will achieve a mean score of 5 or greater (range 1-7; range greater than moderately to extremely) on EBI End of Program Evaluation on the following items: To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: #53 Understand the effects of health policies on diverse populations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
2005-2006: Mean 5.18

### M 11: End of Program Evaluation - Global Health Care (O: 5)
Students complete the EBI End of Program Evaluation in the last semester of their nursing program.

**Target for O5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces**
The graduating seniors will achieve a mean score of 5 or greater (range 1-7; range greater than moderately to extremely) on EBI End of Program Evaluation on the following items: To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: #54. Understand the global health care environment.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
2005-2005 Mean 4.56

### M 12: End of Program Evaluation - Health Care Delivery (O: 5)
Students complete the EBI End of Program Evaluation in the last semester of their nursing program.

**Target for O5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces**
The graduating seniors will achieve a mean score of 5 or greater (range 1-7; range greater than moderately to extremely) on EBI End of Program Evaluation on the following items: To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: #55. Understand how health care delivery systems are organized.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
2005-2005 Mean 4.45

### M 13: End of Program Evaluation - Cost Factors (O: 5)
Students complete the EBI End of Program Evaluation in the last semester of their nursing program.

**Target for O5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces**
The graduating seniors will achieve a mean score of 5 or greater (range 1-7; range greater than moderately to extremely) on EBI End of Program Evaluation on the following items: To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: #56. Incorporate knowledge of cost factors when delivering care.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
2005-2006: Mean 4.18

### M 14: End of Program Evaluation - Ethical (O: 6)
Students complete the EBI End of Program Evaluation in the last semester of their nursing program.
**Target for O6: Ethical and legal issues**
The graduating seniors will achieve a mean score of 5 or greater (range 1-7; range greater than moderately to extremely) on EBI End of Program Evaluation on the following items: To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: #52. Apply an ethical decision-making framework to clinical situations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
2005-2006 Mean 5.12

**M 15: Clinical Evaluation Tool - Multidisciplinary (O: 3)**
The Clinical Performance Evaluation tool is used to assess student performance in the clinical setting.

**Target for O3: Collaborate**
95% of the students will receive a grade of satisfactory for their performance in the clinical practica courses (NURS 3510, NURS 3610, NURS 3710, NURS 3810, NURS 3910, NURS 4610) in the section : The student will engage in multidisciplinary activities.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Fall semester 2005: 100% Spring semester 2006: 99% Summer semester 2006: 100%

**M 16: Clinical Evaluation Tool - Diversity (O: 4)**
The Clinical Performance Evaluation tool is used to assess student performance in the clinical setting.

**Target for O4: Respect for Diversity**
95% of the students will receive a grade of satisfactory for their performance in the clinical practica courses (NURS 3510, NURS 3610, NURS 3710, NURS 3810, NURS 3910, NURS 4610) in the section : The student will assess clients in a holistic process.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Fall semester 2005 - 99% Spring semester 2006 - 100% Summer semester 2006 - 100%

**M 17: NUR 3300 Grade (O: 5)**
Students will receive a grade of C or higher in NUR 3300 Health Policy.

**Target for O5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces**
95% of the students will receive a grade of C or higher in a selected policy course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Fall 2005 - 100% Spring 2006 - 100% Summer 2006 - 100%

**M 18: End of Program Evaluation - Vulnerable Populations (O: 4)**
Graduating seniors will complete the EBI End of Program Evaluation in the last semester of their nursing program.

**Target for O4: Respect for Diversity**
The graduating seniors will achieve a mean score of 5 or greater (range 1-7; range greater than moderately to extremely) on EBI End of Program Evaluation on the following items: To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: #33. act as an advocate for vulnerable populations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
2005-2006: Mean 5.55

**M 19: Critical Thinking (O: 9)**
100% of graduating seniors will take a standardized test on critical thinking (ERI Critical Thinking Test)

**Target for O9: Critical Thinking**
85% of the graduating seniors taking a standardized critical thinking test will receive a passing score on their first attempt. Passing will be considered scoring at the national average or higher.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
Graduating students for December 2005 and May 2006 have completed the critical thinking test but the data compilation is in process.

**M 20: NCLEX (O: 8)**
NCLEX first time pass rates

**Target for O8: Knowledge of self, science and humanities**
80% of the graduates of the undergraduate generic program who take the NCLEX will pass on the first attempt.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
2005 - 91.75 % of students passed on first attempt 2006 - First quarter: 100% of students passed on first attempt. 2006 - Second quarter: Unofficially 91% of the students passed on their first attempt.
Students will take and pass a standardized exit exam in their final semester prior to graduation. RN to BSN students will complete an exit activity prior to graduation.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of self, science and humanities**

90% of the graduates of the undergraduate generic program will have a passing score on the exit examination on their first attempt. 100% of the RN to BSN students will complete the required exit activity successfully.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

December 2005 - 40% of students passed the exit exam on the first attempt; 100% of RN BS students successfully completed the exit activity. May 2006 - 53% of students passed the exit exam on the first attempt; 100% of RN BS students successfully completed the exit activity.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Alumni Data**

An alumni survey has been developed and IRB approval has been obtained to do data collection on a variety of factors related to our graduates. The survey will be administered by phone contact.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Alumni Nursing Research | **Outcome/Objective:** Nursing Research
- **Measure:** Professional Nursing Organization Involvement | **Outcome/Objective:** Value of Professional Commitment

**Implementation Description:** December 2006.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Krista Meinersmann, Bridget Doerr, and Cathy Gebhardt

**Critical Thinking**

The results of the critical thinking assessment for the December 2005 and May 2006 graduates needs to be compiled.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Critical Thinking | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking

**Implementation Description:** October 10, 2006

**Responsible Person/Group:** Associate Director Undergraduate Program and Administrative Coordinator

**End of Program Evaluation**

The timing and administration of the end of program evaluation needs to be reviewed. It is probable that the current schedule is such that students are anxious and in a hurry when completing the tool.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** End of Program Evaluation - Cost Factors | **Outcome/Objective:** Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces
- **Measure:** End of Program Evaluation - Global Health Care | **Outcome/Objective:** Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces
- **Measure:** End of Program Evaluation - Health Care Delivery | **Outcome/Objective:** Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces
- **Measure:** End of Program Evaluation - Integrate Theory | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking

**Implementation Description:** Fall Semester 2006

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director and Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program

**Exit exam**

A re-evaluation of the passing standard for the exit exam needs to be conducted to see if the selected standard is appropriate.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Exit Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of self, science and humanities

**Implementation Description:** Academic Year 2006-2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Committee

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

The assessment shows that the Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing continues to improve their NCLEX first time pass rate. This was a high priority item for the school and it has been achieved. At the same time the first time pass rate on the senior exit exam has decreased. It is probable that the higher exit exam passing standard that was implemented in 2005-2006 contributed to the lower first time pass rate on the exit exam. However, it is also probable that this change contributed to the increased NCLEX first time pass rate.
When looking at the two outcomes the increased NCLEX first time pass rate is the more important measure of program success.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The results of the end of program evaluation show a less than optimal performance in several areas of assessment. The administration of this evaluation tool has coincided with the exit exam process and final exams. This is a time of high stress and anxiety in the student body. It is probable that changing the timing and administration procedures will give a more accurate reflection of our performance. Graduates of the program who informally share feedback with faculty after passing their NCLEX on the first attempt give a very different picture of our performance. They consistently comment on the quality of their educational experience.

---
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing are: to educate nurse clinicians, practitioners, scholars, educators, leaders, and researchers; to develop health-related community partnerships; and to engage in research and other forms of scholarship. This education is provided in a multi-cultural urban setting, and is accomplished through a unique professional and academic interdisciplinary environment. Our community-focused approach enriches student learning, fosters leadership development, and furthers the pursuit of science. Continue

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Integrating Knowledge into Practice (M: 1, 2)
Integrate knowledge of self, science and the humanities in advanced practice nursing.

Relevant Associations:
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- National Organization of Nurse Practitioners
- American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynercologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Activities for Improvement of Health (M: 3, 4)
Initiate activities that promote nursing and the improvement of health and health care

Relevant Associations:
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- National Organization of Nurse Practitioners
- American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynercologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.3 Quality professional programs

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Participation in Research (M: 4, 5)
Engage in research to support and promote nursing knowledge and to improve advanced practice nursing

Relevant Associations:
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- National Organization of Nurse Practitioners
- American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynercologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 3 Oral Communication--major
Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Collaboration in Provision of Health Care (M: 3)
Collaborate with individuals, families, communities and others for the purpose of providing nursing care and promoting health and wellness.

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health) National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynercologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 Collaboration--major
6 Collaboration--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
13 Technology--major
14 Technology--core

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

SLO 5: Assessment of Factors Affecting Health Care (M: 3, 5)
Analyze the influence of socio-political, economic, and ecological forces on nursing practice, health, health care delivery, and health care providers.

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health) National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynercologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 Collaboration--major
6 Collaboration--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major
10 Contemporary Issues--core

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

SLO 6: Legal and Ethical Issues in Advanced Nursing (M: 6)
Incorporate knowledge of legal and ethical issues in advanced practice nursing.

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health) National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynercologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 Collaboration--major
6 Collaboration--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major
10 Contemporary Issues--core
### Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 7: Professional Commitment (M: 3, 4, 5)
Demonstrate professional commitment.

Relevant Associations:
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- National Organization of Nurse Practitioners
- American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 5 | Collaboration--major |
| 6 | Collaboration--core |
| 7 | Critical Thinking--major |
| 8 | Critical Thinking--core |
| 9 | Contemporary Issues--major |
| 10 | Contemporary Issues--core |

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 8: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specialization (M: 3, 7)
Demonstrate behaviors consistent with the selected advanced practice role.

Relevant Associations:
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- National Organization of Nurse Practitioners
- American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 3 | Oral Communication--major |
| 4 | Oral Communication--core |
| 5 | Collaboration--major |
| 6 | Collaboration--core |
| 7 | Critical Thinking--major |
| 8 | Critical Thinking--core |
| 9 | Contemporary Issues--major |
| 10 | Contemporary Issues--core |

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 9: Theory as a Basis for Advanced Practice Nursing (M: 8)
Evaluate concepts and theories in nursing as a basis for advanced practice nursing

Relevant Associations:
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- National Organization of Nurse Practitioners
- American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 1 | Written Communication--major |
| 2 | Written Communication--core |
| 7 | Critical Thinking--major |
| 8 | Critical Thinking--core |

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Success in Certification (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates will be successful in passing the certification examination in their specialty area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Integrating Knowledge into Practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of master's graduates of the master's program who take a certification exam in their areas of master's specialization within one year after graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.1% (37/44) reported they are employed as certified advanced practice nurses one year post graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **M 2: Success in MS Nursing Program (O: 1)** |
| Students will successfully progress in and complete their coursework required for the completion of a M.S. degree in nursing. |
| **Target for O1: Integrating Knowledge into Practice** |
| 75% of students who enroll in and successfully complete their first semester of master's level coursework will successfully complete the requirements for graduation with a M.S. degree in nursing. |
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met** |
| In 2005-2006 218 students were enrolled in our master’s program; 10 (4.5%) students were suspended; 42 (19.3%) graduated. 208 (95.4%) were successfully progressing through the program or successfully completed the program. |

| **M 3: Practice in Specialty Area (O: 2, 4, 5, 7, 8)** |
| Master's graduates will be practicing in their area of master's specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Target for O2: Activities for Improvement of Health** |
| 85% of master's graduates will be practicing in their area of master's specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met** |
| 85% (17/20) were practicing in their area of master’s specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Target for O4: Collaboration in Provision of Health Care** |
| 85% of master's graduates will be practicing in their area of master's specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met** |
| 85% (17/20) were practicing in their area of master’s specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Target for O5: Assessment of Factors Affecting Health Care** |
| 85% of master's graduates will be practicing in their area of master's specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met** |
| 85% (17/20) were practicing in their area of master’s specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Target for O7: Professional Commitment** |
| 85% of master's graduates will be practicing in their area of master's specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met** |
| 85% (17/20) were practicing in their area of master’s specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Target for O8: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specialization** |
| 85% of master's graduates will be practicing in their area of master's specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met** |
| 85% (17/20) were practicing in their area of master’s specialization by 1 year post-graduation. |

| **M 4: Scholarly Productivity (O: 2, 3, 7)** |
| Graduates will seek post-masters education and/or be involved in scholarly activities. |
| **Target for O2: Activities for Improvement of Health** |
| 10% of master's graduates will be involved in some kind of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation. 5% of master's graduates will see post-master's education by 5 years post-graduation. |
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met** |
| By 5 years post-graduation: 38.5% (5/13) of master's graduates served as a consultant 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a referred journal 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a non-referred journal 61.5% (8/13) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting 30.8% (4/13) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 76.9% (10/13) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities. 7.7% |
Target for O3: Participation in Research

10% of master’s graduates will be involved in some kind of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation. 5% of master’s graduates will see post-master’s education by 5 years post-graduation.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

By 5 years post-graduation: 38.5% (5/13) of master’s graduates served as a consultant. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a referred journal. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a non-referred journal. 61.5% (8/13) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting. 30.8% (4/13) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 76.9% (10/13) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities. 7.7% (1/13) of the master’s graduates were enrolled in doctoral education.

Target for O7: Professional Commitment

10% of master’s graduates will be involved in some kind of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation. 5% of master’s graduates will see post-master’s education by 5 years post-graduation.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

By 5 years post-graduation: 38.5% (5/13) of master’s graduates served as a consultant. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a referred journal. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a non-referred journal. 61.5% (8/13) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting. 30.8% (4/13) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 76.9% (10/13) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities. 7.7% (1/13) of the master’s graduates were enrolled in doctoral education.

M 5: Professional Membership and Activities (O: 3, 5, 7)

Graduates will be involved in professional nursing organizations and/or scholarly activities.

Target for O3: Participation in Research

35% of master’s graduates will hold membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 20% of master’s graduates will be actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. 10% of master’s graduates will be involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation. 70% of master’s students will be eligible to join Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing annually.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

95% (19/20) of master’s graduates have membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 36.4% (4/11) of master’s graduates will be actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. 10% of master’s graduates will be involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation; see next seven measures: By 5 years post-graduation: 38.5% (5/13) of master’s graduates served as a consultant. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a referred journal. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a non-referred journal. 61.5% (8/13) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting. 30.8% (4/13) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 76.9% (10/13) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities. 7.7% (1/13) of the master’s graduates were enrolled in doctoral education.

Target for O5: Assessment of Factors Affecting Health Care

35% of master’s graduates will hold membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 20% of master’s graduates will be actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. 10% of master’s graduates will be involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation. 70% of master’s students will be eligible to join Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing annually.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

95% (19/20) of master’s graduates have membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 36.4% (4/11) of master’s graduates will be actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. 10% of master’s graduates will be involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation; see next seven measures: By 5 years post-graduation: 38.5% (5/13) of master’s graduates served as a consultant. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a referred journal. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a non-referred journal. 61.5% (8/13) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting. 30.8% (4/13) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 76.9% (10/13) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities. 7.7% (1/13) of the master’s graduates were enrolled in doctoral education.

Target for O7: Professional Commitment

35% of master’s graduates will hold membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 20% of master’s graduates will be actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. 10% of master’s graduates will be involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation. 70% of master’s students will be eligible to join Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing annually.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

95% (19/20) of master’s graduates have membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 36.4% (4/11) of master’s graduates will be actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. 10% of master’s graduates will be involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation; see next seven measures: By 5 years post-graduation: 38.5% (5/13) of master’s graduates served as a consultant. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a referred journal. 8.3% (1/12) of master’s graduates published in a non-referred journal. 61.5% (8/13) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting. 30.8% (4/13) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 76.9% (10/13) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities. 7.7% (1/13) of the master’s graduates were enrolled in doctoral education.
activities. 7.7% (1/13) of the master’s graduated were enrolled in doctoral education. 34% (57/168)of master's students who met credit hour completion criteria were eligible to join Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing annually.

**M 6: Ethical and Legal Practice (O: 6)**
Graduates will demonstrate evidence of ethical and legal practice.

**Target for O6: Legal and Ethical Issues in Advanced Nursing**
100% of students will demonstrate evidence of ethical advanced nursing practice. 100% of master's graduates will be practicing within scope of practice as set forth by the Nurse Practice Act.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students will demonstrate evidence of ethical advanced nursing practice as evidenced by successful completion of their clinical practicum courses which evaluate ethical practice. 100% of master's graduates will be practicing within scope of practice as set forth by the Nurse Practice Act as evidenced by successful certification and continued recognition of advanced practice nursing status by the Georgia State Board of Nursing.

**M 7: Student Awards (O: 8)**
Students will receive an award from a professional or scholarly organization or from an academic institution annually.

**Target for O8: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specialization**
5% of master's students will receive an award from a professional or scholarly organization or from an academic institution annually.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
5.05% (11/218) of the master’s students received an award form a professional or scholarly organization or from an academic institution in 2005-2006.

**M 8: Use of Theory as Basis for Nursing Practice (O: 9)**
Graduates and students will report that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing in advanced nursing practice.

**Target for O9: Theory as a Basis for Advanced Practice Nursing**
85% of the students completing their master’s program will indicate that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing for advanced nursing practice.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
92.3% (12/13) of the graduating students reported that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing for advanced nursing practice.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our assessment demonstrated the following strengths: 1. Student certification rate after graduating is very high, indicating that they are prepared for advanced nursing practice. 2. Over 90% of our students complete the first semester of the master’s program and are successfully moving through the program. 3. 85% of our students find positions in their specialty advanced practice area, indicating that they are well prepared and that employment opportunities are available for advanced practice nurses. 4. Our graduates are involved in scholarly activities and/or post-master's education. 5. Our graduates are active in professional organizations and scholarly activities. 6. Our graduates practice within the Code of Ethics for Nurses. 7. Some of our master's students are recognized for their achievements.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Based on this assessment we do not see any specific outcomes that need intense attention. However, we do believe that we must continue to focus on student progress and graduate employment trends and accomplishments to adequately assess the effectiveness of our master's programs.
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**Mission / Purpose**
The Ph.D. program in Nursing at Georgia State University prepares nurse scholars and researchers to make tangible and socially relevant contributions to both the profession and to the larger society. The program is centered around developing and maintaining an active, dialogical learning community—one in which faculty and students are viewed as co-learners and which embraces communities of professionals and the larger society. In this environment, education is viewed as a mutually evocative conversation in which existing knowledge is critically examined, re-discovered and at the same time, new knowledge and meanings are generated.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Implement Socially Relevant Nursing Research (M: 1)

Plan and implement nursing research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Written Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Oral Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quantitative Skills--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 2: Theory & Research with Vulnerable Populations (M: 2)

Link theory and research to the promotion of health in vulnerable populations.

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Written Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Oral Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 3: Human Environments Interactions & Health Promotion (M: 3)

Analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration.

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Written Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Oral Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Issues Affecting the Conduct of Research (M: 4)**

Examine issues such as race, gender and class in conducting research

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
3 Oral Communication--major
4 Oral Communication--core
5 Collaboration--major
6 Collaboration--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry (M: 5, 6)**

Explore, develop, and apply diverse modes of inquiry to the discipline of nursing

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
3 Oral Communication--major
4 Oral Communication--core
5 Collaboration--major
6 Collaboration--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major
10 Contemporary Issues--core
12 Quantitative Skills--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 7: Presentations at Professionals Meetings (M: 10, 13)**

Submit abstracts for scholarly presentations at professional meetings

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
3 Oral Communication--major
4 Oral Communication--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3 Quality professional programs</th>
<th>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</th>
<th>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 8: Submission of Manuscripts (M: 9)
Submit manuscripts for consideration for publication.

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
7. Critical Thinking--major
8. Critical Thinking--core

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 9: Publication of Manuscripts (M: 11)
Publish manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for publication.

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
7. Critical Thinking--major
8. Critical Thinking--core

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 10: Funded Research (M: 8, 12)
Submit proposal for internal or external funding to support doctoral coursework and/or dissertation research.

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
7. Critical Thinking--major
11. Quantitative Skills--major
12. Quantitative Skills--core

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 6: Completion of PhD Program (M: 7)
Complete PhD program requirements

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
3. Oral Communication--major
4. Oral Communication--core
5. Collaboration--major
6. Critical Thinking--major
7. Critical Thinking--core

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Implementation of Socially Relevant Research (O: 1)

Students and alumni will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

**Target for O1: Implement Socially Relevant Nursing Research**

100% of PhD students will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

From Fall 05 thru Summer 06, 100% (5/5) students completed socially relevant research on such topics as: *Mother confidence among first-time mothers during child’s infancy* *Teenage sisters’ perspectives about teenage pregnancy following the birth of a child to their single adolescent siblings* *Self esteem, family support, peer support and depressive symptomology of pregnant adolescents* *Adolescents raised by their grandmothers: Perceptions of parenting style and attachment representation* *Women’s expectations and experiences of role performance following coronary bypass graft surgery*

#### M 2: Theory, Research and Vulnerable Populations (O: 2)

Students will link theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations.

**Target for O2: Theory & Research with Vulnerable Populations**

100% of students will link theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In Spring 2005, 100% (8/8) demonstrated their ability to link theory and research to health issues by the successful completion of N8200 Health in Vulnerable Populations.

#### M 3: Human Interactions & Health Promotion (O: 3)

Students will analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration in the NURS 8100

**Target for O3: Human Environments Interactions & Health Promotion**

100% of students who successfully completed N8000 Human Environment Interactions demonstrated their ability will analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% (11/11) of the students taking N8000 Human Environment Interactions passed the courses demonstrating their ability to analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration.

#### M 4: Issues in the Conduct of Research (O: 4)

Students will address issues such as race, gender and class in conducting research.

**Target for O4: Issues Affecting the Conduct of Research**
100% of students will address issues such as race, gender and class in conducting research.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% (5/5) of students have addressed race, gender and class in conducting research as demonstrated by the successful completion of their dissertations and receipt of IRB approval for their research studies between Summer 2005 and Spring 2006.

**M 5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry (O: 5)**

Students will explore diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral level coursework

**Target for O5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry**

100% of students will explore diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral level coursework

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students successfully demonstrated the use of diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral level coursework as demonstrated by successful completion of the methods and statistics courses (N8050 [100%;12/12]/N8051 [91.6%; 11/12] quantitative research methods courses, N8012 [100%;9/9] qualitative research methods course, N8120 [100%;8/8]/N840 [100%;11/11]/ univariate and multivariate statistics courses, pilot studies, and dissertation research [100%; 5/5].

**M 6: Application of Research Methods to Nursing Topics (O: 5)**

Develop and apply a methodology appropriate to phenomena/research questions related to the discipline of nursing.

**Target for O5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry**

100% if students who progress to dissertation will develop and apply a methodology appropriate to phenomena/research questions related to the discipline of nursing.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During 2005-2006, 100% (5/5) of the students completing their dissertation research applied methodology appropriate to phenomena/research questions related to the discipline of nursing as demonstrated in dissertation subject matter listed below: * Mother confidence among first-time mothers during child’s infancy * Teenage sisters’ perspectives about teenage pregnancy following the birth of a child to their single adolescent siblings * Self esteem, family support, peer support and depressive symptomology of pregnant adolescents * Adolescents raised by their grandmothers: Perceptions of parenting style and attachment representation * Women’s expectations and experiences of role performance following coronary bypass graft surgery

**M 7: Completion of PhD Program (O: 6)**

Students will successfully complete requirements for graduation with a PhD degree in nursing.

**Target for O6: Completion of PhD Program**

60% of students admitted to the nursing doctoral program will successfully complete the requirements for graduation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

During 2005-2006, 27 students were enrolled in the doctoral program; 96.3% (26/27) were successfully progressing (21) through the doctoral program or successfully completed the requirement for graduation (n=5).

**M 8: Submission of Research Proposal for Funding (O: 10)**

Students and alumni will submit proposals for internal or external funding to support doctoral coursework and/or dissertation research.

**Target for O10: Funded Research**

30% of the students will apply for internal or external funding (i.e. scholarships, NRSA awards, etc.) to support doctoral coursework and dissertation projects. 10% of the students applying for funding to support doctoral work will be successful in obtaining funds.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Of students responding to a survey, 70% (7/10) applied for internal or external funding to support doctoral coursework and dissertation research. 28.6% (2/7) of the students applying for funding to support doctoral work were successful in obtaining funds.

**M 9: Submission of manuscripts for publication (O: 8)**

Students will submit manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty/colleagues, for publication.

**Target for O8: Submission of Manuscripts**

30% of the students will submit manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for publication.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

Of students responding to our survey, 40% (4/10) submitted manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for publication.

**M 10: Professional Presentations (O: 7)**
Students will submit abstracts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty/colleagues, for scholarly presentations at professional meetings.

**Target for O7: Presentations at Professionals Meetings**
35% of the students will submit abstracts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for scholarly presentations at professional meetings.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Of the ten students responding to the survey, 7 (70%) presented a poster at a local conference; 5 (50%) presented a poster at a national conference; and, 1 (10%) gave a presentation at a national conference. Ten students gave 13 presentations with a 130% participation rate.

**M 11: Publication in Refereed Journals (O: 9)**
Graduates will publish articles in refereed journals by 5 years post-graduation.

**Target for O9: Publication of Manuscripts**
20% of the graduates will publish articles in refereed journals by 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Of the ten students responding to the survey, 70% (2/3) students at published in refereed journals at 5 years post-graduation.

**M 12: Funded Research (O: 10)**
Graduates will receive funding to support research projects within 5 years post-graduation.

**Target for O10: Funded Research**
5% of the graduates will receive funding to support research projects within 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
The question regarding receipt of research funding was inadvertently left off the survey. However, 100% (3/3) 5-year graduates reported participating in research.

**M 13: Presentation at Professional Meetings (O: 7)**
Graduates will give presentations at local, regional, national and/or international meetings and/or conferences

**Target for O7: Presentations at Professionals Meetings**
50% of the graduates will give presentations at local, regional, national and/or international meetings and/or conferences

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Of the 1-year (n = 2), 3-year (n = 1), and 5-year (n = 3) graduates responding to our survey, 100% (6/6) gave presentations at local, regional, national and/or international meetings and/or conferences

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
This assessment supported our proven strengths: 1. Our doctoral students implement theory-based socially relevant research related to health issues (health promotion, protection, and restoration) of vulnerable populations. These research endeavors inform the nursing profession and other health-related disciplines. 2. Students explore diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral coursework. 3. Although not specifically addressed in this assessment, our attrition rate is relatively low with over 60% of our students completing the requirements for graduation. 4. Our doctoral students do apply for internal and external funding to support doctoral coursework and dissertation research. We are pleased with the increase in the applications for internal and external funding. 5. Students have published and/or submitted manuscripts alone or with faculty; presented paper and poster presentations at local, regional, and national meetings. Our graduates have also been successful in publication, participate in research, and present at local, regional, and national conferences.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
We are pleased with our outcomes but want to improve our survey responses to strengthen the reported outcomes. We will also be very attentive to student and graduate outcomes as we implement a web-facilitated teaching approach for the doctoral courses.
The Division of Nutrition at Georgia State University is to prepare professionals who enhance individual and community health through dietetics practice and to contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge in the fields of nutrition and dietetics. Admission to this Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE)-accredited program is at the junior year. The program graduates approximately 30 students each year.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes V.42-V.62.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Integrate social sciences (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate psychological, social and economic aspects of the environment and examine how they individually and collectively affect food and nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes III.31-III.34.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Utilize critical thinking skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize critical thinking skills in the interpretation and application of research methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes IV.35-IV.41.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 13 Technology--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrate science understanding (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the influence of chemical, microbiological, and physiological disciplines as they affect food and nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes II.17-II.30.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Communicate effectively (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes I.1-I.16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the role of nutrients and food in human health, disease prevention, health promotion, and medical nutrition therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes VI.63-VI.79.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Apply knowledge of management principles (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge of management principles and systems in planning, monitoring, and evaluating dietetic services and practice and implementing of quality improvement programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes VII.80-VII.98.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 Collaboration--major

SLO 8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Describe the impact of laws, regulations, and costs on health care systems and food and nutrition programs
Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE)/Learning Outcomes VIII.99-VIII.101.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

9 Contemporary Issues--major

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
The portfolio included 12 artifacts from courses specified by the program director. These included:

Target for O1: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 2-- 5 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 3 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O2: Integrate social sciences
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 2-- 5 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 3 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O3: Utilize critical thinking skills
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 2-- 5 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 3 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O4: Demonstrate science understanding
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 2-- 5 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 3 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O5: Communicate effectively
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 2-- 5 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 3 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 2-- 5 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 3 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O7: Apply knowledge of management principles
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 2-- 5 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 3 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 2-- 5 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 3 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 8 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

M 2: Comprehensive senior examination (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
This comprehensive senior examination includes questions from each of the Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) core knowledge areas (listed as objectives in WEAVEonline). The question distribution is 18 items for Objective 1, 21 items for Objective 2, 17 items for Objective 3, 9 items for Objective 4, 26 items for Objective 5, 26 items for Objective 6, 27 items for Objective 7, and 12 items for Objective 8.

Target for O1: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 54% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 61%; Objective 2 -- 62%; Objective 3 -- 58%; Objective 4 -- 63%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 56%; Objective 7 -- 52%; Objective 8 -- 47%).

Target for O2: Integrate social sciences
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 54% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 61%; Objective 2 -- 62%; Objective 3 -- 58%; Objective 4 -- 63%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 56%; Objective 7 -- 52%; Objective 8 -- 47%).

Target for O3: Utilize critical thinking skills
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 54% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 61%; Objective 2 -- 62%; Objective 3 -- 58%; Objective 4 -- 63%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 56%; Objective 7 -- 52%; Objective 8 -- 47%).

Target for O4: Demonstrate science understanding
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 54% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 61%; Objective 2 -- 62%; Objective 3 -- 58%; Objective 4 -- 63%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 56%; Objective 7 -- 52%; Objective 8 -- 47%).
**Target for O5: Communicate effectively**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score was 54% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 61%; Objective 2 -- 62%; Objective 3 -- 58%; Objective 4 -- 63%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 56%; Objective 7 -- 52%; Objective 8 -- 47%).

**Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score was 54% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 61%; Objective 2 -- 62%; Objective 3 -- 58%; Objective 4 -- 63%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 56%; Objective 7 -- 52%; Objective 8 -- 47%).

**Target for O7: Apply knowledge of management principles**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score was 54% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 61%; Objective 2 -- 62%; Objective 3 -- 58%; Objective 4 -- 63%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 56%; Objective 7 -- 52%; Objective 8 -- 47%).

**Target for O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score was 54% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 61%; Objective 2 -- 62%; Objective 3 -- 58%; Objective 4 -- 63%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 56%; Objective 7 -- 52%; Objective 8 -- 47%).

**M 3: Exit questionnaire (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

The exit questionnaire is a survey that includes both closed and open-ended questions. It is administered to graduating seniors during the last month of the program.

**Target for O1: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 -- 18/22; Objective 2 -- 19/22; Objective 3 -- 15/22; Objective 4 -- 15/22; Objective 5 -- 20/22; Objective 6 -- 20/22. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 -- 13/22; Objective 8 -- 13/22).

**Target for O2: Integrate social sciences**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 -- 18/22; Objective 2 -- 19/22; Objective 3 -- 15/22; Objective 4 -- 15/22; Objective 5 -- 20/22; Objective 6 -- 20/22. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 -- 13/22; Objective 8 -- 13/22).

**Target for O3: Utilize critical thinking skills**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 -- 18/22; Objective 2 -- 19/22; Objective 3 -- 15/22; Objective 4 -- 15/22; Objective 5 -- 20/22; Objective 6 -- 20/22. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 -- 13/22; Objective 8 -- 13/22).
Target for **O4: Demonstrate science understanding**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 -- 18/22; Objective 2 -- 19/22; Objective 3 -- 15/22; Objective 4 -- 15/22; Objective 5 -- 20/22; Objective 6 -- 20/22. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 -- 13/22; Objective 8 -- 13/22).

Target for **O5: Communicate effectively**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 -- 18/22; Objective 2 -- 19/22; Objective 3 -- 15/22; Objective 4 -- 15/22; Objective 5 -- 20/22; Objective 6 -- 20/22. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 -- 13/22; Objective 8 -- 13/22).

Target for **O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 -- 18/22; Objective 2 -- 19/22; Objective 3 -- 15/22; Objective 4 -- 15/22; Objective 5 -- 20/22; Objective 6 -- 20/22. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 -- 13/22; Objective 8 -- 13/22).

Target for **O7: Apply knowledge of management principles**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 -- 18/22; Objective 2 -- 19/22; Objective 3 -- 15/22; Objective 4 -- 15/22; Objective 5 -- 20/22; Objective 6 -- 20/22. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 -- 13/22; Objective 8 -- 13/22).

Target for **O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 -- 18/22; Objective 2 -- 19/22; Objective 3 -- 15/22; Objective 4 -- 15/22; Objective 5 -- 20/22; Objective 6 -- 20/22. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 -- 13/22; Objective 8 -- 13/22).

**M 4: Alumni survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**
This survey is mailed to alumni at 1-year after completion and at 3-years after completion. It includes both closed and open-ended questions.

Target for **O1: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Only 3 returned. Not enough to evaluate.

Target for **O2: Integrate social sciences**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Only 3 returned. Not enough to evaluate.

Target for **O3: Utilize critical thinking skills**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Only 3 returned. Not enough to evaluate.

Target for **O4: Demonstrate science understanding**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)
## Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

### Discuss e-portfolio development and evaluation

Undergraduate students have been completing paper portfolios for several years. We began making a conversion to an e-portfolio system, TrueOutcomes, but this has proved very cumbersome. We have a successful graduate e-portfolio system. We will try to use our previous experience with paper portfolios, TrueOutcomes, and the graduate portfolio system to develop a strong e-portfolio system for the undergraduate program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Exit questionnaire  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Apply knowledge of management principles
- **Measure:** Communicate effectively  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle
- **Measure:** Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate science understanding
- **Measure:** Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Integrate social sciences
- **Measure:** Utilize critical thinking skills

**Implementation Description:** January 15, 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dea Baxter, Director of the undergraduate program, with assistance from M Doucette and M. Cody

**Additional Resources:** Dr. Doucette was formerly a full-time faculty member. She is currently a part-time instructor. She developed the e-portfolio system for the graduate program. We need her expertise for this development project.

### Improve alumni evaluation return rate

We plan to improve our alumni database and our evaluation methods to increase our alumni return rate.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Alumni survey  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Apply knowledge of management principles
- **Measure:** Communicate effectively  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle
- **Measure:** Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate science understanding
- **Measure:** Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Integrate social sciences
- **Measure:** Utilize critical thinking skills

**Implementation Description:** April 15, 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Mildred Cody

**Additional Resources:** Clerical help in the division and assistance from the Alumni Association

### Strengthening Learning Outcome #7

Faculty will discuss methods of strengthening Learning Outcome #7(Apply knowledge of management principles and systems...). The undergraduate program director will develop the implementation plan for faculty approval.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Comprehensive senior examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge of management principles
  - Measure: Exit questionnaire | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge of management principles

Implementation Description: April 1, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dea Baxter, director of the undergraduate program

**Strengthening Learning Outcome #8**
Faculty will discuss methods of strengthening Learning Outcome #8 (Describe the impact of laws, regulations, and costs on health care systems and food and nutrition programs). The undergraduate program director will develop the implementation plan for faculty approval.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Comprehensive senior examination | Outcome/Objective: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs
  - Measure: Exit questionnaire | Outcome/Objective: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs

Implementation Description: April 1, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dea Baxter, undergraduate program director

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Student reflections showed perceptions of strong achievement in six of eight areas. Students reported lower achievement (confidence) in the food service management area and the health regulation area. These student perceptions were not supported by the low scores on the comprehensive examination.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The comprehensive exit exam is designed to mirror the national registration examination that students will take after a 6-12 month internship. While it is difficult to know what the target score on this test should be, we have noted that our scores are lower in the food service management and health regulations areas. We will work on those areas (Objectives 7 and 8) over the next year.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Operations Management MS**

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
Operations Management (OM) focuses on the management of resources and activities that produce and deliver the goods and services for customers. OM can play a critical role in enhancing a company’s competitive position by providing superior products and services.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Operations Strategy (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
The ability to analyze and evaluate alternative operations strategies for a given business environment and to identify the appropriate facility location, design, and technology choices as related to the operations function of the organization.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 5 Collaboration--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Operations Planning and Control**
The student should be able to identify critical success factors of the operations planning and control system for a organization, describe key elements of widely used operation planning and control systems and techniques, identify the critical success factors of designing and implementing a total quality management, program, service operations and describe the key elements required in
planning and controlling.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Oral Communication--core
- Collaboration--major
- Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- Graduate Experience

**Strategic Plan Associations**

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Employment (M: 4)**
The student should secure a position in operations management within one year after graduation and should succeed as evidenced by increasing responsibility, promotions, and salary increases over a period of five years after graduation.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Reasoned Analysis (O: 1)**
Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student projects done in their class: In the completion of their final project and coursework this student team was able to do a reasoned analysis of: a) The studied firm's specific dimensions of the Operations Management application. b) The studied industry specific application of the Operations Management application. c) Highlight the affects of the different dimensions of Operations Management as it applies to their chosen topic.

**Target for O1: Operations Strategy**
Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
1. In the completion of their final project and coursework this student team was able to do a reasoned analysis of: Strongly Agree Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 a) The studied firm's specific dimensions of the Operations Management application. 1.58 b) The studied industry specific application of the Operations Management application. 1.28 c) Highlight the affects of the different dimensions of Operations Management as it applies to their chosen topic. 1.25

**M 2: Integration of Recommendations (O: 1)**
Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student projects done in their class: In presenting their final project this student team was able to make integrated recommendations on: a) The studied firm's specific dimensions of the Operations Management application. b) The industry specific application of the Operations Management application. c) Highlight the affects of the different dimensions of Operations Management as it applies to their chosen topic.

**Target for O1: Operations Strategy**
Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
2. In presenting their final project this student team was able to make integrated recommendations on: a) The studied firm's specific dimensions of the Operations Management application. 1.58 b) The industry specific application of the Operations Management application. 1.14 c) Highlight the affects of the different dimensions of Operations Management as it applies to their chosen topic. 1.14

**M 3: Performance (O: 1)**
Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student projects done in their class: In analyzing the Operations Management area of the Industry and the Firm this student team was able to: a) Identify the critical success factors for the Operations Application. b) Analyze and understand the firm's performance in part through an assessment of its resources and capabilities used in the operations management application. c) Analyze and understand how the firm's performance is affected by the application of the OM process in the competitive environment.

**Target for O1: Operations Strategy**
Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
3. In analyzing the Operations Management area of the Industry and the Firm this student team was able to: a) Identify the critical success factors for the Operations Application. b) Analyze and understand the firm's performance in part through an assessment of its resources and capabilities used in the operations management application. 1.14 c) Analyze and understand how the firm's performance is affected by the application of the OM process in the competitive environment. 1.14
Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to student projects done in their class: My impression of the students' contributions to this project and the overall coursework is, in general: a) The students delivered a project that showed an understanding of the integration of the basic areas of Operations. b) Each student was able to contribute functional expertise in Operations Management to the team's project effort.

**Target for O1: Operations Strategy**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

4. My impression of the students' contributions to this project and the overall coursework is, in general: a) The students delivered a project that showed an understanding of the integration of the basic areas of Operations. 1.14 b) Each student was able to contribute functional expertise in Operations Management to the team's project effort. 1.28

**Target for O2: Employment**

Strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 1.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being agreement with the above statements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

4. My impression of the students' contributions to this project and the overall coursework is, in general: a) The students delivered a project that showed an understanding of the integration of the basic areas of Operations. 1.14 b) Each student was able to contribute functional expertise in Operations Management to the team's project effort. 1.28

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Peer Evaluations**

Student peer evaluation may be needed to identify uneven contribution and delivery.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Team Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Employment

**Implementation Description:** AY 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** OM Faculty Members

**Additional Resources:** None

**Qualitative Emphasis**

Some quantitative analytical methods are covered in the later part of the course, which may be the reason students use qualitative methods.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Reasoned Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Operations Strategy

**Implementation Description:** AY 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** OM Faculty Members

**Additional Resources:** None

**Supply Chain Emphasis**

Their weaknesses come from a lack of experience in the analysis of a production process. The course will need to place more emphasis on the production process when developing the overall supply chain strategy.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** AY 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** OM Faculty Members

**Additional Resources:** None

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

The teams were able to present the firms' dimensions of Operations Management from the viewpoint of someone who is experienced in Operations Management. The students developed an analysis of the organization from a viewpoint of someone who is currently holding an operations management position. The students gave presentations and completed projects showed an understanding of how to analyze a firm. Their analytical skills were very high. The students were very homogenous in their understanding of the OM processes. The teams were able to present the industry applications of Service Operations Management from the viewpoint of someone who is experienced in Operations Management. The students developed an analysis of the organization from a viewpoint of someone who is currently holding an operations management position. Overall, the teams were able to do a reasoned analysis on these dimensions, although there are areas that could be improved.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The projects could have developed more completely scenarios that are in opposition to their analytical conclusions. The actual presentation skills were somewhat weak in some classes. The materials contained all of the necessary detail, but the students could easily have presented their ideas during the presentation in a more efficient way. The teams were able to address the issues from topics learned in the course. However, their understanding of the human/employee related issues were somewhat more limited. In addition, the project typically addressed one issue which may not be a true weakness.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2005-2006 Organizational Change MS**  
*As of 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST*  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

### Mission / Purpose

The organizational change concentration is designed for individuals who wish to increase their understanding of people in organizations and their ability to effect change, either as managers or as internal or external consultants. Topics include leadership, negotiation, organizational change, and consulting.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Design Evaluation

The student should be able to assess an organization's design and determine whether it is appropriate for the organization's environment and goals.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - 4 Oral Communication--core

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  - 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Situational Characteristics Evaluation

Students should be able to identify situational characteristics and be able utilize leadership behaviors to aid individual and organizational functioning in those situation.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - 4 Oral Communication--core

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  - 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 4: Student Action Capability

Students should be able to act as an organizational change agent or project manager. In this role the students should be able to plan and organize a change project, defend the change project orally and in writing, mobilize support for a project, negotiating with relevant constituencies resolve disagreements among project participants, and assess the effectiveness of a change effort.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - 1 Written Communication--major
  - 2 Written Communication--core
  - 3 Oral Communication--major
  - 4 Oral Communication--core
  - 6 Collaboration--core

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  - 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 3: Recognition Skills

Students should be able to Recognize the opportunities and problems caused by political realities in organizations.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Oral Communication--core

Institutional Priority Associations
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 1)
This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: None yet Developed (O: 5)
None yet Developed

Target for O5: Outcome/Objective Not Specified
None yet Developed

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
None this cycle.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Development of Assessment
A WEAVE-oriented assessment procedure to be developed and implemented in 2006-2007.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: OB Faculty
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Processes used did not adequately provide information for this determination to be made. Processes will be revised for 2006-2007 cycle based on exercises set out in the Action Plan and the WEAVE template.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Personal Financial Planning MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION: To enhance social well being by developing knowledge and providing education in risk and its management. RMI DEPARTMENT VISION: To be the world’s leader in risk management scholarship and education. Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the selection and design of individual, organizational, and societal strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 3: Use of professional/technical resources (M: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)
MS-PFP graduates will be aware of and use academic/professional/practitioner periodicals and other sources of personal financial planning information and literature.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 4: Demonstration of professional skills (M: 9, 10)**
MS-PFP graduates will be able to demonstrate the analytical, technical, communication, and research skills required to perform as a financial planning professional.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 5: Knowledge of practical standards and ethics (M: 1, 9)**
Each MS-PFP student will demonstrate knowledge of the standards of practice and ethical rules and considerations involved in the practice of financial planning.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 6: Formulate/communicate quantifiable objectives (M: 9)**
MS-PFP graduates will demonstrate the ability to compile and summarize financial data, to formulate quantifiable objectives from information given by a client, and to communicate financial advice effectively.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 7: Implementation of financial plan (M: 9)**
MS-PFP graduates will be able to demonstrate the ability to recommend appropriate courses of action to implement a financial plan to achieve client objectives.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 8: Produce high-quality comprehensive financial plans (M: 9)**
MS-PFP graduates will be able to demonstrate the ability to produce high-quality comprehensive financial plans.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
SLO 9: Explanation of technical concepts (M: 9)
MS-PFP graduates will be able to explain technical concepts to financial planning associates and clients.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Value to graduates (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
MS-PFP graduates value the program.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

O/O 2: Awareness/participation in professional societies (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
MS-PFP graduates will be aware of relevant professional designations and be encouraged to obtain them and to participate in professional societies.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Introductory Course (PFP 8400) (O: 5)
PFP 8400 courses in the 2005-2006 timeframe address the learning outcomes in the following manner: 1. Each student writes a personal financial plan on a subject of his or her choosing, emphasizing financial analysis, goal achievement, and the taking of corrective actions. 2. Each student takes three case examinations. Each consists of a fact pattern resembling a family situation. These exams emphasize financial analysis, goal achievement, the taking of corrective actions, and the environment of financial services. 3. Each student participates in discussions about technical and behavioral issues in personal financial planning. One hundred percent of students in PFP participated in these discussions.

Target for O5: Knowledge of practical standards and ethics
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
1. Personal Financial Plan: 100% of students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan which emphasized financial analysis, goal achievement, and the taking of corrective actions. Assessment: 2. Case Examinations: 100% of students in PFP 8400 wrote these exams, which emphasized financial analysis, goal achievement, the taking of corrective actions, and the environment of financial services. Assessment: Exam performance improved over this timeframe as students become more adept at recognizing key facts and performing relevant analyses. 3. Student Discussions: 100% of students in PFP participated in these discussions. Assessment: Discussions improved over this timeframe with greater motivation to understand these issues from both a personal and professional perspective. >>see Program Director’s Report

M 2: Alumni Survey - PFP Competency (O: 1, 2)
A written survey will be sent to each graduate, approximately two to three years after graduation. The surveys will be tabulated and reviewed by the Program Director. This section measures the extent to which each PFP course contributed to student competency in personal financial planning.

Target for O1: Value to graduates
Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Alumni reported overall satisfaction with the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses (mean = 3.23). Several individual courses scored below average, including RE 8020, RMI 8220, RMI 8240, and Tx 8020. >>survey results (Please note that none of the survey respondents rated either Tx 8200 or Tx 8220.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Alumni reported overall satisfaction with the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses (mean = 3.23). Several individual courses scored below average, including RE 8020, RMI 8220, RMI 8240, and Tx 8020. (Please note that none of the survey respondents rated either Tx 8200 or Tx 8220.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Alumni Survey - Career Preparation (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A written survey will be sent to each graduate, approximately two to three years after graduation. The surveys will be tabulated and reviewed by the Program Director. This section measures the extent to which students feel that the program has prepared them for or enhanced a career in personal financial planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O1: Value to graduates

Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the program has prepared them for or enhanced a career in personal financial planning.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Alumni reported satisfaction with the extent to which the program prepared them for a career in personal financial planning (mean = 3.86) as well as the extent to which the program enhanced their career opportunities (mean = 3.71).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A written survey will be sent to each graduate, approximately two to three years after graduation. The surveys will be tabulated and reviewed by the Program Director. This section measures a student’s level of satisfaction with multiple program attributes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O1: Value to graduates

Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various program attributes.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Alumni reported overall satisfaction with all of the indicated program attributes (see findings).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various program attributes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Alumni reported overall satisfaction with all of the indicated program attributes (see findings).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Graduating Student Survey - PFP Competency (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A written survey will be administered to all students in the Capstone Course. At least once per year, the surveys will be tabulated and reviewed by the Program Director. This section measures the extent to which each PFP course contributed to student competency in personal financial planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O1: Value to graduates

Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Graduating students report overall satisfaction (mean = 3.9) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses. One course, FI 8240, fell below average.

### Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies

Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Graduating students report overall satisfaction (mean = 3.9) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses. One course, FI 8240, fell below average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Graduating students report overall satisfaction (mean = 3.9) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses. One course, FI 8240, fell below average. >>survey results

**M 6: Graduating Student Survey - Career Preparation (O: 1, 2, 3)**
A written survey will be administered to all students in the Capstone Course. At least once per year, the surveys will be tabulated and reviewed by the Program Director. This section measures the extent to which students feel that the program has prepared them for or enhanced a career in personal financial planning.

**Target for O1: Value to graduates**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level to which the program has prepared them for a career in personal financial planning and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students reported a high-level of satisfaction in the extent to which the program has prepared them for a career in personal financial planning (mean = 4.55) and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities (mean = 4.36). >>survey results

**Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level to which the program has prepared them for a career in personal financial planning and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students reported a high-level of satisfaction in the extent to which the program has prepared them for a career in personal financial planning (mean = 4.55) and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities (mean = 4.36). >>survey results

**Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level to which the program has prepared them for a career in personal financial planning and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students reported a high-level of satisfaction in the extent to which the program has prepared them for a career in personal financial planning (mean = 4.55) and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities (mean = 4.36). >>survey results

**M 7: Graduating Student Survey - Program Attributes (O: 1, 2, 3)**
A written survey will be administered to all students in the Capstone Course. At least once per year, the surveys will be tabulated and reviewed by the Program Director. This section measures student level of satisfaction across various attributes of the program.

**Target for O1: Value to graduates**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various program attributes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students reported a high-level of satisfaction (mean = 4.11) across various program attributes. >>survey results

**Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various program attributes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students reported a high-level of satisfaction (mean = 4.11) across various program attributes. >>survey results

**Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various program attributes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students reported a high-level of satisfaction (mean = 4.11) across various program attributes. >>survey results

**M 8: Graduating Student Survey - Program Changes (O: 1, 2, 3)**
A written survey will be administered to all students in the Capstone Course. At least once per year, the surveys will be tabulated and reviewed by the Program Director. This section measures student opinion regarding possible changes in the PFP program.

**Target for O1: Value to graduates**
Graduating students will rate a variety of suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top rated 2 or 3 suggested
changes will be considered for implementation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The top-rated suggested changes were: (1) activities for alumni, (2) increase non-class activities, and (3) additional job placement emphasis. >>survey results

**Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies**

Graduating students will rate a variety of suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top rated 2 or 3 suggested changes will be considered for implementation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The top-rated suggested changes were: (1) activities for alumni, (2) increase non-class activities, and (3) additional job placement emphasis. >>survey results

**Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources**

Graduating students will rate a variety of suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top rated 2 or 3 suggested changes will be considered for implementation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The top-rated suggested changes were: (1) activities for alumni, (2) increase non-class activities, and (3) additional job placement emphasis. >>survey results

**M 9: PFP 8520 Capstone Course (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

The PFP 8520 (Capstone) course addresses the stated learning outcomes in the following manner: 1. Each student participates in a role-play exercise as a planner and once as a client. Qualitative feedback from students suggests that this is a very challenging exercise. 2. Each student prepares a "Greenfield" financial plan—acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. 3. Each student takes a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. 4. Each student prepares a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five “live interview” sources are required. 5. Each student is part of the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize the value of participating in professional societies, such as the Financial Planning Association.

**Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The PFP 8520 (Capstone) course in the 2005-2006 timeframe focus on the following outcomes: 1. Develop knowledge, skills, and desire to meet financial planning needs of future clients To meet this outcome, students are required to participate in the following activities: a. One hundred percent of the students participated in a financial planning role-play exercise once as a planner and once as a client. Each student not participating is required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. b. One hundred percent of the students prepared a “Greenfield” financial plan—acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. c. One hundred percent of the students took a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Assessment: Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. Financial plans and exam performance remained at satisfactory levels similar to past years. 2. Pursue continued learning and professional development a. Each student prepared a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five “live interview” sources are required. Students presented their preliminary and final findings to the class for feedback. b. Two hundred percent of students were active participants and questioners in the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize the particular aspect of financial planning practice management Assessment: Financial planning papers improved during this timeframe due to the inclusion of feedback during the process and an increased willingness by students to seek out live sources of expertise. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights. 3. Improve professionalism and integrity in Financial Planning Practice See speaker series above. 4. Improve communications with clients and fellow financial planners See role play and client discussion exercises above. >>see Program Director’s Report

**Target for O4: Demonstration of professional skills**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The PFP 8520 (Capstone) course in the 2005-2006 timeframe focus on the following outcomes: 1. Develop knowledge, skills, and desire to meet financial planning needs of future clients To meet this outcome, students are required to participate in the following activities: a. One hundred percent of the students participated in a financial planning role-play exercise once as a planner and once as a client. Each student not participating is required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. b. One hundred percent of the students prepared a “Greenfield” financial plan—acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. c. One hundred percent of the students took a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Assessment: Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. Financial plans and exam performance remained at satisfactory levels similar to past years. 2. Pursue continued learning and professional development a. Each student prepared a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five “live interview” sources are required. Students presented their preliminary and final findings to the class for feedback. b. One hundred percent of students were active participants and questioners in the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are
prominent practitioners who emphasize a particular aspect of financial planning practice management. Assessment: Financial planning papers improved during this timeframe due to the inclusion of feedback during the process and an increased willingness by students to seek out live sources of expertise. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights. 3. Improve Professionalism and Integrity in Financial Planning Practice. See speaker series above. 4. Improve Communications with Clients and Fellow Financial Planners. See role play and client discussion exercises above. >>see Program Director’s Report

**Target for O5: Knowledge of practical standards and ethics**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The PFP 8520 (Capstone) course in the 2005-2006 timeframe focus on the following outcomes: 1. Develop knowledge, skills, and desire to meet financial planning needs of future clients. To meet this outcome, students are required to participate in the following activities: a. One hundred percent of the students participated in a financial planning role-play exercise once as a planner and once as a client. Each student not participating is required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. b. One hundred percent of the students prepared a “Greenfield” financial plan – acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. c. One hundred percent of the students took a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Assessment: Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. Financial plans and exam performance remained at satisfactory levels similar to past years. 2. Pursue continued learning and professional development a. Each student prepared a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five "live interview" sources are required. Students presented their preliminary and final findings to the class for feedback. b. One hundred percent of students were active participants and questioners in the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize a particular aspect of financial planning practice management. Assessment: Financial planning papers improved during this timeframe due to the inclusion of feedback during the process and an increased willingness by students to seek out live sources of expertise. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights. 3. Improve Professionalism and Integrity in Financial Planning Practice. See speaker series above. 4. Improve Communications with Clients and Fellow Financial Planners. See role play and client discussion exercises above. >>see Program Director’s Report

**Target for O6: Formulate/communicate quantifiable objectives**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The PFP 8520 (Capstone) course in the 2005-2006 timeframe focus on the following outcomes: 1. Develop knowledge, skills, and desire to meet financial planning needs of future clients. To meet this outcome, students are required to participate in the following activities: a. One hundred percent of the students participated in a financial planning role-play exercise once as a planner and once as a client. Each student not participating is required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. b. One hundred percent of the students prepared a “Greenfield” financial plan – acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. c. One hundred percent of the students took a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Assessment: Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. Financial plans and exam performance remained at satisfactory levels similar to past years. 2. Pursue continued learning and professional development a. Each student prepared a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five "live interview" sources are required. Students presented their preliminary and final findings to the class for feedback. b. One hundred percent of students were active participants and questioners in the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize a particular aspect of financial planning practice management. Assessment: Financial planning papers improved during this timeframe due to the inclusion of feedback during the process and an increased willingness by students to seek out live sources of expertise. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights. 3. Improve Professionalism and Integrity in Financial Planning Practice. See speaker series above. 4. Improve Communications with Clients and Fellow Financial Planners. See role play and client discussion exercises above. >>see Program Director’s Report

**Target for O7: Implementation of financial plan**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The PFP 8520 (Capstone) course in the 2005-2006 timeframe focus on the following outcomes: 1. Develop knowledge, skills, and desire to meet financial planning needs of future clients. To meet this outcome, students are required to participate in the following activities: a. One hundred percent of the students participated in a financial planning role-play exercise once as a planner and once as a client. Each student not participating is required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. b. One hundred percent of the students prepared a “Greenfield” financial plan – acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. c. One hundred percent of the students took a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Assessment: Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. Financial plans and exam performance remained at satisfactory levels similar to past years. 2. Pursue continued learning and professional development a. Each student prepared a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five "live interview" sources are required. Students presented their preliminary and final findings to the class for feedback. b. One hundred percent of students were active participants and questioners in the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize a particular aspect of financial planning practice management. Assessment: Financial planning papers improved during this timeframe due to the inclusion of feedback during the process and an increased willingness by students to seek out live sources of expertise. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights. 3. Improve Professionalism and Integrity in Financial Planning Practice. See speaker series above. 4. Improve Communications with Clients and Fellow Financial Planners. See role play and client discussion exercises above. >>see Program Director’s Report
Integrity in Financial Planning Practice
See speaker series above.

4. Improve Communications with Clients and Fellow Financial Planners
See role play and client discussion exercises above.

Target for O8: Produce high-quality comprehensive financial plans
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The PFP 8520 (Capstone) course in the 2005-2006 timeframe focus on the following outcomes: 1. Develop knowledge, skills, and desire to meet financial planning needs of future clients. To meet this outcome, students are required to participate in the following activities: a. One hundred percent of the students participated in a financial planning role-play exercise once as a planner and once as a client. Each student not participating is required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. b. One hundred percent of the students prepared a “Greenfield” financial plan – acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. c. One hundred percent of the students took a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Assessment: Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. Financial plans and exam performance remained at satisfactory levels similar to past years.

2. Pursue continued learning and professional development
a. Each student prepared a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five “live interview” sources are required. Students presented their preliminary and final findings to the class for feedback.

b. One hundred percent of students were active participants and questioners in the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize a particular aspect of financial planning practice management. Assessment: Financial planning papers improved during this timeframe due to the inclusion of feedback during the process and an increased willingness by students to seek out live sources of expertise. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights.

4. Improve Professionalism and Integrity in Financial Planning Practice
See speaker series above.

Target for O9: Explanation of technical concepts
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The PFP 8520 (Capstone) course in the 2005-2006 timeframe focus on the following outcomes: 1. Develop knowledge, skills, and desire to meet financial planning needs of future clients. To meet this outcome, students are required to participate in the following activities: a. One hundred percent of the students participated in a financial planning role-play exercise once as a planner and once as a client. Each student not participating is required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation.

b. One hundred percent of the students prepared a “Greenfield” financial plan – acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. c. One hundred percent of the students took a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Assessment: Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants.

2. Pursue continued learning and professional development
a. Each student prepared a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five “live interview” sources are required. Students presented their preliminary and final findings to the class for feedback.

b. One hundred percent of students were active participants and questioners in the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize a particular aspect of financial planning practice management. Assessment: Financial planning papers improved during this timeframe due to the inclusion of feedback during the process and an increased willingness by students to seek out live sources of expertise. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights.

Assessment:
- Financial planning papers improved during this timeframe due to the inclusion of feedback during the process and an increased willingness by students to seek out live sources of expertise. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights.

M 10: CFP Exam (Q: 4)
The CFP® Exam is administered three times each year. Many of the program's graduates take this examination and the CFP Board of Standards reports the results to the Program Director. This examination tests competence to become a CFP certificant. The percentage of our graduates passing the examination will be compared to the national average to assess mastery of the technical and analytical skills necessary to practice as a financial planner. The long-range passing percentage for program graduates will be kept and compared with the most recent performance of the graduates and the national performance averages. Each year, the Program Director will analyze the data received from the CFP Board. The Program Director also will use his or her best efforts to monitor the frequency, bases, and nature of any disciplinary action taken by the CFP Board against any graduate of the program and will report the results of this monitoring effort.

Target for O4: Demonstration of professional skills
CFP® Exam pass rates for PFP program students and graduates will be higher than the national average.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
For the monitoring period starting in Summer 2005 through Spring 2006, the CFP® Exam pass rate for PFP Program students and graduates was an outstanding 92.3%, compared to the national average of 62%. A total of 13 PFP students took the exam and only one failed.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Address student survey suggestions
Address top 2-3 improvements suggested in graduating student survey. These include additional activities for alumni, more non-class activities, and additional job placement help.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Graduating Student Survey - Program Changes | Outcome/Objective: Value to graduates
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Ciccotello/Elger/PFP Advisory Group
Additional Resources: To be determined

**Revised investment course options**
Continue development and implementation of a PFP-specific investment planning course
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Alumni Survey - PFP Competency | Outcome/Objective: Value to graduates
  Measure: Graduating Student Survey - PFP Competency | Outcome/Objective: Value to graduates
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Ciccotello/Elger

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Both graduating students and 3-year alumni remain generally well-satisfied with the PFP program. The pass rate on the CFP exam during 2005-2006 was at an all time high.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
While satisfaction levels with PFP prefix courses remain high on both graduating student and alumni survey, some are down a bit from prior years. Also, satisfaction with non-PFP required and elective courses is below desired levels. Of particular concern are the ratings for the MBA/FI sequence.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Philosophy BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU's strategic plan, which states: “In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University's curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices.” Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: “Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students . . . .” The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in undergraduate education. In Critical Thinking (Phil 1010 in Area B) students honing reasoning skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Furthermore, because it is a writing intensive course, each section of Phil 1010 focuses developing the essential skill of writing lucid argumentative essays. In Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010 in Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history’s most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Learning Goals for Philosophy BA: Phil Skills**

Students majoring in philosophy are expected to gain certain philosophical skills: the ability to read critically and with comprehension; the ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively; the ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions; and the ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
SLO 2: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students successfully completing Phil 1010 should be able to: distinguish arguments from non-arguments, identify the premises and conclusion, understand the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluate the arguments of others, and construct their own well-written argumentative essays.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
4 Oral Communication--core
8 Critical Thinking--core

SLO 3: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals (M: 2, 3, 4)

(A) Students successfully completing Phil 2010 should have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics (What is real?), epistemology (What do we know?), and ethics (What should we do?), and should have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems. They should also have a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors. (B) Students successfully completing Phil 2010 should also have a basic ability to think and write philosophically. This requires being able to critically evaluate philosophical claims and arguments and being able to provide and defend their own claims and arguments.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
4 Oral Communication--core
8 Critical Thinking--core

SLO 4: Learning Goals for Philosophy BA: Content Knowledg (M: 5, 6)

Students majoring in philosophy are expected to gain: general knowledge of a variety of philosophical systems and movements from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy (ancient/medieval and modern) and detailed knowledge of at least one system or movement in each of these two periods; general knowledge of the thought of various major philosophers from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy and detailed knowledge of at least one philosopher from each of the two periods; a familiarity with representative philosophers and movements in contemporary philosophy and in-depth understanding of at least one philosopher in at least two of the movements; knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in at least three of the main areas of philosophy (ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, epistemology, and logic, all defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy); knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry; and knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Writing ability (O: 2)

All philosophy students should be able to construct well-written argumentative essays. Our majors should also be able to orally communicate substantial philosophical views and arguments as well as well-formulated objections. This measure concerns only the former. It is a determination of whether our Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) students are writing argumentative essays appropriately. (Our target is an average of 2.50.)

Target for O2: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals

Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target:

We selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the first four papers submitted to instructors of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then graded by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding writing, the average grade for the papers was 3.0555. These were evaluated by the three Assessment Committee Members. Regarding the content of the papers, the three gave them an average grade of 2.9025.

M 2: Philosophical skills (O: 2, 3)

All philosophy students should possess philosophical skills. More particularly, they should be able to analyze information and arguments by: distinguishing arguments from non-arguments, identifying premises and conclusions, understanding the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluating the arguments of others, and constructing their own argumentative essays. To measure the content knowledge of our majors, senior majors in all Fall 4000 level philosophy classes are required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation. We collected these and, using a random number generator, chose 20 to have 3 Assessment Committee members score for philosophical skills.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
### Target for O2: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
We selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the first four papers submitted to the instructors of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then graded by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding philosophical skills, the average grade for the papers was 2.7825. We also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the first four final exams submitted to the instructors of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a grade isolating philosophical skills. The average grade the instructors gave the tests for philosophical skills was a 2.967.

### Target for O3: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals
Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
We selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the first four papers submitted to the instructors of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then graded by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding philosophical skills, the average grade for the papers was 2.7825. We also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the first four final exams submitted to the instructors of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a grade isolating philosophical skills. The average grade the instructors gave the tests for philosophical skills was a 2.967.

### M 3: Application (O: 2, 3)
Philosophy students should be able to apply philosophical abilities and skills to contemporary problems. This measure is meant to determine if students in Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) and Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010) can do so at an adequate level. (Our target is an average of 2.50 for both 1010 and 2010.)

**Target for O2: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals**
Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
We selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the first four papers submitted to the instructors of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then graded by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding the ability to apply what they learned, the average grade for the papers was 3.025. We also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the first four final exams submitted to the instructors of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a grade isolating the ability to apply what they learned. The average grade the instructors gave the tests for that ability was a 3.188125.

**Target for O3: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals**
Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
We selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the first four papers submitted to the instructors of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then graded by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding the ability to apply what they learned, the average grade for the papers was 3.025. We also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the first four final exams submitted to the instructors of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a grade isolating the ability to apply what they learned. The average grade the instructors gave the tests for that ability was a 3.188125.

### M 4: 2010 Content Knowledge (O: 3)
Mastery of content knowledge, more particularly: (i) have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics, (ii) have a basic understanding of central problems in epistemology, (iii) have a basic understanding of central problems in ethics, (iv) have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems, and (v) have a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors.

**Target for O3: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals**
Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
We selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the first four papers submitted to the instructors of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then graded by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding the ability to apply what they learned, the average grade for the papers was 3.025. We also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the first four final exams submitted to the instructors of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a grade isolating content knowledge. The average grade the instructors gave the tests for this was a 3.0505.

### M 5: BA Content Knowledge (O: 4)
1. General knowledge of a variety of philosophical systems and movements from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy (ancient/medieval and modern) and detailed knowledge of at least one system or movement in each of these two periods. 2. General knowledge of the thought of various major philosophers from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy and detailed knowledge of at least one philosopher from each of the two periods. 3. Familiarity with representative philosophers and movements in contemporary philosophy and in-depth understanding of at least one philosopher in at least two of the movements. 4. Knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in at least three of the following concentrations: ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, epistemology, and logic. (These concentrations are to be defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy.) 5. Knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry. 6. Knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life.

**Target for O4: Learning Goals for Philosophy BA: Content Knowledge**
Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class submitted their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the three Assessment Committee Members. Regarding the content of the papers, the three gave them an average grade of 2.9025.

**M 6: BA Philosophical Skills (O: 4)**
1. Ability to read critically and with comprehension. 2. Ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively. 3. Ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions. 4. Ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.

**Target for O4: Learning Goals for Philosophy BA: Content Knowledge**
Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class submitted their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the three Assessment Committee Members. Regarding the philosophical skills displayed in the papers, the three gave them an average grade of 2.64.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Phil 2010**
After discussion, the faculty decided no curricular changes were warranted at this time for Phil 2010. Nor does the Department see any real flaws in the current assessment procedure. However, the data was reported in too many different formats. This made data collection and aggregation inefficient. The Assessment Coordinator developed a form to standardize the reporting of the data. This form is available in Appendix 4 of the Departmental Learning Goals and Assessment Policy.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: 2010 Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals
- Measure: Philosophical skills | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals

- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The Philosophy Department

**Phil BA**
With respect to assessing the BA students (seniors who are majors in philosophy), the Department modified the Assessment Plan for the B.A. in Philosophy to collect data on oral communication and collaboration (see section 4 of the Department of Philosophy's Learning Goals and Assessment Policy). In addition, the data was reported in too many different formats. This made data collection and aggregation inefficient. The Assessment Coordinator developed a form to standardize the reporting of the data (see Appendix 3 of the Learning Goals and Assessment Policy).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: BA Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Learning Goals for Philosophy BA: Content Knowledge
- Measure: BA Philosophical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Learning Goals for Philosophy BA: Content Knowledge

- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The Philosophy Department

**Redesign of Phil 1010**
The Department decided to do a complete redesign of the 1010 curriculum. The current curriculum is too focused on critical thinking in the humanities and on critical thinking in every day life. The Department decided to focus Phil 1010 on the critical thinking skills needed to help students earn an undergraduate degree. (This will have the side benefit of contributing to the University's retention to graduation efforts.) The course will have three parts corresponding to Areas C, D and E of the core curriculum: critical thinking in the humanities, critical thinking in the social sciences, and critical thinking in the natural sciences. The goal of the course will be to give the students the knowledge and skills they need to do well in Areas C, D, and E of the core. As these are also basic skills for majors, the new Phil 1010 should also help students in their majors. George Rainbolt and Sandy Dwyer have reviewed the available texts and discovered that none provide what we need. Therefore the two of them have reluctantly agreed to write a new critical thinking text. It will be tested in draft form in the Spring 2007 semester and used for all sections starting in Fall 2007.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Application | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
- Measure: Philosophical skills | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
- Measure: Writing ability | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The Philosophy Department
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Learning Goals for the MA in Philosophy (M: 1, 2)**

Students pursuing the MA in philosophy are expected to acquire a greater mastery of the content knowledge that graduates of the B.A. program attain. These include: general knowledge of a variety of philosophical systems and movements from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy (ancient/modern and modern) and detailed knowledge of at least one system or movement in each of these two periods; general knowledge of the thought of various major philosophers from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy and detailed knowledge of at least one philosopher from each of the two periods; a familiarity with representative philosophers and movements in contemporary philosophy and in-depth understanding of at least one philosopher in at least two of the movements; knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in at least three of the main areas of philosophy (ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, epistemology, and logic, all defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy); knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry; and knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life. Students pursuing the MA in philosophy are expected to gain a higher level of the philosophico-scientific skills that graduates of the B.A. program attain. These include: the ability to read critically and with comprehension; the ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively; the ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions; and the ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication—major
2. Written Communication—core
3. Oral Communication—major
4. Oral Communication—core
5. Collaboration—major
6. Critical Thinking—major

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Philosophy MA**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU's strategic plan, which states: "In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University's curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices." Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: "Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students . . . ." The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in graduate education. In Critical Thinking (Phil 1010 in Area B) students honing reasoning skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Furthermore, because it is a writing intensive course, each section of Phil 1010 focuses developing the essential skill of writing lucid argumentative essays. In Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010 in Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history’s most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being.
M 1: MA Philosophical Skills (O: 1)

All students receiving the MA defend a thesis to a committee of at least 3 faculty members. Upon successful defense, the committee members all indicate a philosophical skills score (on a 4.0 scale). This is used as a measure of our success regarding the Philosophy MA Learning Outcome B.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Learning Goals for the MA in Philosophy

Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target:

For each MA thesis defended in the department, all committee members were required to report a grade regarding philosophical skills. The average of these grades was 3.11824.

M 2: MA Content Knowledge (O: 1)

All students receiving the MA defend a thesis to a committee of at least 3 faculty members. Upon successful defense, the committee members all indicate a content knowledge score (on a 4.0 scale). This is used as a measure of our success regarding the Philosophy MA Learning Outcome.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Learning Goals for the MA in Philosophy

Unfortunately, we did not have targets previously set as we did not realize that they were required; we will have them for next year.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target:

For each MA thesis defended in the department, all committee members were required to report a grade regarding content knowledge. The average of these grades was 3.29471.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

MA Program

The data indicate that the MA program is very successful. No changes to procedures or curriculum are appropriate at this time. However, the data was reported in too many different formats. This made data collection and aggregation inefficient. The Assessment Coordinator developed a form to standardize the reporting of the data (see Appendix 2 of the Learning Goals and Assessment Policy). The Department previously indicated that a tenured or tenure-track faculty member must be given responsibility for coordination of the collecting assessment data. Dr. Andrew J. Cohen was assigned this task and the data collection process this year was much improved.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: MA Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Learning Goals for the MA in Philosophy
- Measure: MA Philosophical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Learning Goals for the MA in Philosophy

Projected Completion Date: 07/2007
Responsible Person/Group: The Philosophy Department

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Overall, the Department was very satisfied with the performance of students in the MA program. They showed high abilities in both content and skills. Their abilities to e-mail their theses show that all of them have the technological expertise required by the field.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Overall, the Department was very satisfied with the performance of students in the MA program. They showed high abilities in both content and skills. Their abilities to e-mail their theses show that all of them have the technological expertise required by the field.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate the ability to actively accept responsibility for diverse roles, obligations, and actions, including self-regulation and other behaviors that positively influence patient/client outcomes, the profession, and the health care needs of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.1 through 5.5) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (1.1 through 1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate compassion, caring, and empathy in providing serves to patients/clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.8, 5.9) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate integrity in all interactions with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, and other health care providers, students, other consumers and payers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.10) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate professional behaviors in all interactions with patients/clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.11) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates expressively and receptively communicate in a culturally competent manner with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, practitioners, interdisciplinary team members, consumers, payers, and policy makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates exemplify primary regard for the interest of their patients/clients, thus assuming fiduciary responsibility of placing the needs of the patient/client ahead of their self-interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (2.1) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (CC-5.6, 5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates identify, respect, and act with consideration for patients’/clients’ differences, values, preferences, and expressed needs in all professional activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.18) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate a systematic process for clinical judgement and reflection to identify, monitor, and enhance clinical reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.19, CC-5.20) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (8.1, 8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates integrate the best possible research evidence with clinical expertise and patient values, to optimize patient/client outcomes and quality of life to achieve the highest level of excellence in clinical practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates effectively educate others using culturally appropriate teaching methods that are commensurate with the needs of the learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.26) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 11: Patient/Client Management Expectation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate competency in the five elements of care including examination, evaluation, diagnosis, prognosis, and intervention for patients across the lifespan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.28 through CC-5.44) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (12.1 through 17.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 12: Practice Management Expectation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates will demonstrate competence in determining a plan of care that is acceptable, realistic, culturally competent, and patient/client-centered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.53 through 56) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (10.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Three progressively complex comprehensive examination to assess students’ competency in specific content areas of Physical Therapy.

### Target for O1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DPT Students (n)</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DPT Students (n)</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DPT Students (n)</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DPT Students (n)</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DPT Students (n)</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DPT Students (n)</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DPT Students (n)</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

First year DPT students (n=20) average score 71% Second year MPT students (n=29) average score 74% Third year MPT students (n=34) average score 78%.

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation**

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

First year DPT students (n=20) average score 71% Second year MPT students (n=29) average score 74% Third year MPT students (n=34) average score 78%.

**M 2: Evidence-based case study (O: 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**

Each student presents a comprehensive case study of a patient including relevant evidence for interventions and expected outcomes.

**Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students orally presented a comprehensive clinical case study in their final semester using a format comparable to that required at a scientific meeting. All students scored 90% or higher.

**Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students orally presented a comprehensive clinical case study in their final semester using a format comparable to that required at a scientific meeting. All students scored 90% or higher.

**Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students orally presented a comprehensive clinical case study in their final semester using a format comparable to that required at a scientific meeting. All students scored 90% or higher.

**Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students orally presented a comprehensive clinical case study in their final semester using a format comparable to that required at a scientific meeting. All students scored 90% or higher.

**Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students orally presented a comprehensive clinical case study in their final semester using a format comparable to that required at a scientific meeting. All students scored 90% or higher.

**Target for O11: Prof Practice Expectation: Patient/Client Management**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students orally presented a comprehensive clinical case study in their final semester using a format comparable to that required at a scientific meeting. All students scored 90% or higher.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students orally presented a comprehensive clinical case study in their final semester using a format comparable to that required at a scientific meeting. All students scored 90% or higher.

M 3: Capstone research project (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and poster/platform for peer-review.

Target for O1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).
**Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

**Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

**Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Oral platform presentations occurred on December 5, 2005 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on May 4, 2006. 62.5% of the projects resulted in manuscripts for publication (5 out of 8).

**M 4: Clinical competence (O: 1,2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**


**Target for O1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

Data analysis of CPIs in progress
**Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation**
Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target:  
Data analysis of CPIs in progress

### M 5: Employer Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)
A survey instrument to assess graduates’ preparedness is sent to the employer.

#### Target for O1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

| Findings 2005-2006 - Target: |
In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007

**Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007

**Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
In process: the survey will be mailed in January 2007

**M 6: Licensure Pass Rate (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**
The Federal and State Boards for Physical Therapy pass rate for the program

**Target for O1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability**
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

**Target for O2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

**Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity**
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

**Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty**
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

**Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication**
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.
Target for **O6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism**  
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

Target for **O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence**  
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

Target for **O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**  
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

Target for **O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice**  
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

Target for **O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education**  
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

Target for **O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**  
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

Target for **O12: Practice Management Expectation**  
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
The first time pass rate for the Class of 2006 is 94.12%. Ultimate pass rate of those having taken the exam is 100%.

**M 7: Graduate Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**  
Six-months after graduation, students anonymously evaluate their satisfaction with the program preparation for performance of clinical and professional skills in Physical Therapy.

**Target for O1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability**  
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**  
The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.

**Target for O2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**  
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**  
The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.

**Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity**  
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Profession Practice Expectation: Professional Duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Profession Practice Expectation: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Profession Practice Expectation: Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Profession Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Profession Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O8:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Profession Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O9:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Profession Practice Expectation: Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O10:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Patient/Client Management Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O11:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Practice Management Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O12:</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>The graduate survey will be mailed in January, 2007 to the alumni who graduated May 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Clinical Performance Instrument for the Physical Therapist Student, (questions 1-5) developed by the American Physical Therapy Association.

Target for O1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Students graduating in May 2005, (n=34) scored 5/5, 4.96/5, 4.96/5, 5/5, 5/5 on questions 1-5 respectively on the Clinical Performance Inventory. Second year MPT students (n=39, completing semester 6) scored 5/5 out of all 5 questions. First year DPT students (completing semester 3) scored 4.9, 5/5, 4.95/5, 4.9/5, 4.95/5 on questions 1-5 respectively.

Target for O2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Students graduating in May 2005, (n=34) scored 5/5, 4.96/5, 4.96/5, 5/5, 5/5 on questions 1-5 respectively on the Clinical Performance Inventory. Second year MPT students (n=39, completing semester 6) scored 5/5 out of all 5 questions. First year DPT students (completing semester 3) scored 4.9, 5/5, 4.95/5, 4.9/5, 4.95/5 on questions 1-5 respectively.

Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Students graduating in May 2005, (n=34) scored 5/5, 4.96/5, 4.96/5, 5/5, 5/5 on questions 1-5 respectively on the Clinical Performance Inventory. Second year MPT students (n=39, completing semester 6) scored 5/5 out of all 5 questions. First year DPT students (completing semester 3) scored 4.9, 5/5, 4.95/5, 4.9/5, 4.95/5 on questions 1-5 respectively.

Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Students graduating in May 2005, (n=34) scored 5/5, 4.96/5, 4.96/5, 5/5, 5/5 on questions 1-5 respectively on the Clinical Performance Inventory. Second year MPT students (n=39, completing semester 6) scored 5/5 out of all 5 questions. First year DPT students (completing semester 3) scored 4.9, 5/5, 4.95/5, 4.9/5, 4.95/5 on questions 1-5 respectively.

Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Students graduating in May 2005, (n=34) scored 5/5, 4.96/5, 4.96/5, 5/5, 5/5 on questions 1-5 respectively on the Clinical Performance Inventory. Second year MPT students (n=39, completing semester 6) scored 5/5 out of all 5 questions. First year DPT students (completing semester 3) scored 4.9, 5/5, 4.95/5, 4.9/5, 4.95/5 on questions 1-5 respectively.

Target for O6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Students graduating in May 2005, (n=34) scored 5/5, 4.96/5, 4.96/5, 5/5, 5/5 on questions 1-5 respectively on the Clinical Performance Inventory. Second year MPT students (n=39, completing semester 6) scored 5/5 out of all 5 questions. First year DPT students (completing semester 3) scored 4.9, 5/5, 4.95/5, 4.9/5, 4.95/5 on questions 1-5 respectively.

Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence
Clinical instructors will assess students' professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Improve Scores on Division Comprehensive Exams**

Under the guidance of the Division’s Student Promotion and Retention Committee, the faculty will review the comprehensive examinations currently given the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year DPT students in order to see if the questions are reflective of current practice standards. Responses to examination questions will be reviewed. Trends, regarding types of questions missed, will be assessed (e.g. Neuro, Ortho, Clinical Reasoning) with a corresponding curricular assessment of topic areas. In 2006, the third year students who fell short of the 80% pass rate goal were responsible for correcting all their missed questions on the final comprehensive exam. Each student provided Dr. Deborah Michael, Chair of the Student Promotion and Retention Committee, with a summary statement for each question missed, including documentation of corresponding evidence as to why their first choice was incorrect and why their new choice was correct. Based on students’ feedback as to the benefits of this reflexive self-assessment exercise, we will incorporate this into the examination experience for all three years of students, thus enhancing learning opportunities.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Comprehensive Examinations | Patient/Client Management Expectation  
Practice Management Expectation | Professional Duty  
Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability | Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice  
Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning | Prof Practice Expectation: Education  
Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence | Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity

**Implementation Description:** May 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Student Promotion and Retention Committee and Curriculum Committee
Increase Visibility of Student Research
In Spring of 2006, 100% of student research groups presented their research in the form of poster or platform presentations at a national conference or regional conference and/or to a peer-reviewed journal.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Capstone research project
- **Outcome/Objective:** Patient/Client Management Expectation
- **Practice Management Expectation:** Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability | Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning | Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence | Prof Practice Expectation: Education | Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice | Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity | Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty | Prof Practice Expectations: Communication

**Implementation Description:** May 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty Research Team

Review the Clinical Performance Inventory
The Clinical Performance Inventory is the assessment instrument developed by the American Physical Therapy Association for Clinical Instructors to use to rate students’ performances while in clinical settings. The Director of Clinical Education will review the form with the faculty and will make suggestions for additional measures to adequately assess professional behaviors. Additionally, the Director of Clinical Education will review the rating criteria with the Clinical Instructors to ensure that the assessments are reflective of skills perceived.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Professional Behaviors
- **Outcome/Objective:** Patient/Client Management Expectation
- **Practice Management Expectation:** Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability | Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism | Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning | Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring | Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence | Prof Practice Expectation: Education | Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice | Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity | Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty | Prof Practice Expectations: Communication

**Implementation Description:** May 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Julie Jefferson and Leslie Taylor

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

1. Curricular additions of comprehensive examinations: The first year DPT students successfully met the passing criteria. 2. All third-year students scored 90% or higher on a comprehensive case presentation. This presentation required immersion in the literature prior to treating a patient while on their final clinical internship, developing an intervention and treatment plan based on the evidence, and assessing their outcomes. 3. 5 of 8 student research projects resulted in manuscripts for submission to peer-reviewed journals. 4. Three classes scored 4.9 or higher on the 5 measures of professional behavior as identified by the Clinical Performance Inventory. The Second Year students scored 100%, or entry-level, on all 5 measures. 5. Graduate survey data not available. 6. Employer data not available. 7. Clinical Competence scores under analysis. 8. First time Pass Rate data on the national licensure exam for the graduates of 2006 was 94.14%.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

1. Second and third year students fell below the passing rate set by the Division on the yearly comprehensive examination. Additional attention will be focused on incorporating Board examination questions on all tests in all clinical courses throughout the curriculum. 2. Student research projects were presented in poster format at the State Physical Therapy conference in addition to the program's research forum. The students' research was highlighted on the Division's web page. Further attention will be placed on increasing the number the projects that are submitted for peer-review for presentation at a national conference or for publication. 3. Better tracking of alumni is needed to ensure delivery of post-graduate surveys and communication.
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**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Physics and Astronomy is an integral part of the University mission of education, research, and public service. In particular, the department’s mission in these three areas is Education: To provide our students with the skills and knowledge to be successful practitioners and leaders in their field. To prepare students for long-term success in fast-changing areas of research and technological development. Research: To extend our current understanding in a variety of sub-fields of physics and astronomy by performing state-of-the-art research. To collaborate with other departments and institutions in cutting edge research. To prepare students to perform and direct state-of-the-art research in individual and collaborative environments. Service: To support other programs within the university through training in physics and astronomy. To work with local, state, and national communities in
communicating the roles and benefits of physics and astronomy in our lives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Collaboration (M: 5, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students collaborate effectively with other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Contemporary Issues (M: 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Critical Thinking: Research Questions (M: 5, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students develop research questions appropriate for research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Critical Thinking: Data Collection (M: 5, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis (M: 5, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 6: Critical Thinking: Future Research (M: 5, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7: Oral Communication (M: 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8: Written Communication (M: 5, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Core Knowledge Content (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate a knowledge of core principles in modern physics, statistical and thermal physics, classical mechanics, and electricity and magnetism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10: Application of Knowledge (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems, using ordinary and partial differential equations and vector calculus where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 11: Computer Skills (M: 5, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

13 Technology--major

**SLO 12: Research Equipment Skills (M: 5, 6)**

Students effectively use appropriate specialized research equipment.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

13 Technology--major

**SLO 13: Critical Thinking in Area D courses (M: 2, 3, 4)**

A student that complete an Area D laboratory science sequence should be able to: a. formulate appropriate questions and testable hypotheses for research; b. effectively collect appropriate (empirical) evidence; c. apply and integrate principles and concepts to analyze problems within specific core areas; d. appropriately evaluate and interpret claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses; e. use the results of analysis to appropriately construct new arguments or alternate hypotheses and formulate new questions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

8 Critical Thinking--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Physics Core (O: 9, 10)**

Physics Majors take a number of required courses in their junior and senior years that cover the content in the Physics and Math Core. The core content courses are Phys3401/3402 (Modern Physics I and II), Phys3850 (Statistical and Thermal Physics), Phys4600 (Classical Mechanics), and Phys4700 (Electricity and Magnetism). The outcomes are assessed by the instructors for each of the core courses by rating each student on each outcomes with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O9: Core Knowledge Content**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

Approximately ten students were rated in each of the core physics courses. An average rating of 3.7 out of 5.0 was given for Outcome 9, Core Knowledge Content, and a rating of 3.6 out of 5.0 for Outcome 10, Application of Knowledge.

**Target for O10: Application of Knowledge**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

Approximately ten students were rated in each of the core physics courses. An average rating of 3.7 out of 5.0 was given for Outcome 9, Core Knowledge Content, and a rating of 3.6 out of 5.0 for Outcome 10, Application of Knowledge.

**M 2: Physics Intro Sequences - Lecture (O: 13)**

In the lecture portion of Physics 1111K, 1112K, 2211K, and 2212K, each instructor included two targeted critical thinking essay questions on their final exam. These questions cannot be answered directly from memorized material, but require some critical analysis. One goal of our approach has been to standardize the assessment tools used in each class so that we can compare results between instructors and from term to term. By using only final exam questions we can use the same question over a number of semesters. In addition to standardizing the questions, we have also established grading rubrics to be used by each instructor.

**Target for O13: Critical Thinking in Area D courses**

Physics final exams are comprehensive and difficult. They are mainly problem solving questions. The critical thinking questions on the exams are routinely the most difficult. Since they are based in the physics taught in the course, they require understanding of the concepts as well as the critical thinking skills being tested here. For this reason, we have set target performance level of an average score of 50% on each question.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Data was collected for all students in the assessed physics courses in which the instructor is faculty or lecturer, but not in those taught by adjunct faculty. Based on data from 325 students in Phys1111, the average score on the two final exam questions was 30%. Based on data from 225 students in Phys1112, the average score on the two final exam questions was 45%. Based on data from 168 students in Phys2211, the average score on the two final exam questions was 54%. Based on data from 112 students in Phys2212, the average score on the two final exam questions was 57%.

**M 3: Physics Intro Sequences - Lab (O: 13)**

Assessment is performed in the laboratory for the physics intro courses by giving quizzes containing identified critical thinking questions to lab students during the next to last week of the labs. Students are given extra credit for this quiz. A random sample of
papers is used for the critical thinking analysis.

### Target for O13: Critical Thinking in Area D courses

Since questions are based in the physics taught in the course, they require understanding of the concepts as well as the critical thinking skills being tested here. For this reason, we have set target performance level of an average score of 50% for the laboratory quiz.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

A random sample of quiz scores was scored according to the developed rubric for each of the four courses. Based on data from 60 students in Phys1111, the average score on the five quiz questions was 67%. Based on data from 50 students in Phys1112, the average score on the five quiz questions was 65%. Based on data from 67 students in Phys2211, the average score on the five quiz questions was 73%. Based on data from 58 students in Phys2212, the average score on the five quiz questions was 66%.

### M 4: Astronomy Intro Sequence (O: 13)

A set of core questions is included on final exams in every section. These questions stressed physical, spatial, and quantitative reasoning.

#### Target for O13: Critical Thinking in Area D courses

The critical thinking questions on the exams are routinely the most difficult. Since they are based in the astronomy taught in the course, they require understanding of the concepts as well as the critical thinking skills being tested here. For this reason, we have set target performance level of an average score of 50% on each question.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Data was collected for all students in the assessed physics courses in which the instructor is faculty or lecturer, but not in those taught by adjunct faculty. Based on data from 489 students in Astr1010, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 49%. Based on data from 478 students in Astr1020, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 56%.

### M 5: Modern Physics Lab (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12)

Physics Majors are also required to take a junior-level laboratory course, Phys3901 (Modern Physics Laboratory I). This course is designed to bring the student from the level of the introductory physics labs (where goals and procedures are mostly given to them) up to a level where they are prepared to do a Senior Research Project (more independent and open-ended project, collaborating with graduate students and professors in a research lab). The development of critical thinking skills and appropriate written communication (lab notebooks and lab reports) are emphasized. In these lab courses the students work both independently and collaboratively. They also use computers and other specialized laboratory apparatus. The outcomes are assessed by the instructor by rating each student on each outcomes with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

#### Target for O1: Collaboration

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Ten students were rated at the conclusion of Modern Physics Laboratory I. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.5 out of 5.0, Outcome 3, Research Questions - 3.9 out of 5.0, Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0, Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0, Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0, Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0, Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.1 out of 5.0, Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.1 out of 5.0

#### Target for O3: Critical Thinking: Research Questions

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Ten students were rated at the conclusion of Modern Physics Laboratory I. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.5 out of 5.0, Outcome 3, Research Questions - 3.9 out of 5.0, Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0, Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0, Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0, Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0, Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.1 out of 5.0, Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.1 out of 5.0

#### Target for O4: Critical Thinking: Data Collection

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Ten students were rated at the conclusion of Modern Physics Laboratory I. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.5 out of 5.0, Outcome 3, Research Questions - 3.9 out of 5.0, Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0, Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0, Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0, Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0, Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.1 out of 5.0, Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.1 out of 5.0

#### Target for O5: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Ten students were rated at the conclusion of Modern Physics Laboratory I. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.1 out of 5.0

**Target for O6: Critical Thinking: Future Research**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Ten students were rated at the conclusion of Modern Physics Laboratory I. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.1 out of 5.0

**Target for O8: Written Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Ten students were rated at the conclusion of Modern Physics Laboratory I. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.1 out of 5.0

**Target for O11: Computer Skills**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Ten students were rated at the conclusion of Modern Physics Laboratory I. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.1 out of 5.0

**Target for O12: Research Equipment Skills**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Ten students were rated at the conclusion of Modern Physics Laboratory I. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.1 out of 5.0

**M 6: Senior Research (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12)**

The capstone of the physics bachelor's degree program is Phys4950, Senior Research. In this course students work in the research lab of a professor (within Physics and Astronomy or another department) to perform a research project. The project is one that is integrated with the ongoing research done in that group and may lead to the student being part of a presentation at a scientific conference or an article in a scientific journal. It is meant to prepare students for graduate work or a career in corporate research and development or basic research. The student participates in research group interaction (e.g. group meetings) over the course of the project. At the conclusion of the project, the student presents his/her results as a written and oral report. The outcomes are assessed by the faculty mentor overseeing the students senior research project by rating the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O1: Collaboration**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O2: Contemporary Issues**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0
Target for O3: Critical Thinking: Research Questions

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for O4: Critical Thinking: Data Collection

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for O5: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for O6: Critical Thinking: Future Research

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for O7: Oral Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for O8: Written Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for O11: Computer Skills
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four students were rated by their mentors at the conclusion of Senior Research. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 out of 5.0

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Senior Research Presentation Preparation

Learning outcomes related to oral and written communication were below target values. Therefore, a more concerted effort will be made to prepare students for presenting their senior research results in an oral presentation and a written report.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Senior Research | Outcome/Objective: Oral Communication
| Written Communication

Implementation Description: Dec. 1, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Brian Thoms, undergrad advisor and supervisor for Senior Research course.
Additional Resources: When possible, a time slot in the departmental colloquium schedule will be used for oral presentation of the results of senior research projects.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Over the assessment period (2005/2006 academic year), 3 students received B.S. degrees in Physics. Since we have small numbers of students involved at each assessment point (core courses (10), junior labs (10), and senior research(4)), accurate measures of student learning outcomes will required averaging over several years. In addition, progress can not be measured yet since this is the first year of the assessment.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Outcomes 7 and 8, Oral and Written Communication, were rated below the targets as revealed by assessment in our capstone course. Senior Research. Continued attention by research mentors to preparation for oral and written presentations is required. Outcomes 9 and 10, Core knowledge content and Application of knowledge, were slightly below target values as revealed by ratings of instructors in core courses taken by majors in their junior and senior year. However, with 9 or 10 students in each course and only 3 to 5 students receiving B.S. degrees in an average year, some of the students not meeting target levels are likely leaving the program.

Mission / Purpose

The department is an integral part of the University mission of education, research, and public service. In particular, the department’s mission in these three areas is Education: To provide our students with the skills and knowledge to be successful practitioners and leaders in their field. To prepare students for long-term success in fast-changing areas of research and technological development. Research: To extend our current understanding in a variety of sub-fields of physics and astronomy by performing state-of-the-art research. To collaborate with other departments and institutions in cutting edge research. To prepare students to perform and direct state-of-the-art research in individual and collaborative environments. Service: To support other programs within the university through training in physics and astronomy. To work with local, state, and national communities in communicating the roles and benefits of physics and astronomy in our lives.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

##### SLO 1: Collaboration (M: 1, 5)
Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

##### SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 2, 4, 6)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

##### SLO 3: Formulate Research Questions (M: 2, 4, 6)
Students develop research questions appropriate for research.

##### SLO 4: Data Collection (M: 2, 4, 6)
Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.

##### SLO 5: Data Analysis (M: 2, 4, 6)
Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.

##### SLO 6: Future Research (M: 2, 4, 6)
Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

##### SLO 7: Oral Communication (M: 1, 4, 5)
Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research, such as a scientific meeting, conference, or colloquium.

##### SLO 8: Written Communication (M: 1, 2, 5, 6)
Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research, such as scientific journals.

##### SLO 9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles (M: 2, 3, 4, 6)
Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, and quantum mechanics. Astronomy concentration students will instead demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in at least two of the above areas, as well as in the fundamentals of astrophysics.

##### SLO 10: Math Skills and Application (M: 2, 3, 4, 6)
Students demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and tensor analysis, Fourier series and boundary value problems, and complex analysis.

##### SLO 11: Computer Skills (M: 1, 5)
Students effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing.

##### SLO 12: Specialized Equipment (M: 1, 5)
Students effectively use appropriate specialized equipment for experimental or theoretical research.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Astronomy Adviser (O: 1, 7, 8, 11, 12)
In the astronomy concentration (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research advisor throughout the course of their M.S. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student’s progress in collaboration, knowledge content, and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the research advisor following the student’s successful completion of the M.S. requirements. The advisor rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O1: Collaboration**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O7: Oral Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O8: Written Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O11: Computer Skills**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O12: Specialized Equipment**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.7 out of 5.0

**M 2: Astronomy Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10)**
In the astronomy concentration (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research advisor throughout the course of their M.S. program. The students also write a research paper (or scientific publication) which is reviewed by the research advisor. The learning outcomes are assessed by the research advisor following the student’s successful completion of the M.S. requirements. The advisor rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O3: Formulate Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O4: Data Collection**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.7 out of 5.0

Target for O6: Future Research

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.7 out of 5.0

Target for O8: Written Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.7 out of 5.0

Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Four Astronomy concentration students were rated by their research advisor based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.7 out of 5.0

Target for O10: Math Skills and Application

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

Nine Astronomy concentration students were rated by the exam committee based on their qualifying examination (Qual I). Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 3.1 out of 5.0

Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

Nine Astronomy concentration students were rated by the exam committee based on their qualifying examination (Qual I). Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 3.1 out of 5.0

Target for O10: Math Skills and Application

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

Nine Astronomy concentration students were rated by the exam committee based on their qualifying examination (Qual I). Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 3.1 out of 5.0

M 3: Astronomy Qualifying Exam I (O: 9, 10)

As part of the astronomy concentration, each astronomy graduate student takes a first qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on the broad scope of astronomy and astrophysics and the essential skills required to apply the relevant physical and mathematical reasoning. Students are counseled at this point on their preparedness for further study. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

Nine Astronomy concentration students were rated by the exam committee based on their qualifying examination (Qual I). Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 3.1 out of 5.0

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

Nine Astronomy concentration students were rated by the exam committee based on their qualifying examination (Qual I). Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 3.1 out of 5.0

M 4: Physics Committee General Examination (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10)
Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students take a general examination (typically an oral examination) administered by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the general examination are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

### Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

### Target for O3: Formulate Research Questions

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

### Target for O4: Data Collection

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

### Target for O5: Data Analysis

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

### Target for O6: Future Research

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

### Target for O7: Oral Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

### Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O10: Math Skills and Application**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection – 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 3.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**M 5: Physics Advisor (O: 1, 7, 8, 11, 12)**

Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research advisor and committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student's progress in collaboration, knowledge content, and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the advisor at the completion of M.S. degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O1: Collaboration**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 3.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O7: Oral Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 3.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O8: Written Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 3.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O11: Computer Skills**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 3.7 out of 5.0

**Target for O12: Specialized Equipment**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Four Physics students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 3.7 out of 5.0

**M 6: Physics Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10)**

Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students write a research paper which is reviewed by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related
to the research paper are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O3: Formulate Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O4: Data Collection**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O6: Future Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O8: Written Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research – 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for O10: Math Skills and Application

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Four Physics students were rated by their research committee (a total of 17 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 3.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.1 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Over the assessment period (2005/2006 academic year), 8 students received M.S. degrees in Physics, 4 of which completing the degree with an astronomy concentration. Since we have small numbers of students involved at each assessment point, accurate measures of student learning outcomes will require averaging over several years. In addition, progress can not be measured yet since this is the first year of the assessment. Both the Physics M.S. and the astronomy concentration performed well, generally meeting targets. It can be noted that the astronomy concentration performed well above targets in assessments performed at the time of the completion of the degree.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Ratings were significantly below target for astronomy concentration students regarding physics, astronomy and math knowledge and application at the time of the first qualifying exam. However, ratings in those areas were above target for students completing their degree as rated by their research advisor. Notice that a different cohort of students participate in the two measures in any given year. This difference could indicate that great improvement is being made in these areas between the first qualifying exam and the completion of the M.S. degree. It could also reflect the loss of students from the program which might suggest changes in admission policies are called for. Data for more than a single year is required to reasonably draw conclusions.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Physics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The department is an integral part of the University mission of education, research, and public service. In particular, the department's mission in these three areas is Education: To provide our students with the skills and knowledge to be successful practitioners and leaders in their field. To prepare students for long-term success in fast-changing areas of research and technological development. Research: To extend our current understanding in a variety of sub-fields of physics and astronomy by performing state-of-the-art research. To collaborate with other departments and institutions in cutting edge research. To prepare students to perform and direct state-of-the-art research in individual and collaborative environments. Service: To support other programs within the university through training in physics and astronomy. To work with local, state, and national communities in communicating the roles and benefits of physics and astronomy in our lives.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Data Collection (M: 1, 2)
Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.

SLO 2: Data Analysis (M: 1, 2)
Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.

SLO 3: Future Research Questions (M: 1, 2)
Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

SLO 4: Oral Communication (M: 2, 3)
Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research, such as a scientific meeting, conference, or colloquium.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Written Communication (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research, such as scientific journals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Core Physics Principles (M: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, advanced quantum mechanics, and advanced statistical mechanics. Students in the applied physics or biophysics options shall be able to demonstrate and apply knowledge in certain alternative areas appropriate to their specialties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Math Skills and Application (M: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and tensor analysis, Fourier series and boundary value problems, and complex analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Computer Skills (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Specialized Research Equipment (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively use appropriate specialized equipment for experimental or theoretical research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Collaboration (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Formulate Research Questions (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students develop research questions appropriate for research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Committee Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12)**

In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the written dissertation, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, scientific process, written communication skills, and physics and math knowledge. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O1: Data Collection**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O2: Data Analysis**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**Target for O3: Future Research Questions**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0
Target for **O5: Written Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for **O6: Core Physics Principles**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for **O7: Math Skills and Application**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for **O11: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

Target for **O12: Formulate Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0 Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0

**M 2: Committee Presentation and Defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12)**

In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the oral presentation and defense, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, scientific process, oral communication skills, and physics and math knowledge. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

Target for **O1: Data Collection**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 6,
Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0

**Target for O2: Data Analysis**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0

**Target for O3: Future Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0

**Target for O4: Oral Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0

**Target for O6: Core Physics Principles**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0

**Target for O7: Math Skills and Application**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0

**Target for O11: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Six Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (23 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0 Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0 Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0 Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0

**Target for O12: Formulate Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome
M 3: Research Advisor (O: 4, 5, 8, 9, 10)

The students work in close collaboration with their research advisor throughout the course of their Ph.D. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student's progress in collaboration, communication, and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the research advisor following the student's successful dissertation defense. The advisor rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

Target for O4: Oral Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Target for O5: Written Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Target for O8: Computer Skills

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Target for O9: Specialized Research Equipment

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Target for O10: Collaboration

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
Target for O7: Math Skills and Application
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Four students were rated by the exam committee based on their qualifying examination. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.6 out of 5.0 Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 out of 5.0

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Over the assessment period (2005/2006 academic year), 6 students received Ph.D. degrees in Physics. Since we have small numbers of students involved at each assessment point, accurate measures of student learning outcomes will require averaging over several years. In addition, progress can not be measured yet since this is the first year of the assessment. Physics Ph.D. students performed well, meeting all targets. An extremely good performance is observed for oral communication, especially considering that most of the students are not native English speakers.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
No significant weaknesses are seen in this assessment. However, the small numbers of students mean that year to year variability is expected. Results over several years are needed for meaningful analysis.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Political Science BA
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Because of Georgia State University’s location adjacent to the State Capitol, the Federal Reserve Board, federal and state courts, Fulton County Government and Atlanta City Hall, the Department of Political Science is a natural site for the study of politics in the Southeast. Additionally, Atlanta’s strength as an increasingly important center for international trade and commerce demands that the University--and, in some ways, most especially the Department of Political Science--provide its students with a broad international perspective as part of a comprehensive education. The Department of Political Science is committed to preparing undergraduate students (the broader GSU undergraduate community as well as our more than 620 majors) to think critically, to communicate ideas and arguments effectively, to make informed choices, and to engage in creative problem-solving. The Department’s mission also includes grounding its students in the methodology of social science as well as preparing students for the practical and professional application of their course of study. Moreover, the Department strives to create an important experiential component to the BA program in Political Science, encouraging study abroad, discipline-oriented internships, and participation in competitive academic teams (Mock Trial, Model United Nations, Model Arab League). The Department of Political Science offers undergraduate students education in the five major fields of the discipline: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Public Administration/Policy. The BA program in Political Science endeavors to ensure that students get broad exposure to these fields. With two courses in the University's undergraduate core (e.g. POLS 1101 American Government and POLS 2401 Global Issues), the Department is exceptionally well placed to help realize the University's mission of producing responsible citizens who can contribute to the ideals of an open, democratic and global society. The Department seeks to enhance student participation outside the classroom, to stimulate and award academic excellence, and to stimulate general awareness throughout the University community of the nature and impact of the field of Political Science.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Analyzing Contemporary Issues (M: 1)
Students should effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural questions and students effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
10 Contemporary Issues--core

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes (M: 2)
Students should demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of the institutions of government and the behavior of governmental and non governmental actors. Specifically, students should have a fundamental knowledge of constitutionalism,
federalism, knowledge of the key institutions of government and the key actors as well as separation of powers, civil liberties, and the electoral process for American Government

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
9 Contemporary Issues--major
10 Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Substantive Knowledge--Global Perspectives (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate recognition of the universality of politics in human experience, an appreciation of political issues from a global perspective, and an appreciation of global issues from a political perspective. Specifically students should demonstrate an understanding of comparative perspectives and the international system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate an ability to assess evidence using principles of logical analysis and be able to apply that evidence when making conclusions. This outcome includes the ability to recognize appropriate supporting evidence as well as assessing contrary evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Quantitative Skills--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Effective Communication (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate an ability to write a paper or make an oral presentation with a clear thesis statement or question, support this statement or address this question in a logical manner, and draw logical conclusions from findings. In doing so, students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Critical Thinking--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should demonstrate organizational skills of presentation without distracting grammatical errors. In such communication, students should demonstrate the analytical skills in outcome #2 above. Students also should be able to demonstrate an ability to support their findings by citing relevant authorities. Students should demonstrate a nuanced understanding of plagiarism when writing their own papers and must not use the ideas of others without citation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major  
2 Written Communication--core  
3 Oral Communication--major  
4 Oral Communication--core  
13 Technology--major  
14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 7: Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major (M: 7)**

Students should demonstrate basic knowledge of the use of social statistics. Students should demonstrate an ability to understand data reported in various forms. Students should demonstrate an ability to conduct research using traditional and new technological resources. Students should demonstrate an understanding of the scientific method, including the formulation of hypotheses and the role of independent, control and dependent variables.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major  
11 Quantitative Skills--major  
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Analyzing Contemporary Issues (O: 1)**

For POLS 1101, the assessment involved four questions from a 50-question multiple choice exam across three sections, totaling 408 students. For POLS 2401, the assessment involved a final exam with 50 multiple choice questions for one section of the class, totaling 98 students.

**Target for O1: Analyzing Contemporary Issues**

An average of 70% of students will get the questions correct in both classes surveyed.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

POLS 1101 (American Government and Politics): Results Goal IV 1: Diverse Perspectives Percent Passing: Question #2 92% Question #4 95% Question #34 81% Question #35 88% Question #39 76% Question #46 65% 2. POLS 2401 (Global Issues). Results Goal IV 1: Percent passing: Question #25 competing theories of international trade88% Question #26 competing views of mercantilism89% Question #27 competing theories of international trade84% Question #29 competing theories of development92% Question #30 competing theories of development86% Results Goal IV 2a: Question #7 on the Muslim world89% Question #8 on the Muslim world and US89% Question #9 on values in the Muslim World 82%

**M 2: Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes (O: 2)**

The Department offers three major concentrations, General Political Science, Pre Law and International Relations with different course requirements for each concentration. Students must earn 27 credit hours in the major to graduate and must take at least one course in three of the five subject areas in political science, to wit, American Government, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Public Administration and Political Theory. Currently the only course that all majors must take is PolIS 3800, Introduction to Political Research. With the introduction of the CTW courses, all students will be required to take a senior seminar. This will allow better assessment across major concentrations. Concerning the learning outcomes for the major, students should be able to pass exams and pass courses involving these concepts. The Director of Undergraduate Studies along with the Undergraduate Committee, Chair and Executive Committee reviews syllabi and exams from courses in the five subfields to ensure that students are being successfully taught these concepts and in particular examines courses appropriate to each concentration. It also collects data involving the overall pass rate for these classes.

**Target for O2: Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes**

The Department seeks evidence that all syllabi in POLS 1101 are in conformity with the goals of teaching core concepts, structures, and processes of US and Georgia government. The Department seeks pass rates of no less than 90% for students in POLS 1101.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Review of syllabi and exam content reflects a high degree of conformity with the substantive learning outcomes noted above.
Syllabi and exams from multiple sections of PolS 1101 directly and consistently address the substantive knowledge learning objectives. Syllabi and exams for PolS 1101 consistently focus on: the practice of governmental institutions in the U.S. and Georgia, highlighting fundamental concepts such as constitutionalism, federalism, powers of governmental institutions, the separation of powers, civil liberties, bureaucracy, the media, and voting and the electoral process. PolS 1101 is a well-established course in the Department; it is always taught in multiple (and often large) sections each semester by junior and senior faculty as well as advanced graduate students. The course is further supported by the appointment of a faculty coordinator to help ensure greater consistency among the various sections and instructors in terms of substantive content, textbook choices, and learning outcomes. This year the Department has also piloted the use of Supplemental Instruction leaders to assist the faculty teaching the course. In addition, this course is part of the University core curriculum; therefore, we have a very large number of non-majors in each section. POLS 1101 also requires a significant level of department resources to meet the needs of hundreds of such students each semester. However, despite the large number of students taught, the Department achieved a very high and fairly consistent success rate: more than 9 out of 10 students pass the course and the average grades conform to a normal distribution curve.

M 3: Substantive Knowledge—Global Perspectives (O: 3)

Concerning the second learning outcome (the universality of politics in human experience and appreciation of political issues from a global perspective), students should be able to pass exams demonstrating the political nature of global issues. The Department will review syllabi and exams from PolS 2401 (Global Issues), a required class in which this outcome is addressed, to ensure that the outcome is being addressed successfully. It also will collect data involving the overall pass rate for these classes.

Target for O3: Substantive Knowledge—Global Perspectives

The Department seeks evidence that all syllabi in POLS 2401 Global Issues are in conformity with the goals of teaching about the universality of politics in human experience and appreciation of political issues from a global perspective. The Department seeks pass rates of no less than 90% for students in POLS 2401.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Syllabi and exams for PolS 2401 directly address the second substantive knowledge learning outcome: the universality of politics in human experience, an appreciation of political issues from a global perspective, and an appreciation of global politics from a political perspective. In doing so the course covers a very wide range of “current events” issues from a political science perspective, including security, environment, energy, human rights, immigration, gender, development, and many others depending on the instructor of record. It also typically includes other disciplinary perspectives when analyzing these issues, such as economics, history, anthropology, area studies, sociology, and the like. PolS 2401 Global Issues is a well-established course in the Department; it is always taught in multiple (and often large) sections each semester by junior and senior faculty as well as advanced graduate students. The course is further supported by the appointment of a faculty coordinator to help ensure greater consistency among the various sections and instructors in terms of substantive content, textbook choices, and learning outcomes. This year the Department has also piloted the use of Supplemental Instruction leaders to assist the faculty teaching the course. In addition, this course is part of the University core curriculum; therefore, we have a very large number of non-majors in each section. POLS 2401 also requires a significant level of department resources to meet the needs of hundreds of such students each semester. However, despite the large number of students taught, the Department achieved a very high and fairly consistent success rate: more than 9 out of 10 students pass the course and the average grades conform to a normal distribution curve.

M 4: Analytical Skills—Distinguishing Behaviors (O: 4)

The assessment of this goal is the same for both learning outcomes listed above (an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior, and an ability to assess evidence using principles of logical analysis and be able to apply that evidence when making conclusions). Here the department has instituted compulsory writing assignments in all upper division courses and has encouraged communication assignments in the lower division. In order to assess the achievement of students in regard to the outcomes of sections 2 and 3 of our undergraduate program, the Department will require students to present at the time of their senior audit their best paper written in a political science class. Such papers will be used by the Department to assess its success in achieving these outcomes.

Target for O4: Analytical Skills—Distinguishing Behaviors

The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Papers collected by the DUGS during senior audits were used to provide assessment material for this learning objective. Response rate significantly improved over 2004-05 with 95 papers submitted out of 107 graduating political science majors in the past year as compared to 34 papers out of 107 graduates that were received in the 2004-2005 academic year. Thus this past year the response rate was 89% as compared to the previous response rate of about 30%. However, there still is an unwanted degree of variation in quality as related to these papers. Part of this is to be expected as we are one department in a large university with significant variation in student ability and aptitude. In addition, just as last year, there are still problems with the collection process that hamper our ability to properly assess these skill sets. First, the types of assignments clearly varied across the papers. Some were more substantial research papers; others were closer to opinion or review essays. The length varied widely as well depending on the nature of the assignment. Some were a few pages long, while a few others were over 50 pages. Not all papers received a grade on them, making it difficult for the Director of Undergraduate Studies to evaluate them without more knowledge of the assignment requirements and grading criteria of the instructors for whom the papers were written. Therefore, while the majority of these papers (typically the students “best papers” from their political science courses) indeed conformed to the analytical skills measured here (i.e., an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior), others simply were not substantial enough to make a clear judgment.

M 5: Analytical Skills—Appropriate Use of Evidence (O: 5)

The department has instituted compulsory writing assignments in all upper division courses. In order to assess the achievement of students in regard to the goal of appropriate use of empirical evidence, the Department will require students to present at the time of their senior audit their best paper written in a political science class. Such papers will be used by the Department to assess its success in achieving this desired learning outcome.

Target for O5: Analytical Skills—Appropriate Use of Evidence
The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

While the majority of student papers assessed (typically the students’ “best papers” from their political science courses) indeed conformed to the analytical skills measured here (e.g., an ability to assess evidence using principles of logical analysis and be able to apply that evidence when making conclusions), others simply were not substantial enough to make a clear judgment. In contrast to the substantial research papers submitted, the quality of shorter essays was much more variable. Some papers were more polemical rather than analytical; others were merely campaign papers turned in by students receiving internship credit for working on a political campaign while still others lacked appropriate evidence or failed to make a clear argument/thesis.

**M 6: Effective Communication (O: 6)**

The assessment of this learning outcome is conducted through an evaluation of class writing assignments and the ability of students to participate in class through through specific assignments and through class participation.

**Target for O6: Effective Communication**

The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

While our assessment notes significant evidence of effective communication, there remains variability in writing skills that should be remedied. The best papers tend to be well-organized, have a clear thesis statement or argument, and are relatively free of spelling or grammatical errors.

**M 7: Methodological Skills (O: 7)**

The assessment of this learning outcome involves evaluating syllabi, exams and evaluations from PolS 3800 (Introduction to Political Research), a course required of all political science majors.

**Target for O7: Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major**

The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Approximately 89% of Political Science majors taking the mandatory POLS 3800 Research Methods course pass. Thus, while this learning objective is largely being met, there is still room for improvement. PolS 3800 however covers material that is often more difficult for students to master in a single course, and many social science students are somewhat math phobic. We expect its grade distribution is similar to the research methods courses required in other departments, such as Sociology and Economics. In our assessment of senior graduation audit papers, it is interesting to note that in 2004-05 only 2 out of 34 papers received made any use of statistical analysis as taught in PolS 3800, and in 2005-06 only 8 out of 95 used numerical data, and only one paper was submitted from POLS 3880. However, in an improvement from last year, many papers demonstrated familiarity with the scientific method as defined by our methodological skills learning outcome, particularly in terms of formulating hypotheses and manipulating variables.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Experiential Learning**

The Department should consider ways to evaluate non-course learning experiences and related data in the overall undergraduate program instruction assessment process, such as internships, directed study projects, Model UN/Model Arab League, Mock Trial, study abroad programs, and similar programs. These are very popular with our political science majors and the Department has enjoyed considerable success in terms of competitions with other institutions. As such experiences may play a significant role in our training of undergraduate students for future careers in law, diplomacy, or international business the Department should begin thinking of ways to incorporate measures of participation and success in our assessment goals and processes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence</td>
<td>Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological Skills</td>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Knowledge--Global Perspectives</td>
<td>Substantive Knowledge--Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Knowledge--Structures and Processes</td>
<td>Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Undergraduate Studies/Chair  
**Additional Resources:** Currently, the Department does not have sufficient resources to support its three academic teams (which compete at local, regional, and national invitational tournaments). Such academic teams deserve consistent funding.

**Refining Assessment of Student Written Work**

In terms of using student papers as part of the assessment process, the Department at a minimum should insist that students save and submit their best research-intensive work(i.e., substantial research papers with a demonstrably high grade) from political science courses, ideally papers that involve independent research and analysis. As argued last year, the most promising avenue is to require students to present their papers from PolS 3800, the research course required of all majors. This would ensure consistency of the type of papers submitted. While some students might worry that a data intensive course is difficult and does not reflect their best work, since the purpose is to assess learning outcomes it will allow consistency across all papers and ensure proper assessment of basic social science skills such as theory development, use of hypotheses and sill at analyzing data and information. While students take PolS 3800 at different stages of their careers almost all are junior or seniors and the department and the college particularly...
want to assess the skills learned from early college entrance to later college years. Thus both the junior and senior year papers would allow this assessment. In addition, we might use this information to analyze the intellectual and educational development between the junior and senior years if an examination reveals systematic differences in quality of 3800 papers between the junior and senior years. Another solution is to mandate that all majors take this course in their junior year. Once the appropriate types of papers are chosen for assessment the Department should attempt to devise a basic evaluation form or scale to further track student performance on three learning outcomes: analytical skills, communication skills, and methodological skills. Possibly the Undergraduate Committee could work together with the larger Department to devise and implement such an assessment during the next phase of this process.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence  
  | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence  
- Measure: Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors  
  | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors  
- Measure: Effective Communication  
  | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication  
- Measure: Methodological Skills  
  | Outcome/Objective: Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major  

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Undergraduate Studies/Chair  
**Additional Resources:**

---

**Supplemental Instruction**  
All large (i.e., more than 120 students) sections of POLS 1101 American Government and POLS 2401 Global Issues should have the assistance of Supplemental Instruction leaders. SI leaders (as planned for under the Department’s successful RPG proposal for 2006-07) can facilitate student involvement, learning, and success.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence  
  | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence  
- Measure: Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors  
  | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors  
- Measure: Effective Communication  
  | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication  
- Measure: Substantive Knowledge--Global Perspectives  
  | Outcome/Objective: Substantive Knowledge--Global Perspectives  
- Measure: Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes  
  | Outcome/Objective: Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes  

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Undergraduate Studies/Chair  
**Additional Resources:** The Department received $18,000 for SI leaders in 2006-07. For continuous impact, support for the program must likewise be continuous.

---

**Writing Intensive Courses**  
Given that the Department has some of the largest class sizes on campus, our stated objective of developing effective communication through writing is a significant challenge. Moreover, if the Department is going to comply with the University’s QEP focus on writing then it will need to designate two writing intensive courses to be taken by all 620+ majors. The Department is prepared to designate the mandatory POLS 3800 Research Methods course as writing intensive, and it wishes to create a series of senior capstone seminars that would also be writing intensive.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence  
  | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence  
- Measure: Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors  
  | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors  
- Measure: Effective Communication  
  | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication  
- Measure: Methodological Skills  
  | Outcome/Objective: Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major  
- Measure: Substantive Knowledge--Global Perspectives  
  | Outcome/Objective: Substantive Knowledge--Global Perspectives  
- Measure: Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes  
  | Outcome/Objective: Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes  

**Implementation Description:** 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Undergraduate Studies/Chair  
**Additional Resources:** Clearly, significant resources (e.g., additional faculty lines) are required to construct a meaningful set of writing intensive capstone courses.

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Regarding changes to the undergraduate political science curriculum, the Department believes it should not make any permanent changes at this time based on two years assessment of learning outcomes. Once we have clearer benchmarks and time-series data beyond a couple of years, the Department can then consider possible revisions to the curriculum to improve our success in achieving the learning outcomes. We do believe, however, that both PolS 1101 and PolS 2401 are essential tools in educating GSU students to be active and aware American and global citizens. Multiple sources of data from our instructors and students make it clear that we are achieving our learning outcomes in these courses and the Department will continue to support the maintenance of PolS 1101 and PolS 2401 in the core curriculum.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

By almost any measure the faculty of the Department of Political Science handles a large student load. The Department has
experienced significant growth in majors, hours, head counts and graduation rates. For example, the number of undergraduate majors has risen from 378 in the fall of 2001 to 620 in the fall of 2005. Graduation numbers have seen a similar increase. In 2002, 63 undergraduate political science majors were graduated, while in 2005, graduating seniors numbered 155. Teaching duty hours in the Department have grown from 18,294 in 2001 to 26,806 in 2006. Thus enrollment grew by almost 60 percent, graduation rates grew by 146 percent and teaching hours grew by 46 percent. While most departments have grown over this time period, the percentage growth of the Department of Political Science is significantly larger than the growth in most other departments within the College of Arts and Science. Given this workload, without increases in resources it will be difficult to implement any radically new tool to increase student learning, such as writing intensive courses at upper division levels.
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**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Political Science offers comprehensive programs leading to the Master of Arts degree. Covering all of the discipline's major fields—American politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Public Administration and Policy, and Political Theory—the programs are designed to produce scholars and practitioners who are experts in their substantive field of study and who are able to combine theoretical sophistication with methodological rigor. MA students can pursue a general program in Political Science or specialize in American Politics, Comparative Politics/International Relations, Professional Political Practices, or a dual MA in International Business and Government. The Department's mission is to simultaneously (1) fill a much-needed niche in the Atlanta area and in the region for a strong terminal Master's program and (2) provide the proper research foundation for those excellent students who wish to continue on for a PhD.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Use of Appropriate Research Skills (M: 1)**
MA students should demonstrate research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature (M: 1)**
Students should demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in their area of specialization.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Effective Reporting of Research Findings (M: 1)**
Students should demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report or thesis in their area of specialization indicating ability to formulate research questions, to synthesize such questions with appropriate literature, to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s), and to analyze data so as to answer the question(s) and raise additional questions.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects (O: 1, 2, 3)**
The members of each MA thesis committee or of a non-thesis paper will individually assess the student’s achievement in terms of the program's stated learning objectives.

**Target for O1: Use of Appropriate Research Skills**
All completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects should demonstrate mastery of the program’s stated learning...
Ten students completed the requirements for the MA in Political Science during the 2005-06 academic year (including summer). Four opted for the non-thesis, six for the thesis. Four completed the thesis or non-thesis requirements in Fall 2005, four in Spring 2006, and two in summer. Four of the MA projects were written in the field of American Politics and six were in Comparative/International Politics. Following approval of each thesis, the Director of Graduate Studies requested completion of an "MA Learning Outcomes Assessment" form by each member of the respective faculty evaluation committees. Summary data, provided below, indicate that the MA theses met departmental learning outcomes to a high degree: (1) To what degree does the thesis/non-thesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student's area of specialization? SCORE: 4.0. (2) To what degree does the thesis/non-thesis paper demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student's area of specialization? SCORE: 4.1. (3) To what degree does the thesis/non-thesis paper demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student's area of specialization? SCORE: 4.0. (3b) ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature SCORE: 4.0. (3c) ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) SCORE: 3.8. (3d) ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) SCORE: 4.6. (3e) ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings SCORE: 3.8. Selected open-ended comments: "Very concisely executed piece of research identifying an interesting question and testing it with appropriate data." [Student] has the potential to be a superb scholar.... [Student's] thesis met the department's learning goals to a very high degree. The thesis speaks to a leading debate in the field of comparative politics...but speaks to it in a novel context. Overall, I would rank this among the top two thesis and non-thesis papers (of 6) that I have helped to supervise at GSU. "The project clearly demanded a genuine comparative dimension, and this omission proved to be a vulnerability. Would have preferred greater attention to explanation and identification of causal mechanisms. ". This project only just met the bar for the MA thesis in our department. "Among the most thorough MA theses I have read at GSU...This thesis is suggestive of student's intellectual ability to go on for doctoral-level work." [This thesis] benefited from intellectual risk-taking and is a very original and interesting work of scholarship. "One of the least rigorous theses I've read at GSU...the empirical coverage was acceptable, but the conceptual/theoretical part of the thesis was marginal at best." [Student's] work excels in surveying research and information and in drawing interesting questions for future work, but falls a bit short in framing a specific question that can be answered in the present research.

Ten students completed the requirements for the MA in Political Science during the 2005-06 academic year (including summer). Four opted for the non-thesis, six for the thesis. Four completed the thesis or non-thesis requirements in Fall 2005, four in Spring 2006, and two in summer. Four of the MA projects were written in the field of American Politics and six were in Comparative/International Politics. Following approval of each thesis, the Director of Graduate Studies requested completion of an "MA Learning Outcomes Assessment" form by each member of the respective faculty evaluation committees. Summary data, provided below, indicate that the MA theses met departmental learning outcomes to a high degree: (1) To what degree does the thesis/non-thesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student's area of specialization? SCORE: 4.0. (2) To what degree does the thesis/non-thesis paper demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student's area of specialization?SCORE: 4.1. (3) To what degree does the thesis/non-thesis paper demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student's area of specialization? SCORE: 4.0. (3b) ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature SCORE: 4.0. (3c) ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) SCORE: 3.8. (3d) ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) SCORE: 4.6. (3e) ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings SCORE: 3.8. Selected open-ended comments: "Very concisely executed piece of research identifying an interesting question and testing it with appropriate data." [Student] has the potential to be a superb scholar.... [Student's] thesis met the department's learning objectives.
goals to a very high degree. The thesis speaks to a leading debate in the field of comparative politics...but speaks to it in a novel context. Overall, I would rank this among the top two thesis and non-thesis papers (of 6) that I have helped to supervise at GSU.” “The project clearly demanded a genuine comparative dimension, and this omission proved to be a vulnerability. Would have preferred greater attention to explanation and identification of causal mechanisms.” “…This project only just met the bar for the MA thesis in our department.” “Among the most thorough MA theses I have read at GSU…Thesis is suggestive of student's intellectual ability to go on for doctoral-level work.” “[This thesis] benefited from intellectual risk-taking and is a very original and interesting work of scholarship.” “One of the least rigorous theses I've read at GSU...the empirical coverage was acceptable, but the conceptual/theoretical part of the thesis was marginal at best.” “[Student's] work excels in surveying research and information and in drawing interesting questions for future work, but falls a bit short in framing a specific question that can be answered in the present research.”

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Reemphasize Research Design and Methodology**
The most fundamental recommendation for future action is to place greater emphasis on the role of faculty in socializing and mentoring students, particularly in the writing of theses and dissertations. Many of our graduate students still seem to reach the proposal stage having no clear idea of what an MA thesis is supposed to look like. In coursework, a greater emphasis on research design would be helpful, as would perhaps the ability to work on multiple drafts of research papers in order to get detailed feedback. Research design should be incorporated in the teaching of graduate courses to the fullest extent possible. The tools acquired in POLS 8800 will be reinforced and gain fuller meaning for students each time they are required to come up with their own research design.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature | Outcome/Objective: Use of Appropriate Research Skills
- **Implementation Description:** Immediate
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies/Chair

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Evidence on learning outcomes at the MA level is again mixed. On average, scores on learning outcomes assessment forms filled out by thesis committee members indicate that the theses met departmental learning goals to a high degree. Individually, a couple of very strong theses were defended, balanced by a couple that were quite weak. The vast majority fell in the middle, and on aggregate scores were slightly higher than last year.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Non-thesis papers were too frequently turned in at the last minute and were often of lower than expected quality. In several cases this year, this resulted in a delay in graduation for students. Next year, the due date for non-thesis papers will be moved up to the same date as for thesis defense.

---

**Georgia State University**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Political Science at Georgia State University recognizes that a research department at a research university needs a genuinely strong doctoral program. As such, the PhD program aims to provide students with a comprehensive grounding in the methodology and philosophy of social science as well as specific training in multiple fields and subfields of the discipline. The PhD program focuses on producing high quality researchers and teachers. The Department strives to develop graduates who are successful at publishing and teaching, and who obtain tenure-track positions in the southeast and nationally. The training students receive in seminars should equip them to pursue their own research, present it at conferences, and secure publication of their work. The program aims to provide doctoral students with varied opportunities to develop research records and skill sets attractive to potential employers.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (M: 1, 2)**
The student should demonstrate familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student's major field of expertise.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield (M: 2)**

Students should demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (M: 1)**

Students should demonstrate a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to his or her research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization (M: 1)**

Students should demonstrate a full understanding of the research enterprise. This includes the ability to critique others’ work and an ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Teaching Effectiveness (M: 3)**

Students should demonstrate an ability to teach courses in his or her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations (O: 1, 3, 4)**

The members of each doctoral dissertation committee will individually provide to the Director of Graduate Studies a written assessment stating the degree to which the dissertation and its defense indicate success in achievement of the program's stated learning outcomes.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

It is the Department’s target that all successfully defended doctoral dissertations demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the student’s major subfield, that all demonstrate a high level of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline, that all demonstrate the ability to critique others’ work, and that all demonstrate the ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. On a 5-point performance scale (with 5 representing the top performance level), the department seeks scores of 3.5 or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Two students completed the requirements for the PhD in Political Science during the 2005-06 academic year. The dissertations were in the fields of Public Administration and American Politics. Following successful oral defense of the
dissertation, the Director of Graduate Studies requested completion of a 'PhD Learning Outcomes Assessment' form by each member of the dissertation committee. Summary data from the forms are provided as follows: Average Scale Score (1=“Very Low Degree” to 5=“Very High Degree”) (1) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within the student's major field of expertise? SCORE: 3.6 (2) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to student's research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches? SCORE: 3.5 (3) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate a full understanding of the research enterprise? This includes the ability to critique others’ work and an ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. SCORE: 4.3 Select open-ended comments from faculty members of the dissertation committees include: “This was the best dissertation in political science that I've directed over the past 12-15 years.” “[Student]'s dissertation demonstrated competence in the subfield. It clearly met the standard. However, it was not far reaching and fell short of realizing its full potential.”

Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods

It is the Department’s target that all successfully defended doctoral dissertations demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the student’s major subfield, that all demonstrate a high level of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline, that all demonstrate the ability to critique others’ work, and that all demonstrate the ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. On a 5-point performance scale (with 5 representing the top performance level), the department seeks scores of 3.5 or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Two students completed the requirements for the PhD in Political Science during the 2005-06 academic year. The dissertations were in the fields of Public Administration and American Politics. Following successful oral defense of the dissertation, the Director of Graduate Studies requested completion of a 'PhD Learning Outcomes Assessment' form by each member of the dissertation committee. Summary data from the forms are provided as follows: Average Scale Score (1=“Very Low Degree” to 5=“Very High Degree”) (1) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within the student's major field of expertise? SCORE: 3.6 (2) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to student's research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches? SCORE: 3.5 (3) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate a full understanding of the research enterprise? This includes the ability to critique others’ work and an ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. SCORE: 4.3 Select open-ended comments from faculty members of the dissertation committees include: “This was the best dissertation in political science that I've directed over the past 12-15 years.” “[Student]'s dissertation demonstrated competence in the subfield. It clearly met the standard. However, it was not far reaching and fell short of realizing its full potential.”

Target for O4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization

It is the Department’s target that all successfully defended doctoral dissertations demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the student’s major subfield, that all demonstrate a high level of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline, that all demonstrate the ability to critique others’ work, and that all demonstrate the ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. On a 5-point performance scale (with 5 representing the top performance level), the department seeks scores of 3.5 or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Two students completed the requirements for the PhD in Political Science during the 2005-06 academic year. The dissertations were in the fields of Public Administration and American Politics. Following successful oral defense of the dissertation, the Director of Graduate Studies requested completion of a 'PhD Learning Outcomes Assessment' form by each member of the dissertation committee. Summary data from the forms are provided as follows: Average Scale Score (1=“Very Low Degree” to 5=“Very High Degree”) (1) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within the student's major field of expertise? SCORE: 3.6 (2) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to student's research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches? SCORE: 3.5 (3) To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate a full understanding of the research enterprise? This includes the ability to critique others’ work and an ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. SCORE: 4.3 Select open-ended comments from faculty members of the dissertation committees include: “This was the best dissertation in political science that I've directed over the past 12-15 years.” “[Student]'s dissertation demonstrated competence in the subfield. It clearly met the standard. However, it was not far reaching and fell short of realizing its full potential.”

M 2: Assessment of Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 2)

Based on the program's learning outcomes, the lead reader for each field or sub-field doctoral comprehensive committee shall write an assessment of the degree to which the answers provided by the students indicate success in achievement of the outcomes.

Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field

The Department’s performance target is for all doctoral students taking comprehensive exams to pass those exams at the first sitting. If not, then the Department aims for students to pass the exams on their second and final sitting.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Three students took written comprehensive exams in December 2005. Two of the three failed one or more of their exams. On retaking those exams in May 2006, both students passed their written and oral exams. Seven students took written comprehensive examinations in May 2006. Of these, five passed their written and oral exams. One student passed one of the three required exams, and another failed all three of the exams. The two students who failed exams in December 2005 took them for a second time and passed. Another student, who had failed his first attempt at the exams in May 2005, also failed his second attempt, and was terminated from the doctoral program in accordance with departmental rules. Selected comments from the lead readers on successful exams: “[Student]'s answers are very competent and complete. [Student]'s work on both [essays] is supported by appropriate citations to literature and informed use of relevant concepts. His essays are well written and organized in a manner that directly addresses the questions. Solid work.” This first essay shows a good command of the issue in question and of the supporting literature. The response appropriately recognizes that methodological rigor can emerge from both quantitative and qualitative approaches, and it effectively judaposes the strengths and weaknesses of reliance on one approach over the other.” “[Student] answered all the questions and in general wrote a nice examination. It is obvious that [student] knows the literature well and has the ability to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the literature and thus he is well positioned to begin work on his dissertation. [Student]'s knowledge of the literature is impressive and his
ability to draw on other areas of his knowledge was impressive.” “[Student’s] answers are very strong conceptually. They make excellent use of appropriate sources and key concepts. Both essays are well-written and organized very effectively.” “The response to this mandatory question does a nice job of acknowledging validity in critiques of both methodological approaches to the study of comparative politics, yet it avoids equivocating by arguing the relative advantages of each. There is clear sensitivity to the particular importance of research design for the comparativist.” “This is a very good essay which demonstrates an understanding of the two theoretical paradigms. It is clear and concise, summarizing well most of the major points.” Selected comments from lead readers on failing exams: “The essay does a decent job of laying out three major theoretical perspectives on economic development…. In general, however, there is insufficient development of the key components of the argument.” “This essay does not adequately address the question, and relies almost exclusively on one work.” “… the essay is not adequately explicit about the principal contributions of constructivism.” “Overall, the essay suffers from the lack of a sufficiently clear structure that would alert the reader to what part of the question was being addressed and what specific arguments were being made. The reader should not have to hunt so hard to find them.” “Overall, the essays demonstrate a good command of the relevant literatures, but they often fail to offer explicit answers to the questions. A consistent effort to provide direct answers would have greatly improved the essays and quite likely have resulted in a passing grade.”

**Target for O2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield**

The Department’s performance target is for all doctoral students taking comprehensive exams to pass those exams at the first sitting. If not, then the Department aims for students to pass the exams on their second and final sitting.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Three students took written comprehensive exams in December 2005. Two of the three failed one or more of their exams. On retaking those exams in May 2006, both students passed their written and oral exams. Seven students took written comprehensive examinations in May 2006. Of these, five passed their written and oral exams. One student passed one of the three required exams, and another failed all three of the exams in December 2005 but took them for a second time and passed. Another student, who had failed his first attempt at the exams in May 2005, also failed his second attempt, and was terminated from the doctoral program in accordance with departmental rules. Selected comments from the lead readers on successful exams: “[Student’s] answers are very competent and complete. [Student’s] work on both [essays] is supported by appropriate citations to literature and informed use of relevant concepts. His essays are well written and organized in a manner that directly addresses the questions. Solid work.” “This first essay shows a good command of the issue in question and of these methodological rigor can emerge from both quantitative and qualitative approaches, and it effectively judoaposes the strengths and weaknesses of reliance on one approach over the other.” “[Student] answered all the questions and in general wrote a nice examination. It is obvious that [student] knows the literature well and has the ability to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the literature and thus he is well positioned to begin work on his dissertation. [Student’s] knowledge of the literature is impressive and his ability to draw on other areas of his knowledge was impressive.” “[Student’s] answers are very strong conceptually. They make excellent use of appropriate sources and key concepts. Both essays are well-written and organized very effectively.” “The response to this mandatory question does a nice job of acknowledging validity in critiques of both methodological approaches to the study of comparative politics, yet it avoids equivocating by arguing the relative advantages of each. There is clear sensitivity to the particular importance of research design for the comparativist.” “This is a very good essay which demonstrates an understanding of the two theoretical paradigms. It is clear and concise, summarizing well most of the major points.” Selected comments from lead readers on failing exams: “The essay does a decent job of laying out three major theoretical perspectives on economic development…. In general, however, there is insufficient development of the key components of the argument.” “This essay does not adequately address the question, and relies almost exclusively on one work.” “… the essay is not adequately explicit about the principal contributions of constructivism.” “Overall, the essay suffers from the lack of a sufficiently clear structure that would alert the reader to what part of the question was being addressed and what specific arguments were being made. The reader should not have to hunt so hard to find them.” “Overall, the essays demonstrate a good command of the relevant literatures, but they often fail to offer explicit answers to the questions. A consistent effort to provide direct answers would have greatly improved the essays and quite likely have resulted in a passing grade.”

**Target for O5: Teaching Effectiveness**

The Department wants all syllabi in courses taught by doctoral students to be in conformity with departmental, College, and University standards. The Department also seeks overall teaching effectiveness scores of at least 4.0 on Question 17 of the student course evaluations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Doctoral students taught a total of 32 sections in 2005-06 (11 instructors for 15 sections in Fall 2005, 14 instructors for 17 sections in Spring 2006). Syllabi from each section in POLS 1101 American Government and POLS 2401 Global Issues were collected and assessed for conformity to departmental and university guidelines. The majority of the syllabi demonstrated such conformity, but several failed to provide adequate instructions regarding the last day to drop the course and receive a W, the class attendance policy, penalties for academic dishonesty, and guidelines for students with disabilities. The teaching abilities of doctoral students are enhanced through their enrollment in EPY 9000 prior to teaching their own course section. Efforts were also made during the year, especially by the POLS 2401 Coordinator, to monitor teaching effectiveness by twice visiting each graduate instructor’s class session. Student evaluations of graduate instructors constitute another indicator of teaching ability. The average overall teaching effectiveness score for Political Science doctoral students teaching during the 2005-06 academic year was 4.34. These high scores did not come at the cost of grade inflation (the average grade distribution in courses taught by Political Science doctoral students was 2.9). A sample of open-ended student comments provides additional indicators of the strengths and weaknesses of doctoral teaching in Political Science: Evidence of teaching effectiveness: “[Instructor] was meticulous enough, spoke with clear diction in conveying the concepts he taught, and was remarkably precise in his choice of words and his use of language.” “[Instructor] took a boring subject and actually made it interesting.” “Engaged me in class and challenged me to learn…inspired respect for herself and classmates and each others’ opinions and backgrounds.” “[Instructor] provoked curiosity about the subjects we covered and really had a lot of interesting lessons.” “[Instructor] was one of the most well prepared instructors I have ever had.” “[Instructor] turned a class I thought I would hate into a class I enjoy going to. He is not easy just straight to the point.” “Excellent teacher who communicated very well with students…encouraged students to view from different perspectives.” “I find myself thinking critically about many
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

The data collected in 2005-06 suggest both strengths and weaknesses in the Department's efforts to meet its stated learning goals. Achievement of learning goals is evidenced by: 17 graduate student research papers accepted and presented at professional conferences, one graduate student finalist for the Fulbright research grant, Summer 2005 PhD graduate won the Malcolm Jewell Award for Outstanding Graduate Student Paper at the 2005 Southern Political Science Association Conference, PhD graduates placed at Vanderbilt University, GSU Department of Communication, Kennesaw State University, Bridgewater College, and the Government of Mauritius. PhD students have published in prestigious research journals, such as Government & Opposition and Electoral Studies. Moreover, a review of the teaching abilities of doctoral students suggests that we are producing effective and well-prepared college-level instructors.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

There is some question about whether students are progressing in as timely a manner as they might. There are several reasons for concern. First, a number of doctoral students have taken longer than expected to develop a successful dissertation proposal and to write the dissertation itself. Recent changes in departmental regulations (requiring a dissertation proposal within two semesters of passing comprehensive exams) aim to ameliorate this problem. Second, the department is forced to draw increasingly upon doctoral students to teach large sections of core undergraduate classes. Though teaching experience is essential for our students, we should be mindful of the danger of loading them down with teaching responsibilities while they are working to develop the dissertation. Finally, in the last two years at least one student has failed the doctoral comprehensive exams the first time around. This delays their start on the dissertation by one semester at a minimum. As in last year's report, the Department believes demonstration of competency in a second substantive field of political science is better measured by performance on comprehensive exams than through the dissertation. Unfortunately, a number of PhD students have failed to demonstrate such competence on comprehensive exams. It is our assessment that exam readers have gradually sought to raise the bar on the exams, and this has been further complicated by the disconnect between what is expected of them in a single course, in terms of depth as well as breadth.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Focus on Comprehensive Exam Preparation

Doctoral students have been encouraged to redouble their efforts to prepare for comprehensive exams and to take a more proactive approach to preparing. Perhaps one important move would be a shift to a problem-driven, rather than a specific text-driven strategy for studying for comps. The lackluster performance of some of our PhD students on comprehensive exams in the last few years has led a number of faculty members to place a renewed emphasis on the writing of substantial essay exams under time pressure in graduate courses. This appears to be not only a useful teaching strategy, but a way to educate students about the form and depth of answers to be expected in exam situations, though it should be clearly communicated that the comprehensive exams will require students to go well beyond what is expected of them in a single course, in terms of depth as well as breadth.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment of Comprehensive Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Second Field or Subfield | Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
Implementation Description: Immediate
Responsible Person/Group: Chair/Director of Graduate Studies/Graduate Committee

Improving Teaching by Graduate Instructors

The Director of Graduate Studies and the coordinators for POLS 2401 and POLS 1101 should meet with graduate instructors at the beginning and end of each semester in an effort to further strengthen graduate instruction. Students expecting to teach one of these courses should be encouraged to partner with one of the current graduate instructors, visiting the class, offering to provide guest lectures, etc., in order to get a feel for the task. Additionally, the Department should explore alternatives to the current process of sending Political Science graduate students to enroll in EPY 9000 College Teaching. We should seek to develop teacher training specific to the discipline of Political Science.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching Effectiveness | Outcome/Objective: Teaching Effectiveness
Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Chair/Director of Graduate Studies/Graduate Committee

Additional Resources: If Political Science is to do as many departments have done (i.e., develop in-house teacher training for graduate students), then resources will be required to cover the efforts of the faculty member or members who coordinate such training.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

There is some question about whether students are progressing in as timely a manner as they might. There are several reasons for concern. First, a number of doctoral students have taken longer than expected to develop a successful dissertation proposal and to write the dissertation itself. Recent changes in departmental regulations (requiring a dissertation proposal within two semesters of passing comprehensive exams) aim to ameliorate this problem. Second, the department is forced to draw increasingly upon doctoral students to teach large sections of core undergraduate classes. Though teaching experience is essential for our students, we should be mindful of the danger of loading them down with teaching responsibilities while they are working to develop the dissertation. Finally, in the last two years at least one student has failed the doctoral comprehensive exams the first time around. This delays their start on the dissertation by one semester at a minimum. As in last year's report, the Department believes demonstration of competency in a second substantive field of political science is better measured by performance on comprehensive exams than through the dissertation. Unfortunately, a number of PhD students have failed to demonstrate such competence on comprehensive exams. It is our assessment that exam readers have gradually sought to raise the bar on the exams, and this has been communicated to students as they prepare for exams. However, it will inevitably take some time before that message filters through completely.
# Mission / Purpose
For students to develop and integrate: (1) skills for analyzing organizational performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions, (2) skills in developing financial reporting systems, (3) skills in interpreting and predicting choices in financial reporting systems, (4) assurance skills, (5) skills for collaborative work in teams, (6) communication skills and, (7) technology skills.

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Analytical skills (M: 1)</th>
<th>That students present sound analyses of financial performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Financial reporting skills: Develop (M: 2)</td>
<td>That students apply professional standards, financial information tools, and professional judgment to develop financial reporting systems for decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (M: 3)</td>
<td>That students apply economic, financial, and psychological theories to interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Assurance skills (M: 4)</td>
<td>That students provide assurance services in a variety of organizational contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Collaboration skills (M: 5)</td>
<td>That students contribute to collaborative efforts to achieve team objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6: Communication skills (M: 6)</td>
<td>That students demonstrate the communication skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7: Technology skills (M: 7)</td>
<td>That students demonstrate the technology skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Analytical skills (O: 1)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8700

**Target for O1: Analytical skills**
Findings to be added during the 2006-2007 assessment cycle

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Findings to be added during the 2006-2007 assessment cycle

### M 2: Financial reporting skills: Develop (O: 2)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8030

**Target for O2: Financial reporting skills: Develop**
80%

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Met
82% for fall 2005 The findings were 78% in Fall 2004, which was below the target level of 80%

### M 3: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (O: 3)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8410

**Target for O3: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict**
80%

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** Met
85%
### M 4: Assurance skills (O: 4)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8610

**Target for O4: Assurance skills**

MPA students in Acct 8610 should be able to complete the targeted assignments with 75-80% score.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

404 Internal Control Assignments: Mean Team Performance = 20.6/25 Average performance across 5 cases = 17.4/20 points per case Average MT score = 76.1/100 Average Final Exam score = 76.5/100

### M 5: Collaboration skills (O: 5)
Evaluation by student peers of contributions to team projects in Acct 8030 and Acct 8410

**Target for O5: Collaboration skills**

90%

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

98%

### M 6: Communication skills (O: 6)
Performance on assignments in MBA 8015

**Target for O6: Communication skills**

Establishment of baseline for future assessments

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

From summer 2005 through spring 2006, 9 MPA students received an A, 4 students received a B, and one withdrew.

### M 7: Technology skills (O: 7)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8030, Acct 8410, Acct 8610, and Acct 8700

**Target for O7: Technology skills**

The Acct 8610 instructor expects students to score above 90% on this type of out of class assignment. In Acct 8030 and 8410, the target is 80%.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

In Acct 8610, ACL Assignment No. 1 - Attribute sampling application: Mean team score = 25/25. On ACL Assignment No. 2 - Monetary unit sampling application: Mean team score = 24.7/25. In Acct 8030, the score was 87%. In Acct 8410, the score was 85%.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Assurance skills
Course will be conducted in a similar manner in 2007 with new material added based on the current accounting environment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Assurance skills | Outcome/Objective: Assurance skills
- **Implementation Description:** December 2006 just prior to start of Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** W.F. Messier, Jr.
- **Additional Resources:** It would be nice to have a grader.

#### Communication skills
None planned at this time

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Communication skills | Outcome/Objective: Communication skills
- **Implementation Description:** N/A
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MPA instructors

#### Technology skills
None planned in Acct 8610

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
In Acct 8030, having a Learning Objective for each chapter and tying every question on the exams and assignments helped in achieving the target performance level. The data reported above is for Fall 2005. The findings were 78% in Fall 2004, which was below the target level of 80%. In Acct 8410, students struggled with some of the math involved in achieving this Learning Objective. When this course was offered in Spring 2005, the findings were 78% which did not meet the 80% target. In Spring 2006, the instructor changed the text which de-emphasized the math and relied more on a descriptive explanation of the theory. This helped to increase the findings to 85% which exceeded the 80% target. In Acct 8610, instructors were motivated to complete the course materials and assignments. In Acct 8030, demonstration by the instructor of an example involving searching through a financial accounting standards database helped improve the performance on this learning outcome from 81% in Fall 2004 to 87% in Fall 2005. In Acct 8410, resources in the library are absolutely critical to achieve this Learning Outcome. In Acct 8610, students were quite capable of handling the assignments.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
In Acct 8610, students did a nice job of meeting expectations. In Acct 8030, instructors have to continuously keep up with the technology and the latest pedagogical research on the teaching of technology skills. In Acct 8610, students achieved the technology outcomes as expected.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Professional Counseling EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Based on our commitment to diversity, advocacy, and the belief that change is possible, the mission of the Department and Psychological Services is to prepare competent professionals and psychological services to contribute to the body of knowledge that undergirds these professions and to provide service to the profession and the community.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Work with individuals and groups to effectively lead groups and affect change in the counseling relationship.

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Quality professional programs
3. Global, cultural perspectives
4. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6. Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis (M: 2, 3, 4)
Acquire and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to work effectively with individuals experiencing a trauma or are in crisis. Students will demonstrate applied knowledge: a) crisis counseling relevant to the practice of counseling; b) recognizes the type of crisis counseling procedures and practices, and acquired knowledge of research literature regarding crisis counseling.

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Quality professional programs
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6. Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others (M: 4)
Process ethical dilemmas and lead others in supervision for successful resolution and toward the implementation of an intervention

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Advocate for the profession (M: 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate by demonstrating actions that will further the identity and respect for the counseling profession.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Share knowledge with professional community (M: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share knowledge through speaking, volunteerism, employment, supervision, and involvement in professional organizations. These involvements are to be with the body of master level students, community requests, and professionals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Implement advanced counseling skills (M: 1, 3, 4, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement advanced counseling skills during the internship field experience. Implementation of these skills and knowledge will be assessed utilizing Form 1010 by external reviewers at the site of placement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**M 1: End of course examination for CPS 8650 and 8260 (O: 1, 5, 6)**

Students will master content for the end of semester examination for CPS 8650 and 8260.

**Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship**

90% of the students will achieve 75% or higher on end of semester examination for CPS 8650 and CPS 8260.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved 70% higher on the end of semester examinations in both CPS 8650 and 8260.

**Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community**

90% of the students will achieve 75% or higher on end of semester examination for CPS 8650 and CPS 8260.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved 70% higher on the end of semester examinations in both CPS 8650 and 8260.

**Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**

90% of the students will achieve 75% or higher on end of semester examination for CPS 8650 and CPS 8260.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved 70% higher on the end of semester examinations in both CPS 8650 and 8260.
### M 2: End of semester examination in CPS 8450 (O: 1, 2, 5)

Students will successfully participate (attendance) in an experiential part of CPS 8450 and pass an end of semester examination in CPS 8450.

**Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship**

90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75% or higher on the end of semester examination in CPS 8450.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of students attended all experiential sessions and scored 75% or greater on the end of semester examination in CPS 8450.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75% or higher on the end of semester examination in CPS 8450.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of students attended all experiential sessions and scored 75% or greater on the end of semester examination in CPS 8450.

**Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community**

90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75% or higher on the end of semester examination in CPS 8450.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of students attended all experiential sessions and scored 75% or greater on the end of semester examination in CPS 8450.

### M 3: End of semester examination in CPS 8470 (O: 1, 2, 6)

Students will demonstrate through a written exercise in how to handle clients experiencing trauma in CPS 8470.

**Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship**

90% of the students will score 70% or higher on an end of semester examination in CPS 8470.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of the students achieved 70% or higher on the end of examination in CPS 8470.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

90% of the students will score 70% or higher on an end of semester examination in CPS 8470.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of the students achieved 70% or higher on the end of examination in CPS 8470.

**Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**

90% of the students will score 70% or higher on an end of semester examination in CPS 8470.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of the students achieved 70% or higher on the end of examination in CPS 8470.

### M 4: End of course examination in CPS 8530 (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)

Students will process attitudes and skills required to resolve an ethical dilemma. The students will process scenarios illustrating an ethical dilemma.

**Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship**

90% of the students will achieve 75% or higher on the end semester examination for CPS 8530.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of the students achieved 70% or better on the end of course examination in CPS 8530.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

90% of the students will achieve 75% or higher on the end semester examination for CPS 8530.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of the students achieved 70% or better on the end of course examination in CPS 8530.

**Target for O3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others**

90% of the students will achieve 75% or higher on the end semester examination for CPS 8530.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

- 100% of the students achieved 70% or better on the end of course examination in CPS 8530.
| **Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community** |
| 90% of the students will achieve 75% or higher on the end semester examination for CPS 8530. |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students achieved 70% or better on the end of course examination in CPS 8530.

| **Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills** |
| 90% of the students will achieve 75% or higher on the end semester examination for CPS 8530. |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students achieved 70% or better on the end of course examination in CPS 8530.

| **M 5: Residency participation in profession (O: 4, 5)** |
| Students are required to engage in a research or clinical residency completing successfully two or more professional residency activities. |

| **Target for O4: Advocate for the profession** |
| 90% of the students will complete 2 professional activities to fulfill residency requirements. The residency advisor will evaluate the success of these activities. |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students successfully completed 2 or more professional activities during the residency requirement.

| **Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community** |
| 90% of the students will complete 2 professional activities to fulfill residency requirements. The residency advisor will evaluate the success of these activities. |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students successfully completed 2 or more professional activities during the residency requirement.

| **M 6: End of semester examination in EPRS 8530 (O: 4, 5)** |
| Students will design a research project which would lead to a publication, submission, and/or conference presentation and successfully demonstrate knowledge. |

| **Target for O4: Advocate for the profession** |
| 90% of the students will achieve 70% or higher on the end of semester evaluation for EPRS 8530. 90% of the students will successfully complete one of the three activities (publication, submission, presentation). |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students achieved 70% or higher on the end of the semester examination and 100% of the students successfully completed one of the three activities in EPRS 8530.

| **Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community** |
| 90% of the students will achieve 70% or higher on the end of semester evaluation for EPRS 8530. 90% of the students will successfully complete one of the three activities (publication, submission, presentation). |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students achieved 70% or higher on the end of the semester examination and 100% of the students successfully completed one of the three activities in EPRS 8530.

| **M 7: Form 1010 Supervisor’s evaluation (O: 5, 6)** |
| Form 1010 (1-6 rating) evaluates the intern’s effectiveness skills in general supervision, counseling process, and conceptualization. |

| **Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community** |
| 90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 rating or greater on Form 1010. |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students achieved a 3.0 or higher on Form 1010, external reviewers. The average for the interns was 5.4 on the 6.0 rating scale.

| **Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills** |
| 90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 rating or greater on Form 1010. |

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students achieved a 3.0 or higher on Form 1010, external reviewers. The average for the interns was 5.4 on the 6.0 rating scale.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Add an additional outcome measure**
The faculty will maintain the present outcome measure but add a second measure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Residency participation in profession
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Advocate for the profession
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Share knowledge with professional community

  **Implementation Description:** May, 2007
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Gary Arthur

**Program faculty will maintain the current design**
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year. Faculty will attempt to derive an additional outcome measure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** End of semester examination in CPS 8450
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Lead groups in the counseling relationship
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Share knowledge with professional community
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis

  **Implementation Description:** May, 2007
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Gary Arthur

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Those specialist's student graduating further enhanced their professional identity as a professional counselor by achieving advanced and in some cases specific counseling skills to work with clients in trauma, process difficult ethical dilemmas, acquired supervision skills, and effectively gave back to the profession, university, community, and to the department.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
There may have been too many options in the residency requirements and tracks for the students to join together and share with others.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Professional Counseling MS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST*

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Mission / Purpose**
Based on our commitment to diversity, advocacy and the belief that change is possible, the mission of the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services is to prepare competent professionals in rehabilitation counseling to contribute to the body of knowledge that undergirds these professions and to provide service to the profession and the community.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Effectively works with groups of clients (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16)**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional skills as they work individually and with groups of clients.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
4. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
5. Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6. Graduate Experience
O/O 2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 16, 17)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional behaviors as they serve and function in counseling and consulting with diverse population
Relevant Associations:  Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Can counsel with other educational professionals (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15)
Students will gain an understanding of the skills to function as a professional in counseling with other professionals and administrators concerning the client's developmental needs.
Relevant Associations:  Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Practices educational, social & career assessment (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15)
Students will acquire skills to understand and implement career assessment behaviors as a counselor.
Relevant Associations:  Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12)
Students will gain an understanding of professional expertise through conducting and facilitating program evaluation and research efforts.
Relevant Associations:  Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17)
Students will demonstrate the acquisition of the knowledge for the principles and problem solving methods to practice the ethical code.
Relevant Associations:  Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13)**

Students will gain an understanding and will practice an application of appropriate use of technology to assist clients through educational, social, and career assessment.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 16)**

Students will demonstrate an understanding through written and/or orally expression of their professional identity as a professional counselor.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 9: Complete an entry level program of training (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17)**

Students will demonstrate the minimum knowledge, skills, and attitudes to function as an entry level practitioner in the field of counseling.

Relevant Associations: Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Form 1015: Written and Oral external (O: 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9)**

The end of year external site reviewers evaluate the intern’s written and oral communication skill and demonstrated effectiveness in the acquisition of behavioral identity and behaviors related to best client care (to include case presentations and record keeping).

**Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients**
90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the interns surpassed the 3.0 rating on the 1-5 rating scale of Form 1015. The average for written was 4.59 and oral was 4.55.

**Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**
90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the interns surpassed the 3.0 rating on the 1-5 rating scale of Form 1015. The average for written was 4.59 and oral was 4.55.
### Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals

90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns surpassed the 3.0 rating on the 1-5 rating scale of Form 1015. The average for written was 4.59 and oral was 4.55.

### Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns surpassed the 3.0 rating on the 1-5 rating scale of Form 1015. The average for written was 4.59 and oral was 4.55.

### Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor

90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns surpassed the 3.0 rating on the 1-5 rating scale of Form 1015. The average for written was 4.59 and oral was 4.55.

### Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training

90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns surpassed the 3.0 rating on the 1-5 rating scale of Form 1015. The average for written was 4.59 and oral was 4.55.

### M 2: Internship membership in ACA (O: 6, 8, 9)

All students entering practicum/internship (second year) become members in the American Counseling Association demonstrating an advocacy for the profession.

Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students joined ACA during 2005-2006 for the internship requirement.

Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor

90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students joined ACA during 2005-2006 for the internship requirement.

Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training

90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students joined ACA during 2005-2006 for the internship requirement.

### M 3: Grade Point Average (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)

Students will complete all core course work in the program of study and one elective

Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients

90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 4.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.

Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations

90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 4.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.

Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Practices educational, social &amp; career assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Conducts effective program evaluation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Applies appropriate technology for counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Complete an entry level program of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: For 1015 Overall Evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Form 1015 with 10 subscales (1-5 rating) assessing overall knowledge is administered at year end. The 10 subscales are knowledge, clinical reasoning, relationship skills, assessment, intervention, written communication, oral communication, ethics, sensitivity to diversity, and attitude toward supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Effectively works with groups of clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Can counsel and consult with diverse populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Can counsel with other educational professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Practices educational, social &amp; career assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005-2006</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of the students completed the program of study with a B or better average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.

**Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.

**Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.

**Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.

**Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.

**Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored 3.0 and above. The performance score was 4.54.

**M 5: CPS Comprehensive Examination (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**
The CPS Comprehensive Examination has 12 subtests assessing the overall knowledge in the core courses for the M.S. degree

**Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

**Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

**Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social & career assessment**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

**Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

**Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

**Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

**Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

**Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of the students were successful in passing the departmental examination on first try.

### M 6: CPS Comprehensive Examination (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)
Ethics application skills are integrated into each of the 12 subtests on the CPS Comprehensive examination. The 150 questions assess for the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for best client care. The pure ethic questions comprise 10% of the examination that pertain to client care.

**Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients**
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students better than 72% on the ethics subtest of the departmental examination.

**Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students better than 72% on the ethics subtest of the departmental examination.

**Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals**
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students better than 72% on the ethics subtest of the departmental examination.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social & career assessment**
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students better than 72% on the ethics subtest of the departmental examination.

**Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of the students better than 72% on the ethics subtest of the departmental examination.

**Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students better than 72% on the ethics subtest of the departmental examination.

#### Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students better than 72% on the ethics subtest of the departmental examination.

#### Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students better than 72% on the ethics subtest of the departmental examination.

#### Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students will achieve 72% correct on this subtest.

### M 7: National Counselor’s Examination (O: 6, 9)
The National Counselor’s Examination (external review) has 1 subtest of 8 devoted to ethics.

#### Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
90% of the students will achieve 72% or greater on the NCE subtest, research.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students scored above 72% on the research subtest of the NCE.

#### Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students will achieve 72% or greater on the NCE subtest, research.

### M 8: National Counselor’s Examination (O: 5, 6, 9)
The National Counselors Examination (NCE), an external evaluation has 1 subtest of 8 assessing research knowledge.

#### Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research
90% will achieve 72% of the items correct on the end of year external review.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
97% of the students achieved in excess of 72% on the research subtest on the NCE. This is an external review.

#### Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
90% will achieve 72% of the items correct on the end of year external review.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
97% of the students achieved in excess of 72% on the research subtest on the NCE. This is an external review.

#### Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training
90% will achieve 72% of the items correct on the end of year external review.

### M 9: Comprehensive Examination subtest (O: 4, 6, 7, 9)
Appraisal subtest on the 150 departmental examination contains 12 questions relative to appraisal in vocational, educational, psychological assessment.

#### Target for O4: Practices educational, social & career assessment
90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students achieved an overall percentage correct of 86.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students achieved an overall percentage correct of 86.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students achieved an overall percentage correct of 86.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students achieved an overall percentage correct of 86.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 10: Form 1015 Clinical Reasoning (O: 4, 5, 6, 7, 9)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form 1015 Clinical reasoning tests for knowledge in assessment and interpretation of educational, psychological, social, and career. This scale is 1-5 rating with less than 3.0 rated as ineffective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Practices educational, social &amp; career assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored above 3.0. The achieved average was 4.52.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored above 3.0. The achieved average was 4.52.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored above 3.0. The achieved average was 4.52.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored above 3.0. The achieved average was 4.52.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored above 3.0. The achieved average was 4.52.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 11: CPS Departmental Examination (O: 5, 6, 9)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CPS Departmental Examination has one subtest measuring research knowledge. The research subtest has 10 questions on the 150 comprehensive examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students achieved greater than 72% (84% score) on the research subtest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students achieved greater than 72% (84% score) on the research subtest.

Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students achieved greater than 72% (84% score) on the research subtest.

M 12: Form 1015 Cumulative end of Year Evaluation Scale (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9)
Form 1015 Scale 4: Assessment is evaluated for each student on a 1-5 scale.

Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients
95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average for 10 scales for Form 1015 was 4.6. The goal was for 100% of the students to achieve an average of 3.0 or higher.

Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations
95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average for 10 scales for Form 1015 was 4.6. The goal was for 100% of the students to achieve an average of 3.0 or higher.

Target for O4: Practices educational, social & career assessment
95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average for 10 scales for Form 1015 was 4.6. The goal was for 100% of the students to achieve an average of 3.0 or higher.

Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research
95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average for 10 scales for Form 1015 was 4.6. The goal was for 100% of the students to achieve an average of 3.0 or higher.

Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average for 10 scales for Form 1015 was 4.6. The goal was for 100% of the students to achieve an average of 3.0 or higher.

Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average for 10 scales for Form 1015 was 4.6. The goal was for 100% of the students to achieve an average of 3.0 or higher.

Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training
95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The average for 10 scales for Form 1015 was 4.6. The goal was for 100% of the students to achieve an average of 3.0 or higher.

M 13: Form 1010 is a 1-5 rating scale for effectiveness (O: 1, 3, 6, 7, 9)
Form 1010 is a 1-5 rating scale for counseling effectiveness in identify client needs

Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients
90% of the students will have an average of 3.0 or higher on the 5.0 scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will have an average of 3.0 or higher on the 5.0 scale.</td>
<td>100% of the students average in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will have an average of 3.0 or higher on the 5.0 scale.</td>
<td>100% of the students average in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will have an average of 3.0 or higher on the 5.0 scale.</td>
<td>100% of the students average in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will have an average of 3.0 or higher on the 5.0 scale.</td>
<td>100% of the students average in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 14: Departmental Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 6, 9)**

The CPS departmental examination (150 items) has one subscale (12 items) assessing knowledge of developmental information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will score 75% of the subscale items correctly.</td>
<td>100% of the students achieved 75% or higher on the subtest of the departmental examination. The performance was 81%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Practices educational, social &amp; career assessment</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will score 75% of the subscale items correctly.</td>
<td>100% of the students achieved 75% or higher on the subtest of the departmental examination. The performance was 81%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will score 75% of the subscale items correctly.</td>
<td>100% of the students achieved 75% or higher on the subtest of the departmental examination. The performance was 81%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will score 75% of the subscale items correctly.</td>
<td>100% of the students achieved 75% or higher on the subtest of the departmental examination. The performance was 81%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 15: National Counselor’s Examination (O: 3, 4, 6, 9)**

The National Counselors Examination (NCE) is a 200 item examination based on content from 8 of the 12 core courses. The developmental subtest of the NCE has 17 questions on developmental knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will exceed 72% correct on that subtest based on a departmental norm.</td>
<td>100% of the students scored excess of 72% on the NCE. The average correct was 87%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will exceed 72% correct on that subtest based on a departmental norm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored excess of 72% on the NCE. The average correct was 87%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will exceed 72% correct on that subtest based on a departmental norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored excess of 72% on the NCE. The average correct was 87%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: CPS 6410 core communication rating scale (1-5) (O: 1, 2, 6, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video tape rating scale (1-5) assessing effective self-disclosure, empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and concreteness. CPS 7680 rating scale 1010-35 items assessing general supervision, counseling process, and conceptualization (1-6 scale for overall counseling performance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students will achieve a minimum 3.0 or higher as assessed by faculty in self-disclosure, empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and concreteness. 95% of the students will score 3.0 or higher on the case conceptualization subtest of Form 1005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students were rated 4.0 and higher on the video rating scale and 100% of the students achieved 4.5 or higher on Form 1010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students will achieve a minimum 3.0 or higher as assessed by faculty in self-disclosure, empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and concreteness. 95% of the students will score 3.0 or higher on the case conceptualization subtest of Form 1005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students were rated 4.0 and higher on the video rating scale and 100% of the students achieved 4.5 or higher on Form 1010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: CPS 7680 Form 1015 (1-5 scale) for effective ethic (O: 2, 6, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be rated by on-site supervisors for effective application of ethics in client care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students will achieve an overall minimum of 3.5 on a 5.0 on-site assessment on Form 1015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The over-all average for ethics on Form 1015 was 4.7 and 100% of the students achieved a scaled rating above 3.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students will achieve an overall minimum of 3.5 on a 5.0 on-site assessment on Form 1015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The over-all average for ethics on Form 1015 was 4.7 and 100% of the students achieved a scaled rating above 3.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for 09: Complete an entry level program of training**

95% of the students will achieve an overall minimum of 3.5 on a 5.0 on-site assessment on Form 1015.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The over-all average for ethics on Form 1015 was 4.7 and 100% of the students achieved a scaled rating above 3.0.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

Program faculty will maintain the current design

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Comprehensive Examination subtest  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Applies appropriate technology for counseling
  Complete an entry level program of training  
  Practices educational, social & career assessment  
  Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

86 of graduating MS student assessed on 109 indices for 10 scales averaged 4.6 on a 1-5 scale. They were especially strong in ethics, supervision, and relationship building. A second strength was cognitive acquisition as 100% of the students were successful on the departmental comprehensive examination and 79 of 80 or 98.75% passed the National Counselor’s Examination.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

All 10 categories had averages above 4.5 on a 1-5 scale with a 3.0 set as minimum standards. None were noticed for the 2005-2006 year.
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Communication and Collaboration Skills (M: 9)**

Students will demonstrate effective written and oral communication skills appropriate to tasks using APA writing conventions and formats. Students will participate effectively in group or team activities in both research labs and community agencies.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 5 Collaboration--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Values in Psychology and Sociocultural Awareness (M: 5, 6, 9)**

Students will show skepticism and intellectual curiosity, attunement to scientific evidence, civic responsibility, and respect for human diversity. Students will show an awareness of sociocultural and international issues. Students will demonstrate sensitivity to diverse research and applied populations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Information and Technology Literacy (M: 7, 9)**

Students will effectively use computer and other technology appropriate to the task in laboratory and field settings.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 13 Technology--major
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Undergraduate Research Practicum Course (M: 8)**

Students will develop research skills in either a laboratory or field setting. Students will conduct research using either qualitative or quantitative methods, perform arithmetic operations, and draw conclusions from data to solve problems appropriate to the setting.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Communication and Collaboration Skills (M: 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Communicate and work in groups effectively. A. Students demonstrate effective written communication skills and use discipline specific writing conventions and formats. B. Students demonstrate effective oral communication skills. C. Students work effectively within groups or teams.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### SLO 7: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 2, 3, 4, 7, 8)

Respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry and the scientific approach. A. Students use research data to formulate or evaluate new research questions, using reason and persuasion in a logical argument. B. Students summarize and evaluate a body of research including primary literature, and can compare psychology's methods with other disciplines' methods. C. Students analyze phenomena at multiple levels of analysis including the biological, individual, family, community, & society.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### SLO 8: Values in Psychology and Sociocultural Awareness (M: 8)

A. Students understand the need to behave ethically in personal and professional domains, and appreciate the need to tolerate ambiguity. B. Students will demonstrate skepticism and intellectual curiosity, attunement to scientific evidence, civic responsibility, and respect for human diversity.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### SLO 9: Information Technology Literacy (M: 8)

Demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes. A. Students demonstrate competent, ethical, and responsible use of information in academic work. B. Students apply software in research reports (e.g. statistical. C. Students master computer basics such as Internet navigation, document and spreadsheet generation. D. Students assess web-based sources of information, popular presentations of psychological research, as well as pseudoscience.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### SLO 10: Undergraduate Applied Practicum Course (M: 9)

Students are expected to demonstrate their ability to apply psychological principles appropriately in laboratory or field settings, (e.g. clinical, industry, community, education).

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### SLO 11: Contemporary Issues - Core (M: 1)

Goal IV. Contemporary Issues 1. Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. 2. Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 12: Theory and Content
Demonstrate familiarity with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends. A. Students learn the historical development of the discipline, its contemporary context (including social and political contexts, organizational and self-governance), and interaction with other disciplines. B. Students learn key psychological theories and concepts (e.g., biological, psychological, and social bases of affect, behavior, and cognition) and the nature and scope of supporting data.

SLO 13: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods (M: 2, 3, 4, 7)
1. Students develop testable hypotheses, differentiate research design and/or statistics, evaluate aptness of research conclusions, and generalize them appropriately. 2. Students design and conduct quantitative or qualitative research studies in laboratory or field settings. 3. Students adhere to ethical guidelines for collection, storage, and use of data from human or non-human participants. 4. Students use print and electronic library resources effectively and appropriately.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
9 Contemporary Issues--major

SLO 14: Application
Understand and apply psychological principles in personal, social, and organizational matters. A. Students identify psychology's major applications in laboratory and field settings (e.g., clinical, industry, education). B. Students articulate how psychology can further social understanding and public policy.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

SLO 15: Personal Development (M: 5, 6)
Shows insight into one's own and others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement. A. Students apply psychology to personal and professional development. B. Students are aware of their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. C. Students define personal and professional integrity.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
9 Contemporary Issues--major

SLO 16: Sociocultural and International Awareness
Students respect individual differences. B. Students define diversity and its role in psychological theory and research. C. Students consider and explain the role of cultural, racial, ethnic, and economic factors, privilege, and discrimination, in affect, behavior, and cognition.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Contemporary Issues Mastery Questions (O: 11)
Instructors administered a 50-question, multiple-choice mastery test (see Appendix A) to all students in all sections at the end of the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters. Questions focused on basic psychological theories and phenomena, with a particular emphasis on the application of these concepts to real-life situations. The specific topics covered in each chapter are listed in Appendix B. Data from 9 of 12 sections (representing 1064 students) were available for analysis.

Target for O11: Contemporary Issues - Core
70% correct on each question in each section

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Students' responses to six multiple-choice questions were scored (0=wrong; 1=correct) and the percentage of correct answers was calculated for each question by section and semester. To maintain confidentiality, data for each section were coded with a unique letter of the alphabet (A-I) that was unrelated to the instructor's name. The data below represent the percent correct for each question for each section and term. Overall percent correct values are provided by question and by section for each semester. Fall 2005 Sections A|B|C|D Mean 1.1 72 70 69 67 80 73 1.2 83 83 96 81 86 81 1.3 69 89 76 88 84 86 2.3 64 61 67 42 66 60 Mean 77 81 79 77 81 Spring 2006 Sections F|G|H|I Mean 1.1 62 70 78 73 71 1.2 85 100 94 90 92 1.3 80 89 90 85 86 2.1 90 76 78 83 82 2.2 96 87 81 79 86 2.3 70 30 67 78 61 Mean 81 75 81 81

M 2: Psychology 3010 Pretest-Postest (O: 7, 13)
10 computational and short-answer questions.

Target for O7: Critical Thinking Skills
75% correct on post-test and significant improvement from pre-test. The Pre- and Post-tests included the same 10 computational and short answer questions. The Departmental learning goals specified 75% correct on the post-test and significant improvement from the pre-test.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
One hundred sixty nine students had post-test data, and 104 of these also had pre-test data. The average post-test score was exactly 74.67% correct (SD = 21.66%), and the fiftieth percentile was 80% (or 8 out of 10) correct, meaning that half of the sample exceeded the learning outcome goal. The average percent increase from pre- to post-test was 43.75% (SD = 22.56%). This was a large and highly significant effect, t(103) 19.74, p<.001, d = 1.94.

### Target for O13: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
75% correct on post-test and significant improvement from pre-test. The Pre- and Post-tests included the same 10 computational and short answer questions. The Departmental learning goals specified 75% correct on the post-test and significant improvement from the pre-test.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
One hundred sixty nine students had post-test data, and 104 of these also had pre-test data. The average post-test score was exactly 74.67% correct (SD = 21.66%), and the fiftieth percentile was 80% (or 8 out of 10) correct, meaning that half of the sample exceeded the learning outcome goal. The average percent increase from pre- to post-test was 43.75% (SD = 22.56%). This was a large and highly significant effect, t(103) 19.74, p<.001, d = 1.94.

### M 3: Psychology 3010 Multiple Choice Questions (O: 7, 13)
Multiple choice questions on key concepts

### Target for O7: Critical Thinking Skills
75% correct

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Multiple choice data were collected on 185 students. Due to fidelity issues, not all students had data on all 19 questions. To take this into account, the percentage correct of all of each student's questions was computed. On average, students got 67.83% of their multiple choice questions correct (SD = 20.42%). Forty three percent of the sample met or exceeded the department's learning goal of 75% correct.

### Target for O13: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
75% correct

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Multiple choice data were collected on 185 students. Due to fidelity issues, not all students had data on all 19 questions. To take this into account, the percentage correct of all of each student's questions was computed. On average, students got 67.83% of their multiple choice questions correct (SD = 20.42%). Forty three percent of the sample met or exceeded the department's learning goal of 75% correct.

### M 4: Written description and interpretation (O: 7, 13)
The accuracy of students' write-up in APA style and interpretation of three sets of statistical tests was rated on a scale from 1-4, where a score of 3 was considered good performance.

### Target for O7: Critical Thinking Skills
Average rating of 3

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
In terms of APA write-up, the average score across the three tests was 2.59 (SD = .84), with 41.8% of the sample meeting or exceeding the Department's goal of an average rating of 3. In terms of interpretation, the average score across the three tests was 2.79 (SD = .84), with 50% of the sample meeting or exceeding the Department's goal of an average rating of 3.

### Target for O13: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
Average rating of 3

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
In terms of APA write-up, the average score across the three tests was 2.59 (SD = .84), with 41.8% of the sample meeting or exceeding the Department's goal of an average rating of 3. In terms of interpretation, the average score across the three tests was 2.79 (SD = .84), with 50% of the sample meeting or exceeding the Department's goal of an average rating of 3.

### M 5: Psychology 3110 self-report pre-post assessment (O: 3, 6, 15)
The pre-and post-test self-report measure, “Gauge My Progress,” was drawn from the Core Communication (Miller & Miller, 1998) workbook used in the course. Consisting of questions pertaining to the 11 communication skills listed earlier, it asks the respondent to rate on a 5-point scale his or her typical and desired behaviors vis-à-vis the different skills. Improvement in communication skills is indicated by an increasingly smaller differential between ratings of typical and desired behaviors. The pre- and post-test measures were administered on the first and last days of class, respectively.

### Target for O3: Values in Psychology and Sociocultural Awareness
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
Unlike last year, mean posttest (35.65) scores did not exceed pretest scores (36.51), $t(84) = .41$ n.s.

**Target for O6: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated Target Performance Level for Program field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

Unlike last year, mean posttest (35.65) scores did not exceed pretest scores (36.51), $t(84) = .41$ n.s.

**Target for O15: Personal Development**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated Target Performance Level for Program field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

Unlike last year, mean posttest (35.65) scores did not exceed pretest scores (36.51), $t(84) = .41$ n.s.

**M 6: Psychology 3110 listening and talking competencies (O: 3, 6, 15)**

Developed for purposes of this evaluation, the behavioral measure assessed students' maximal performance in an interpersonal role-play situation in which they worked in groups of three rotating through the roles of listener, talker, and evaluator. The role-plays involved relational conflicts of an ethical nature. The students were evaluated on their ability to display each of the five listening and six talking skills at least once during the role-plays. The behavioral measure was administered during the last week of classes.

**Target for O3: Values in Psychology and Sociocultural Awareness**

To reach criterion in listening and talking, students have to demonstrate at least 80% of the listening skills and 80% of the talking skills.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For listening skills, 90% reached criterion. For talking skills, 84% reached criterion.

**Target for O6: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

To reach criterion in listening and talking, students have to demonstrate at least 80% of the listening skills and 80% of the talking skills.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For listening skills, 90% reached criterion. For talking skills, 84% reached criterion.

**Target for O15: Personal Development**

To reach criterion in listening and talking, students have to demonstrate at least 80% of the listening skills and 80% of the talking skills.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For listening skills, 90% reached criterion. For talking skills, 84% reached criterion.

**M 7: Discipline specific writing and critical analysis (O: 4, 6, 7, 13)**

For this assessment, students were required to complete two specific writing assignments. The first was a 3-4 page essay on research ethics or an APA style introduction; this was submitted during the third week of the course. The second assignment was an original, full-length research paper, based on data they themselves collected and analyzed over the course of the semester; this was submitted during the last week of the course. Overall writing quality was defined as the organization of the essay and the author's ability to "clearly distinguish between fact and opinion," "support factual statements with observable evidence," "motivate opinions with well-reasoned arguments," and "use wording that is clear and concise." A score from 0-2 was given for each of these writing elements, for a total possible overall writing score of 10. The use of APA style was defined in terms of the author's ability to appropriately paraphrase the ideas of others, without plagiarizing, provide all necessary citations and references in the correct format, present ideas in an objective manner, and follow APA style guidelines for the presentation of numbers and the use of abbreviations. A score from 0-2 was given for each of these five APA elements, for a total possible APA style score of 10. The total of the overall and APA scores was used as the final assessment score for an assignment.

**Target for O4: Information and Technology Literacy**

The goal was to demonstrate a significant improvement in formal written communication in a discipline-specific style over the semester.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

For the Fall 2005 term, the assessment scores for the ethics papers had a median value of 12, with a range of 7 to 16. The scores for the research papers had a median of 16 and a range from 11 to 19. A repeated-measures t-test showed that the research paper scores ($M = 14.8, SD = 2.45$) were significantly higher than the ethics paper scores ($M = 11.7, SD = 2.92$), $t(19) = 9.52, p < .05$. For the Spring 2006 term, the median assessment score for the ethics papers was 13, with a range of 7 to 17. The scores for the research papers had a median of 14 and a range from 8 to 19. Again, a repeated-measures t-test suggested that the research paper scores ($M = 13.9, SD = 3.31$) were significantly higher than the ethics paper scores ($M = 12.4, SD = 2.61$), $t(14) = 7.71, p < .05$. 
The Research Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or in faculty labs. Supervisors evaluate students on five learning objectives indicating how well students performed these skills. Some projects covered all learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the first five objectives. The findings for fall, spring and summer semesters (N=60) are:

Objective 1: 83% of students received evaluations of good or excellent fall semester, 51% and 52% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as "not applicable" each semester: 14% fall, 31% spring, and 43% summer. The N/A ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 2: 97% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 90% and 93% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as "not applicable" each semester: 14% fall, 31% spring, and 43% summer. The N/A ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 3: 82% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 84% and 38% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as "not applicable" each semester: 14% fall, 31% spring, and 79% in summer. The N/A ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 4: 94% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 100% and 71% in spring and summer. Objective 5: 100% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 85% in spring and summer. Objective 10: No new student enrolled for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development fall 71%, spring 96% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 96%, spring 93% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 88%, spring 86% Increased skills in computer technology fall 92%, spring 86% Increased knowledge of research fall 96%, spring 90% Mentoring: fall 96%, spring 86% Exposure to graduate students: fall 88%, spring 89% Professional development fall 58%, spring 75% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.

Target for O1: Career Planning and Development
90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4= good or better.

Target for O5: Undergraduate Research Practicum Course
90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4= good or better.
Target for O6: Communication and Collaboration Skills

90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4= good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Research Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or in faculty labs. Supervisors evaluate students on five learning objectives indicating how well students performed these skills. Some projects covered all learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the first five objectives.

The findings for fall, spring, and summer semesters (N=60) are:

Objective 1: 83% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 51% and 52% in spring and summer. The NA ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 2: 97% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 90% and 93% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as “not applicable” each semester: 14% fall, 13% spring, and 79% in summer. The N/A ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 3: 82% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 84% and 38% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as “not applicable” each semester: 14% fall, 13% spring, and 79% in summer. The NA ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%. Objective 4: 94% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 100% and 71% in spring and summer. Objective 5: 100% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 85% in spring and summer. Objective 10: No new student enrolled for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development: 51%, spring 96% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 96%, spring 93% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 88%, spring 86% Increased skills in computer technology fall 92%, spring 86% Increased knowledge of research fall 96%, spring 90% Mentoring: fall 96%, spring 86% Exposure to graduate students: fall 88%, spring 89% Professional development fall 58%, spring 75% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.

Target for O7: Critical Thinking Skills

90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4= good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Research Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or in faculty labs. Supervisors evaluate students on five learning objectives indicating how well students performed these skills. Some projects covered all learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the first five objectives.

The findings for fall, spring, and summer semesters (N=60) are:

Objective 1: 83% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 51% and 52% in spring and summer. The NA ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 2: 97% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 90% and 93% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as “not applicable” each semester: 14% fall, 13% spring, and 79% in summer. The N/A ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 3: 82% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 84% and 38% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as “not applicable” each semester: 14% fall, 13% spring, and 79% in summer. The NA ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%. Objective 4: 94% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 100% and 71% in spring and summer. Objective 5: 100% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 85% in spring and summer. Objective 10: No new student enrolled for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development: 51%, spring 96% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 96%, spring 93% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 88%, spring 86% Increased skills in computer technology fall 92%, spring 86% Increased knowledge of research fall 96%, spring 90% Mentoring: fall 96%, spring 86% Exposure to graduate students: fall 88%, spring 89% Professional development fall 58%, spring 75% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.

Target for O8: Values in Psychology and Sociocultural Awareness

90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4= good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Research Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or in faculty labs. Supervisors evaluate students on five learning objectives indicating how well students performed these skills. Some projects covered all learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the first five objectives.

The findings for fall, spring, and summer semesters (N=60) are:

Objective 1: 83% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 51% and 52% in spring and summer. The NA ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 2: 97% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 90% and 93% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as “not applicable” each semester: 14% fall, 13% spring, and 79% in summer. The N/A ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%.

Objective 3: 82% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 84% and 38% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as “not applicable” each semester: 14% fall, 13% spring, and 79% in summer. The NA ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%. Objective 4: 94% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 100% and 71% in spring and summer. Objective 5: 100% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 85% in spring and summer. Objective 10: No new student enrolled for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development: 51%, spring 96% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 96%, spring 93% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 88%, spring 86% Increased skills in computer technology fall 92%, spring 86% Increased knowledge of research fall 96%, spring 90% Mentoring: fall 96%, spring 86% Exposure to graduate students: fall 88%, spring 89% Professional development fall 58%, spring 75% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.
Target for O9: Information Technology Literacy

90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4= good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Research Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or faculty projects in the community. Target for the student's evaluations was set at 90%. Supervisors evaluated students on five learning objectives indicating how students performed these skills. Some projects covered all four learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the first five objectives. The findings are for fall, spring and summer semesters (N=60): Objective 1: 83% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in fall and 100% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated this objective as “not applicable” each semester: 14% fall, 31% spring, and 43% summer. The N/A ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%. Objective 2: 97% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 90% and 93% in spring and summer. Objective 3: 82% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 84% and 38% in spring and summer. Supervisors rated objective as “not applicable” each semester: 14% fall, 13% spring, and 79% in summer. The N/A ratings reduced the ability to meet the target goal of 90%. Objective 4: 94% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 100% and 71% in spring and summer. Objective 5: 100% of students received evaluations of good or excellent for fall semester, 85% in spring and summer. Objective 10: No new student enrolled for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development fall 71%, spring 96% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 96%, spring 93% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 92%, spring 86% Increased knowledge of research fall 96%, spring 90% Mentoring: fall 96%, spring 86% Exposure to graduate students: fall 88%, spring 89% Professional development fall 58%, spring 75% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.

M 9: Psyg 4770 Applied Practicum Evaluation Form (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 10)

This form is used by faculty and field supervisors to evaluate student performance using a 5-point scale from 1=poor and 5=excellent on Objectives 6,7,8, and 9. Objective 10 is a survey of student evaluations of career planning and development on a 5-point Likert scale from poor to excellent. This survey is limited to the degree that a particular practicum experience is able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student’s satisfaction with that experience.

Target for O1: Career Planning and Development

90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4=good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Applied Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or faculty projects in the community. The target level for the student’s evaluations was set at 90%. Supervisors evaluated students on five learning objectives indicating how students performed these skills. Some projects covered all four learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the four outcomes. The findings are for fall, spring and summer semesters (N=44): Objective 6: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in fall and 100% were in spring and summer. Objective 7: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall and 100% in spring and summer. Objective 8: (Sociocultural and International Awareness) 66% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall, 95% spring, and 50% summer. Supervisors evaluated this objective “not applicable” at some sites. Objective 8: (Values in Psychology) 78% of students received evaluations of good to excellent in the fall, 91% and 100% in spring and summer. Objective 9: 99% of students received evaluations of good to excellent in the fall, 100% in spring and summer. Objective 10: New students did not enroll for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development fall 71%, spring 95% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 96%, spring 93% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 92%, spring 86% Increased knowledge of research fall 96%, spring 90% Mentoring fall 57% spring 60% Exposure to graduate students fall 57% Spring 60% Knowledge of community mental health fall 79% spring 84% Increased awareness of culture/stereotypes fall 78% spring 92% Professional development fall 50% spring 36% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.

Target for O2: Communication and Collaboration Skills

90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4=good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Applied Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or faculty projects in the community. The target level for the student’s evaluations was set at 90%. Supervisors evaluated students on five learning objectives indicating how students performed these skills. Some projects covered all four learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the four outcomes. The findings are for fall, spring and summer semesters (N=44): Objective 6: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall and 100% were in spring and summer. Objective 7: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall and 100% in spring and summer. Objective 8: (Sociocultural and International Awareness) 66% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall, 95% spring, and 50% summer. Supervisors evaluated this objective “not applicable” at some sites. Objective 8: (Values in Psychology) 78% of students received evaluations of good to excellent in the fall, 91% and 100% in spring and summer. Objective 9: 99% of students received evaluations of good to excellent in the fall, 100% in spring and summer. Objective 10: New students did not enroll for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development fall 71%, spring 95% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 96%, spring 93% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 92%, spring 86% Increased knowledge of research fall 96%, spring 90% Mentoring fall 57% spring 60% Exposure to graduate students fall 57% Spring 60% Knowledge of community mental health fall 79% spring 84% Increased awareness of culture/stereotypes fall 78% spring 92% Professional development fall 50% spring 36% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.

Target for O3: Values in Psychology and Sociocultural Awareness

90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4=good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Applied Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or faculty projects in the community. The target level for the student’s evaluations was set at 90%. Supervisors evaluated students on five learning objectives indicating how students performed these skills. Some projects covered all four learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the four outcomes. The findings are for fall, spring and summer semesters (N=44): Objective 6: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall and 100% were in spring and summer. Objective 7: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall and 100% in spring and summer. Objective 8: (Sociocultural and International Awareness) 66% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall, 95% spring, and 50% summer. Supervisors evaluated this objective “not applicable” at some sites. Objective 8: (Values in Psychology) 78% of students received evaluations of good to excellent in the fall, 91% and 100% in spring and summer. Objective 9: 99% of students received evaluations of good to excellent in the fall, 100% in spring and summer. Objective 10: New students did not enroll for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development fall 71%, spring 95% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 96%, spring 93% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 92%, spring 86% Increased knowledge of research fall 96%, spring 90% Mentoring fall 57% spring 60% Exposure to graduate students fall 57% Spring 60% Knowledge of community mental health fall 79% spring 84% Increased awareness of culture/stereotypes fall 78% spring 92% Professional development fall 50% spring 36% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Re-evaluate Learning Outcomes
Ensure that initial characterization of learning outcomes is still acceptable by faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: November 1, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Program Committee

Refine Assessment Procedures - core
For the 2006-2007 assessment, faculty involved in PSYC 1101 instruction will revise the mastery test to remove or reword any questions that may be specifically linked to the presentation of material in a particular textbook. In addition, we will revise or replace questions that were missed by 50% or more of the students in either of the previous two assessment years. For the purposes of the Core Curriculum Area E assessment, this revision will include a particular focus on developing more accessible questions to address the portion of the core requirement related to the analysis of multicultural, global, and international issues.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Contemporary Issues Mastery Questions | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues - Core
Implementation Description: November 30, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: PSYC 1101 Course Coordinator and PSYC 1101 faculty

Target for O4: Information and Technology Literacy
90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4=good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Applied Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or faculty projects in the community. The target level for the student's evaluations was set at 90%. Supervisors evaluated students on five learning objectives indicating how students performed these skills. Some projects covered all four learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the four outcomes. The findings for fall, spring and summer semesters(N=44) are:

Objective 6: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall and 100% in spring and summer. Objective 7: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall, 95% spring, and 50% summer. Supervisors evaluated this objective "not applicable" at some sites. Objective 8: (Values in Psychology) 78% of students received evaluations of good to excellent in the fall, 91% and 100% in spring and summer.

Objective: New students did not enroll for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development fall 93% spring 96% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 85% spring 88% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 93% spring 84% Mentoring fall 57% spring 60% Exposure to graduate students fall 57% spring 60% Knowledge of community mental health fall 79% spring 84% Increased awareness of culture/stereotypes fall 78% spring 92% Professional development fall 50% spring 36% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.

Target for O10: Undergraduate Applied Practicum Course
90% of students will receive an overall evaluation of 4=good or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Applied Practicum course is a field training course where students work individually or in groups in either community agencies or faculty projects in the community. The target level for the student's evaluations was set at 90%. Supervisors evaluated students on five learning objectives indicating how students performed these skills. Some projects covered all four learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the four outcomes. The findings for fall, spring and summer semesters(N=44) are:

Objective 6: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall and 100% in spring and summer. Objective 7: 78% of students received evaluations of good or excellent in the fall, 95% spring, and 50% summer. Supervisors evaluated this objective "not applicable" at some sites. Objective 8: (Values in Psychology) 78% of students received evaluations of good to excellent in the fall, 91% and 100% in spring and summer.

Objective: New students did not enroll for summer so data for fall and spring are reported. Skill development fall 93% spring 96% Encourage career/grad school goals fall 85% spring 88% Clarification career/grad school goals fall 93% spring 84% Mentoring fall 57% spring 60% Exposure to graduate students fall 57% spring 60% Knowledge of community mental health fall 79% spring 84% Increased awareness of culture/stereotypes fall 78% spring 92% Professional development fall 50% spring 36% The category of professional development was the experience students rated the least satisfactory.
Refine Assessment Procedures - major
We plan to continue to refine our assessment instruments and procedures.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Psyc 4760 Research Practicum Evaluation Form | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development
- Measure: Psyc 4770 Applied Practicum Evaluation Form | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development
- Communication and Collaboration Skills | Information and Technology Literacy | Values in Psychology and Sociocultural Awareness
- Measure: Psychology 3010 Multiple Choice Questions | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
- Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
- Measure: Psychology 3010 Pretest-Postest | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
- Research Methods: Understand & apply methods

Implementation Description: October 1, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Program Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The practicum program continues to be an important culminating and strong experience for students majoring in psychology. Students want to get the types of skills and experiences that prepare them for both graduate training and career opportunities. Since this is not a classroom experience criteria used to measure objectives did not fully capture what the practicum course offers. Each experience is a unique one for students at a particular project and community site. Therefore, supervisors used the N/A category in evaluating the scope of student experiences on their projects. Not all projects offer experiences that can meet all of the objectives. Objective 10 shows that students want mentors, to develop skills, and to receive guidance in their professional development. The undergraduate practicum program continues to be a strong program in the department and the number of students has steadily increased in seven years. With respect to discipline specific writing and critical analysis, the uniform assignments in Psyc 3030 are accomplishing their objectives. Likewise, objectives in communication through Psyc 3110 are for the most part being met consistently.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The one outcome that may need addressing in the future is the students report across both applied and research practicum if a need for professional development. The undergraduate committee may need to follow-up on a proposal to include a lecture section for all practicum students that would offer an opportunity to discuss these issues. Attention to consistency of skill development in Psyc 3010 is needed.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the PhD program in the Department of Psychology is to educate graduate students in various areas of psychology and provide specific training in scholarship, research, clinical, and other skills, consistent with the expertise of the current faculty. Five programs are represented: Clinical Psychology, Community psychology, Development Psychology, Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience, and Social/Cognitive Psychology. Our graduate students seek out entry to our program hoping to become licensed clinical psychologists; psychologists in community, non-profit, or governmental organizations; college teachers in undergraduate institutions; and researchers in research settings including research universities. Our mission is to provide the appropriate education and training for a PhD psychologist in such settings.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Theory and Content (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14)
Develop expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in the field of Psychology, the program area, and the research specialty area.
 Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

SLO 2: Research Methods (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13)
Understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.
 Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13)
Communicate and work in groups effectively.
 Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program
**SLO 4: Application (M: 11, 12, 13)**
Apply psychological principles in professional activities.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**SLO 5: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13)**
Respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and the scientific approach.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**SLO 6: Personal Development (M: 11, 12, 13)**
Show insight into one’s own and other’s behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**SLO 7: Information and Technology Literacy (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 13)**
Acquire skills in accessing and disseminating information with the use of computer technology.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**SLO 8: Values in Psychology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13)**
Weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning psychology.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (M: 10, 13)**
Incorporate knowledge of sociocultural and international issues in their work.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**SLO 10: Career Planning and Development (M: 11, 12, 13)**
Emerge from graduate school with credentials and plans for career path.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: General Exam (written) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8)**
Scored by committee of faculty

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
90% passed on first attempt

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
90% passed on first attempt

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
90% passed on first attempt

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
90% passed on first attempt

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
90% passed on first attempt

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed
### M 2: General Exam (oral defense) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8)
Conducted by committee of faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
<th>90% passed on first attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
<th>90% passed on first attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
<th>90% passed on first attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>90% passed on first attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
<th>90% passed on first attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>100% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: Master`s thesis (proposal) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)
MA thesis proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
<th>At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
<td>47% (7 of 15) 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
<th>At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
<td>47% (7 of 15) 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
<th>At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
<td>47% (7 of 15) 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
<td>47% (7 of 15) 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
<th>At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</td>
<td>47% (7 of 15) 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
47% (7 of 15) 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Master’s thesis (defense) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: PhD Dissertation (proposal) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
70% (7 of 10) 7-year or higher students have had their PhD proposal accepted; all 3 who have not are in the community (COR) program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
70% (7 of 10) 7-year or higher students have had their PhD proposal accepted; all 3 who have not are in the community (COR) program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
70% (7 of 10) 7-year or higher students have had their PhD proposal accepted; all 3 who have not are in the community (COR) program.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

70% (7 of 10) 7-year or higher students have had their PhD proposal accepted; all 3 who have not are in the community (COR) program.

#### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills

At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

70% (7 of 10) 7-year or higher students have had their PhD proposal accepted; all 3 who have not are in the community (COR) program.

#### Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy

At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

70% (7 of 10) 7-year or higher students have had their PhD proposal accepted; all 3 who have not are in the community (COR) program.

#### Target for O8: Values in Psychology

At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

70% (7 of 10) 7-year or higher students have had their PhD proposal accepted; all 3 who have not are in the community (COR) program.

#### M 6: PhD Dissertation (defense) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)

Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting.

#### Target for O1: Theory and Content

At least 90% passed on first attempt.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% passed on first attempt

#### Target for O2: Research Methods

At least 90% passed on first attempt.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% passed on first attempt

#### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills

At least 90% passed on first attempt.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% passed on first attempt

#### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills

At least 90% passed on first attempt.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% passed on first attempt

#### Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy

At least 90% passed on first attempt.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% passed on first attempt

#### Target for O8: Values in Psychology

At least 90% passed on first attempt.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% passed on first attempt

#### M 7: Performance in history course (O: 1)

Psyc 8500: History of Psychology
## Target for **O1**: Theory and Content
At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of students earned at grade of B or better.

## M 8: Performance in statistics courses (O: 2)
Psyc 8410 and Psyc 8420: Psychological Research Statistics I, and Psychological Research Statistics II

### Target for **O2**: Research Methods
At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% earned a grade of B or better in both Psych Stats I and II.

## M 9: Performance in ethics course (O: 8)
Psyc 8490: Scientific and professional ethics in psychology

### Target for **O8**: Values in Psychology
At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% earned a grade of B or better.

## M 10: Performance in diversity courses (O: 9)
Psyc 8050 or Psyc 8060: Diversity issues in clinical practice and psychological research, or Issues of human diversity in psychology

### Target for **O9**: Sociocultural and International Awareness
At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% earned a grade of B or better in both diversity courses.

## M 11: Teaching training (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)
Psyc 9900T: Teaching seminar

### Target for **O3**: Communication and Collaboration Skills
At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were graded satisfactory in Psyc 9960A and 9960B.

### Target for **O4**: Application
At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were graded satisfactory in Psyc 9960A and 9960B.

### Target for **O5**: Critical Thinking Skills
At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were graded satisfactory in Psyc 9960A and 9960B.

### Target for **O6**: Personal Development
At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were graded satisfactory in Psyc 9960A and 9960B.

### Target for **O8**: Values in Psychology
At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)
Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students were graded satisfactory in Psyc 9960A and 9960B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**

At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students were graded satisfactory in Psyc 9960A and 9960B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 12: Teaching performance (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)**

Review of course evaluations.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate portfolios and/or evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 3 of 22 GTAs had less than adequate evaluations in 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Application**

No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate portfolios and/or evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 3 of 22 GTAs had less than adequate evaluations in 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate portfolios and/or evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 3 of 22 GTAs had less than adequate evaluations in 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Personal Development**

No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate portfolios and/or evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 3 of 22 GTAs had less than adequate evaluations in 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**

No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate portfolios and/or evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 3 of 22 GTAs had less than adequate evaluations in 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**

No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate portfolios and/or evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 3 of 22 GTAs had less than adequate evaluations in 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 13: Annual evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**

Faculty members of each program review all students in their program annually to determine how many students are performing satisfactorily on each learning outcome.

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**

Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **O2: Research Methods** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **O4: Application** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **O5: Critical Thinking Skills** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **O6: Personal Development** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **O7: Information and Technology Literacy** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **O8: Values in Psychology** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **O10: Career Planning and Development** | Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.  
| **Findings 2005-2006 - Target:** | Of over 100 evaluations in 2005-2006, only 3 relatively serious problems with student performance were noted.  
|  
| **M 14: Performance in program courses (O: 1)** | Performance in required and elective courses specified by the student’s program  
| **Target for O1: Theory and Content** |  


At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a grade of B or better.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**MA proposal guidelines**

To decrease the number of 3 year or greater students who have not completed their MA proposal, programs will be encouraged to make review of this milestone a regular agenda item during their program meetings throughout the semester, rather than waiting for annual evaluation letters as the single point for review.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships:**
  - **Measure:** Master’s thesis (proposal)
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Communication and Collaboration Skills
  - **Critical Thinking Skills** | **Information and Technology Literacy** | **Research Methods** | **Theory and Content** | **Values in Psychology**

- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty members

**PhD proposal**

Too many 7 year or greater students have not completed their PhD proposal; goal barely met.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships:**
  - **Measure:** PhD Dissertation (proposal)
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Communication and Collaboration Skills
  - **Critical Thinking Skills** | **Information and Technology Literacy** | **Research Methods** | **Theory and Content** | **Values in Psychology**

- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty members

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Almost all objectives were exceeded or met.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Too many students are not completing their MA and PhD proposals in a timely fashion.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Public Health MPH**

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Mission / Purpose**

The Institute of Public Health has the mission of advancing health through leadership, scholarship, research, and service to better the human condition and promote the common good. The most significant application of that mission is to prepare students through the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree program to apply multi-disciplinary skills in public health practice and research and to assume leadership roles to address contemporary public health problems. The mission of the Institute of Public Health complements the stated mission of its administrative college home, the College of Health and Human Sciences, which is “to engage in teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service activities that improve health and well-being and address social justice issues within a multi-cultural society.” With a focus on scholarship and research in urban health and health disparities, the Institute supports the mission of Georgia State University “to achieve a front-rank position among the nation’s premier state-supported universities located in an urban setting.” The Institute’s mission is strengthened by the objective of the University System of Georgia, through its Strategic Plan for Public Health Education, Research and Service, “to ensure that the System becomes one of the national leaders in public health education, research and service.” Note: The Master of Public Health program began in the Fall of 2004 and currently has 100 graduate students enrolled. The first students graduated in Spring 2006.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Articulate and utilize an understanding of core public health concepts in the areas of biostatistics, epidemiology, social and behavioral sciences, health services administration, and environmental health, as well as the eight emerging areas identified by IOM.

Relevant Associations: Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Assess Public Health Conditions (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and assess the public health conditions, both assets and deficiencies, of populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation &amp; Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to plan, implement and evaluate programs and services designed to address these conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand and employ an “ecological approach” to public health, with emphasis on the linkages and relationships among the multiple determinants of health, to assure conditions that protect and promote the health of populations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Analyze Health Disparities (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and analyze health disparities and design appropriate, culturally competent prevention and intervention strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Apply Theory in Field Settings (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an ability to apply theory and knowledge in applied, field-based settings, as evidenced by a competency level of knowledgeable to proficient across the eight (8) competency domains for public health professionals: oanalytical assessment opolicy development/program planning ocommunication ocultural competency ocommunity dimension of practice obsocial public health sciences offinancial planning and management, and oleadership and systems thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply critical thinking skills within the context of public health practice and research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate skills in public health research and communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Successful Completion of Core Courses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
Each core course has course objectives that provide the foundation for the program objectives. A grade of “B” or better is required and successful completion of the core courses serves as evidence of foundational learning outcomes being met. Performance evaluation will consider the number of students enrolled in each of the six (6) core courses each academic year and the number of students receiving “B” or better grades.

**Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts**
At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a “B” in the core courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have not completed an audit of the performance of all students in their core courses, but the vast majority of MPH degree students have received a “B” or better in their five core courses. To my knowledge, fewer than five students have received less than a “B” in a core course.

**Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions**
At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a “B” in the core courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have not completed an audit of the performance of all students in their core courses, but the vast majority of MPH degree students have received a “B” or better in their five core courses. To my knowledge, fewer than five students have received less than a “B” in a core course.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation**
At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a “B” in the core courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have not completed an audit of the performance of all students in their core courses, but the vast majority of MPH degree students have received a “B” or better in their five core courses. To my knowledge, fewer than five students have received less than a “B” in a core course.

**Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health**
At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a “B” in the core courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have not completed an audit of the performance of all students in their core courses, but the vast majority of MPH degree students have received a “B” or better in their five core courses. To my knowledge, fewer than five students have received less than a “B” in a core course.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**

---

**Note:** The findings are based on the assumption that the performance of all students in their core courses has not been fully audited, and thus, the majority of MPH degree students have received a “B” or better in their five core courses. Further, to the knowledge of the author, fewer than five students have received less than a “B” in a core course.
At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a "B" in the core courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We have not completed an audit of the performance of all students in their core courses, but the vast majority of MPH degree students have received a "B" or better in their five core courses. To my knowledge, fewer than five students have received less than a "B" in a core course.

**Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings**

At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a "B" in the core courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We have not completed an audit of the performance of all students in their core courses, but the vast majority of MPH degree students have received a "B" or better in their five core courses. To my knowledge, fewer than five students have received less than a "B" in a core course.

**Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**

At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a "B" in the core courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We have not completed an audit of the performance of all students in their core courses, but the vast majority of MPH degree students have received a "B" or better in their five core courses. To my knowledge, fewer than five students have received less than a "B" in a core course.

**Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**

At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a "B" in the core courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

We have not completed an audit of the performance of all students in their core courses, but the vast majority of MPH degree students have received a "B" or better in their five core courses. To my knowledge, fewer than five students have received less than a "B" in a core course.

**M 2: Course Evaluations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Students enrolled in a course evaluate that course at the end of the semester, providing insight on course content and instruction. Course evaluations should meet or exceed college norms and benchmarks. Performance evaluation will document the summary and discrete evaluation of all core and elective courses for MPH students, establishing comparative and trend data relative to similar graduate programs within the college.

**Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts**

60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Final assessment of overall course evaluation has not been completed. Preliminary review suggests that target performance level has been achieved.

**Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions**

60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Final assessment of overall course evaluation has not been completed. Preliminary review suggests that target performance level has been achieved.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation**

60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Final assessment of overall course evaluation has not been completed. Preliminary review suggests that target performance level has been achieved.

**Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health**

60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Final assessment of overall course evaluation has not been completed. Preliminary review suggests that target performance level has been achieved.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**

60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Final assessment of overall course evaluation has not been completed. Preliminary review suggests that target performance level has been achieved.

**Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings**  
60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**  
Final assessment of overall course evaluation has not been completed. Preliminary review suggests that target performance level has been achieved.

**Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**  
60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**  
Final assessment of overall course evaluation has not been completed. Preliminary review suggests that target performance level has been achieved.

**Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**  
60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**  
Final assessment of overall course evaluation has not been completed. Preliminary review suggests that target performance level has been achieved.

**M 3: Successful Completion of Practicum (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**  
Each MPH student must complete a six (6) hour practicum or field experience prior to program completion. Students are required to receive positive evaluations from their field preceptors or supervisors, receive an overall course grade of satisfactory, make an oral presentation of their work at the end of each semester, and submit a portfolio or manuscript on their experience to be maintained in the Institute library. Performance evaluation will measure the number of students enrolled in the practicum or field experience each semester with data reflecting the number receiving a satisfactory grade based on positive evaluations, the quality of oral presentation and the merits of the portfolio/manuscript submission. All aspects of the practicum experience will be evaluated using the domains of core competencies for public health professionals.

**Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts**  
100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
All students have successfully completed their six credit hour practicum assignment.

**Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions**  
100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
All students have successfully completed their six credit hour practicum assignment.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation**  
100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
All students have successfully completed their six credit hour practicum assignment.

**Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health**  
100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
All students have successfully completed their six credit hour practicum assignment.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**  
100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**  
All students have successfully completed their six credit hour practicum assignment.

**Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings**  
100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.  

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students have successfully completed their six credit hour practicum assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students have successfully completed their six credit hour practicum assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)

Each MPH student has the option of completing either a thesis or a special capstone research project. Both culminating experiences are designed to test the student's competency in core public health knowledge, skills and abilities and to ensure proficiency in the student's area of specialization. Students are expected to present their thesis or capstone project in writing and defend it orally, to a faculty committee. Performance evaluation will consider the number and quality of thesis and capstone projects during each academic year. Evaluation will be based on the student's demonstration of overall achievement of learning outcomes as evidenced by the work in the culminating experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation &amp; Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

All students (n=7) have successfully completed their thesis project.

**M 5: Alumni Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Following completion of the degree program, information about program outcomes will be sought from the new graduate. The survey gauges usage of learning outcomes in an applied public health setting, career changes or advancement, further advanced study, and activities such as publication or peer-reviewed presentations that confirm learning outcomes. Performance evaluation will be based on graduate participation in the survey, response to survey questions, self-assessment of skill and application in the core competencies, and impact of graduate education experience on career and academic development.

**Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts**

75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As of Fall 2006, seven students have graduated from the MPH degree program. Of these students, 5 are employed in public health, one is in medical school, and one is home schooling.

**Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions**

75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As of Fall 2006, seven students have graduated from the MPH degree program. Of these students, 5 are employed in public health, one is in medical school, and one is home schooling.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation**

75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As of Fall 2006, seven students have graduated from the MPH degree program. Of these students, 5 are employed in public health, one is in medical school, and one is home schooling.

**Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health**

75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As of Fall 2006, seven students have graduated from the MPH degree program. Of these students, 5 are employed in public health, one is in medical school, and one is home schooling.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**

75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As of Fall 2006, seven students have graduated from the MPH degree program. Of these students, 5 are employed in public health, one is in medical school, and one is home schooling.

**Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings**

75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As of Fall 2006, seven students have graduated from the MPH degree program. Of these students, 5 are employed in public health, one is in medical school, and one is home schooling.

**Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**

75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

As of Fall 2006, seven students have graduated from the MPH degree program. Of these students, 5 are employed in public health, one is in medical school, and one is home schooling.

**Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**

75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.
As of Fall 2006, seven students have graduated from the MPH degree program. Of these students, 5 are employed in public health, one is in medical school, and one is home schooling.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Evaluate Health Research Methods Course

We will offer a new course, PH1019 Health Research Methods, in the Spring of 2007. One of the major goals of this course is to provide student learning outcomes that will facilitate timely completion of the thesis or final practicum project. We will evaluate this new course in terms of its ability to assist in completion of the core course requirements.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Critical Thinking Skills
- **Measure:** Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Critical Thinking Skills

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Successful Completion of Core Courses | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Critical Thinking Skills
- **Measure:** Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Critical Thinking Skills

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director

#### Improve Academic Advisement Process

The MPH degree program at GSU is new, with our first students graduating in May 2006. Accordingly, the entire academic process needs to be reviewed and analyzed in terms of effectiveness. While we receive direct feedback on teaching effectiveness from course evaluations, we do not receive similar feedback of faculty advisement of students. We propose formally assessing student satisfaction with academic advisement performed by IPH faculty.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Alumni Survey | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities
- **Measure:** Apply Critical Thinking Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director

#### Obtain CEPH Accreditation

The Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) provides accreditation to public health programs and schools of public health. We are currently a candidate for program accreditation, having submitted our self-study in August. We are scheduled to be site-visited in January, with a final decision in June 2006.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Course Evaluations | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities
- **Measure:** Apply Critical Thinking Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director

#### Review Student Preparation for Thesis Completion

It appears that students are having a more difficult time in completing their thesis than anticipated. It was expected that students would learn the basics of research methods during their core courses, but this does not appear to be the case. To address this concern, we have created a new core course, PH7019 Health Research Methods that will be offered for the first time in Spring 2007 and will be required of all students starting with those admitted in Fall 2006.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Successful Completion of Practicum | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities
- **Measure:** Apply Critical Thinking Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Director
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project | Outcome/Objective: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
- Apply Theory in Field Settings | Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills | Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation
- Measure: Successful Completion of Core Courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
- Apply Theory in Field Settings | Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills | Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Director

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our students are doing quite well academically in terms of completion of required and elective course work. They are meeting the learning objectives of courses as well as receiving praise from their practicum supervisor. The program continues to be popular among graduate applicants, with approximately five applicants for every enrolled student. The pending accreditation process will provide additional documentation on the status of the program and need for corrections and improvements.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We are adding a Health Research Methods course to improve student's understanding of the research enterprise. It is our hope that completion of this required course will make our students better suited to meet their thesis or capstone project requirement for graduation. Relatedly, we are endeavoring to better understand the student matriculation process and to help students graduate in as short a period of time as possible. Most of our students work at least part time, so it is difficult to precisely compare average matriculation periods, but we will endeavor to assist students to graduate in as efficient manner as possible.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Public Policy BS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
This is a new degree program, effective fall semester, 2007

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Public Policy PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
To combine the resources of two excellent schools of public policy to create a top doctoral program. To produce high-quality researchers capable of making contributions to the academic study of public policy and to the public policy process. To produce high-quality teachers, knowledgeable in the field and capable of conveying it to others.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Core
To learn social science concepts and to apply them in the study of public policy.
Relevant Associations: None.

Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Theoretical Understanding of Public Policy (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

Students will demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy through the core comprehensive examination. 90% will pass the comprehensive exam.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students passed comprehensive exams in 2005-06. Over the course of the program, one student was terminated from the program for failing comps, and three students passed the comps only after failing at least once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Analytical Methods of Public Policy (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of the analytical methods used to study public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

Students will demonstrate their understanding of the analytical methods used to study public policy through the core comprehensive examination. 90% will pass the comprehensive exam.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students passed comprehensive exams in 2005-06. Over the course of the program, one student was terminated from the program for failing comps, and three students passed the comps only after failing at least once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Field of Specialization (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

Students will demonstrate their understanding of their major field of specialization in public policy through the field comprehensive examination. 90% will pass the comprehensive exam.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Over the course of the program, only two students have failed field exams. One passed it on a re-take, the other has a re-take scheduled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Original Research in Public Policy 1 (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply their understanding of the theories and methods of public policy to a particular sub-field to produce original research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of students who pass comps will successfully defend dissertation proposals within one year of completing comprehensive exams. If 50% successfully defend within one year, we will have partially met target.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

Of the nine students who entered seven or more years ago and passed comps, the four students who have not finished their dissertations have also not defended their proposals. Of the five who entered in 2000 and passed comps, two defended their proposals on time, two defended their proposals late, and one has not defended but is close. Of the four students who began in 2001, one is still taking classes, one has not passed comps, one defended a proposal on time, and one has not defended a proposal. Of the five students who entered in 2002 and passed comps, one defended a proposal on time, one defended a proposal late, two are late but close, and one has disappeared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Original Research in Public Policy 2 (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply their understanding of the theories and methods of public policy to a particular sub-field to produce original research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

80% of students who pass comps will successfully defend dissertations within seven years of beginning program. If 50% successfully defend dissertations within seven years, we will have partially met target.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Five of nine students who began seven or more years ago and passed comps successfully defended dissertations within seven years of beginning program.
**Core Comprehensive Exam**

Professors of core courses are constantly modifying courses in response to strengths and weaknesses in core comprehensives. The Scope and Theory seminar shifted its focus from historical to more current research based on perceived weaknesses in the comps. Exercises analyzing manuscripts were introduced into core courses in response to comps. Because students have done so well on recent comps, this is currently a low priority.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Field Specializations**

Interested faculty met this summer to discuss re-focusing specializations to allow stronger course offerings in the fields. A committee will develop a formal proposal to cut the number of fields of specialization and to commit to regular doctoral course offerings in the chosen fields.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty committee
- **Additional Resources:** Additional faculty approved in departmental action plan may be necessary to teach additional doctoral courses.

**Original Research**

Regular workshops will be held to discuss how to develop and write a dissertation. All advanced students will present original research to faculty and other doctoral students. Department will subsidize travel to professional conferences for students presenting original research. Faculty committee will develop additional plans to encourage research. Office of Academic Assistance will send doctoral students letters informing them of deadlines. Admissions and Coordinating Committee will discuss what actions to take with students who are not meeting deadlines. Committee will also discuss potential actions to identify students in trouble.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** All actions will take place by Summer 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Doctoral faculty committee
- **Additional Resources:** More support for student travel may be necessary.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Prior comprehensive exams had demonstrated several areas of weakness in core curriculum. Recent success on the comps indicates that core faculty have successfully addressed many of these weaknesses. Growing numbers of presentations at academic conferences and published research articles demonstrate progress in strengthening the research abilities of the doctoral students.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Timely development and defense of dissertation proposals is a clear problem. Continued efforts to help students identify dissertation topics early and make steady progress on their proposals is a top priority.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Teaching Activities**

In Spring 2005, 7 doctoral students taught 10 classes. (One doctoral student had been hired as a visiting lecturer.) In Summer 2005, three doctoral students taught three courses. In Fall 2005, eight doctoral students taught eleven courses. In Spring 2006, six doctoral students taught six courses. In Summer 2006, two doctoral students taught two courses. In Fall 2006, four two doctoral students are teaching four courses. Over this two year period, 15 doctoral students taught at least once.

**Research and Scholarly Activities**

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Demonstrates Research-based Reading Instruction (M: 2)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension (SBRR principles).

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Quality professional programs
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
4. Public/Community Service
5. Research Participation
6. Institutional Priority Associations

Public/Community Service

International Activities
D. Keith Burns (Joint Ph.D. in Public Policy) served as a Visiting Instructor at the Georgian Institute of Public Affairs, Tbilisi, Republic of Georgia, October 2005. This trip was the second in two years and was sponsored by the International Center for Democratic Governance at the University of Georgia (Athens), which provides instructors from American universities to several institutes in the Republic of Georgia and other former Soviet states.

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Quality professional programs
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
4. Public/Community Service
5. Research Participation
6. Institutional Priority Associations

Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Reading Specialist (p-12) MEd
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)
**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge -Reading &amp; Writing (M: 1)</th>
<th>Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Creates Literate Environments for Rdg and Writing (M: 3)</th>
<th>Candidates integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters both reading and writing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Develops Professional Behaviors and Activities (M: 4)</th>
<th>Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Uses Assessment To Plan Effective Instruction (M: 5)</th>
<th>Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Rating of Standard 1 (O: 1)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 1 will be derived from written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge -Reading &amp; Writing</th>
<th>100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an understanding of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. Their ratings of level 3 indicated that they all demonstrated foundational knowledge of theories related to practices and materials they use in the classroom.

**M 2: Faculty Rating of Standard 2 (O: 2)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student`s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Demonstrates Research-based Reading Instruction</th>
<th>100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers demonstrated that they were knowledgeable about and could apply research-based reading instruction at a level 3 (intermediate level). This rating reflects their ability to demonstrate in their portfolio and in written and oral rationales research-based practices for teaching phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

**M 3: Faculty Rating Standard 3 (O: 3)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O3: Creates Literate Environments for Rdg and Writing**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated ability to create effective environments for reading and writing instruction at a level 3 (intermediate level). This rating documents (a) their use instructional practices that promote reading and writing; (b) their ability to provide a critical rationale for their practices, and (c) their ability to design reading and writing instruction to meet the needs of students from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

**M 4: Faculty Rating Standard 4 (O: 4)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O4: Develops Professional Behaviors and Activities**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers were rated at a level 3 for their professional behaviors and responsibilities. This rating involved a review of their portfolio for the following: (a) Candidates identified questions related to knowledge, skills and/or dispositions related to his or her teaching of reading and writing. They planned specific strategies for finding answers to those questions. They carried out those plans and articulate the answers derived.; and (b) Candidates indicated some knowledge of either professional organizations, conferences, and/or resources related to reading and writing.

**M 5: Faculty Rating Standard 5 (O: 5)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

**Target for O5: Uses Assessment To Plan Effective Instruction**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated a level 3 (intermediate) ability to use assessment to effectively plan instruction. This involved portfolio artifacts and oral/written explanations in which (a) the candidate discussed instruction for a student or students as was relevant to specific areas of literacy achievement; and (b) the candidate’s analysis of student learning included evidence of the literacy achievement of the target student or students.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Increase Attention to Writing Instruction**

Faculty will examine coursework within the RLL M.Ed program to consider where attention to writing theories and instruction could be strengthened.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Knowledge - Reading & Writing
  - Measure: Faculty Rating Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Creates Literate Environments for Rdg and Writing
- **Implementation Description:** 2006-2007 School Year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Reading, Language, and Literacy Faculty

**Integrate Additional Attention to Research Article**

Faculty will examine the recommended readings for coursework in the RLL M.Ed to ensure students read not only articles written for teachers but also original research.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Knowledge - Reading & Writing
  - Measure: Faculty Rating Standard 4 | Outcome/Objective: Develops Professional Behaviors and Activities
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
All completers demonstrated content knowledge in reading and writing, an ability create effective learning environments for literacy and to use research-based practices, an ability to demonstrate an impact on students’ literacy achievement, and a disposition for professional development and reflection.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although all objectives were met, faculty noted that in general candidates were weaker in the area of writing instruction than reading instruction. In addition, although all students were knowledgeable about theorists and had read professional literature in the field which had been written for an audience of teachers, few were able to discuss specific research studies in the field.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Reading, Language, & Literacy--TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 1)
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Understands student development re: learning (M: 2)
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 4)
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)**
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)**
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 7: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 7)**
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 8)**
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 9: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)**
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 10: Involves school and community in learning (M: 10)**
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience
**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 1 (O: 1)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

93% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge" at the expected level.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 2 (O: 2)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O2: Understands student development re: learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Understands student development re: learning" at the expected level.

**M 3: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 3 (O: 3)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners" at the expected level.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 4 (O: 4)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies" at the expected level.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 5 (O: 5)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O5: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

93% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Can motivate and manage students for learning" at the expected level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 6 (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Uses communication skills and technology**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Uses communication skills and technology" at the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 7 (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Can effectively plan for instruction**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Can effectively plan for instruction" at the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 8 (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Understands and uses assessment for learning" at the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 9 (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Practices professional reflection**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

86% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Practices professional reflection" at the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 10 (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

86% of our students in the Reading, Language & Literacy TEEMS program met "Involves school and community in learning" at the expected level.
Increase Collaboration and Communication

The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts will be made to have at least 2 meetings with all faculty and all supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program design, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors will visit practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating teachers and provide an overview of the program and expectations. We expect this initiative to strengthen the overall success of our interns when in the field.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 10 | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 2 | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 4 | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 6 | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 7 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 9 | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS RLL-ESOL Faculty and Supervisors: Amy Flint, Gertrude Tinker Sachs, Yan Wang and Eudes Aoulou

Maintain Continuity of Instruction

Students in the TEEMS RLL-ESOL program performed well on all performance assessments. 2005-2006 was the second year of this program and the cohort numbers were very small. The 2006-2007 cohort is triple in size and 2 new faculty and 1 new supervisor have joined the program. The primary focus for this year will be to ensure all faculty understand the program design and content and are able to maintain the quality of the program with the increased size of our cohort.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 10 | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 2 | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 4 | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 6 | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 7 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 9 | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS RLL-ESOL Faculty and Supervisors: Amy Flint, Gertrude Tinker Sachs, Yan Wang and Eudes Aoulou

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Students in the TEEMS RLL-ESOL program performed at high levels on all assessments. This may have been related to the high level of faculty involvement that was necessary because of the small size of the 2005-2006 cohort (6 students).

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
As the size of the cohort increases (the 2006-2007 cohort has 18 students), all outcomes and objectives will be emphasized to ensure continued high performance levels.
knowledge to support real estate decision making; 2) analytical skills leading to sound equity investment recommendations, value enhancing project funding strategies, effective project development plans; and 3) persuasive business communication skills.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: To develop creative decision-making skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

To develop creative decision-making skills associated with the real estate industry. 1) The student should be able to apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations. 2) The student should be familiar with available real estate financing products and be able to develop financing strategies for funding real estate projects. 3) The student should be able to use knowledge of real estate development to layout efficient project development plans.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major  
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**SLO 2: To develop business communication skills (M: 4)**

The student should be able to communicate real estate decisions and recommendations effectively.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major  
3 Oral Communication--major

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Assignments in the real estate investment course. (O: 1)**

Performance on assignments in the real estate investment course (Numerical grade).

**Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills**

75%

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Met  
81%

**M 2: Assignments in the finance and mortgage course (O: 1)**

Performance on assignments in the finance and mortgage banking course. (Numerical Grade)

**Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills**

75%

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Not Met  
70%

**M 3: Assignments in the real estate development course. (O: 1)**

Performance on assignments in the real estate development course. (Numerical Grade)

**Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills**

75%

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Met  
84%

**M 4: Performance on writing assignments (O: 2)**

Performance on writing assignments in writing intensive designated course.

**Target for O2: To develop business communication skills**

75%

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: Met  
80%

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Address problems related to a professor**

The problems in RE 4150 relate to the performance of one instructor. The instructor is participating in a program to address areas of teaching performance.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Assignments in the finance and mortgage course | Outcome/Objective: To develop creative decision-making skills

Implementation Description: 8/15/06
Responsible Person/Group: Real Estate Department Chair
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Overall, the change from year to year in the investments class have been flat and within acceptable range for the past three years. Demand for the course (RE 4160) remains very strong and the student evaluations suggest that the students are satisfied with the course. Averages in development have remained flat from 2005 and remain within acceptable range in both years. Demand for the course (RE 4050) remains very strong and the student evaluations suggest that the students are satisfied with the course. Development continues to be one of the favorite activities of students because of its “hands on” nature. Averages were flat from 2005 to 2006 in business communications and within acceptable range in both years. The department embraced the notion of “writing across the curriculum” several years ago and we have seen substantial improvement in the quality of business communication among our students.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Instructional issues arising in RE 4150 are being addressed.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Real Estate MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Master of Science in Real Estate degree is designed for individuals who are principally interested in careers in the real estate industry and those who will use real property in business decision making. It provides the student with both general and specialized real estate knowledge and analytical skills. The MSRE program is based on a synthesis of legal, physical, market and financial considerations that affect the real property decision process. The primary objectives of the program are for students to develop and integrate: (1) analytical skills for decision making associated with the real estate industry (2) leadership skills, and (3) interpersonal skills that contribute to teamwork.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: To develop creative decision-making skills (M: 1, 2, 3)
To develop creative decision-making skills associated with the real estate industry. 1. The student should be functional in all areas of real estate equity investment analysis. 2. The student should be fully familiar with available real estate financing products and be able to develop financing strategies for funding real estate projects. 3. The student should be able to perform a detailed market analysis on perspective real estate projects and develop marketing strategies for existing properties.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

SLO 2: To develop real estate business leadership skills. (M: 4)
To develop real estate business leadership skills. The students should be able to demonstrate real estate industry leadership skills including: inspiring a shared vision, challenging conventional processes, motivating others.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

SLO 3: To become contributing members of effective team. (M: 5, 6)
To become contributing members of effective real estate teams. 1. The student should be able to contribute as a productive member of a management-level work team that is responsible for a specified real estate task. 2. The student should be able to contribute functional expertise to a problem solving cooperative real estate project.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Investment assignments in the capstone course (O: 1)
Performance on investment assignments in the case study capstone course.

Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills
7.5

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
8.5

M 2: Financing assignments in capstone course (O: 1)
Performance on real estate financing assignments in the case study capstone course.

Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills
7.5

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
8.0

M 3: Marketing assignments in capstone course (O: 1)
Performance on real estate marketing assignments in the case study capstone course.

Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills
7.5

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
7.2

M 4: Leadership performance on NAIOP competition (O: 2)
Leadership skills observed by faculty advisor in NAIOP competition.

Target for O2: To develop real estate business leadership skills.
7.5

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
9.5 Studentexemplified excellent leadership skills in this project. We won the competition for the first time in 10 years.

M 5: Teamwork among the various member of NAIOP team (O: 3)
Students should all be contributing members to team as observed by the faculty advisor.

Target for O3: To become contributing members of effective team.
7.5

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
9.5 Work was divided equitably among the students and all members successfully carried out their assignments on time.

M 6: Ability to provide functional expertise to team. (O: 3)
Students should be able to provide functional expertise to the NAIOP team as observed by the faculty advisor.

Target for O3: To become contributing members of effective team.
7.5

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
9.5 In a large development project of this type, many areas of expertise were required. Students demonstrated outstanding competence in their respective assignments.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
NAIOP team performed outstandingly in real life project situation demonstrating leadership, teamwork, technical competence and
communication skills both written and oral. In the capstone course, students met our objectives in both the investments and finance areas. Test scores in investments have risen considerably since 2005 going from 7.2 (marginal) to 8.5. Test scores in finance are down slightly but still above our objectives.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Test scores slipped slightly in 2006 indicating some weakness in the market analysis area. However, the small sample size (only 5 students) may be producing an anomaly. We continue to have faith in the instructor and the curriculum and shall watch this closely in the future.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Rehabilitation Counseling MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Counseling and Psychological Services and the graduate rehabilitation program are committed to excellence in the vocational preparation of individuals in a wide variety of rehabilitation and health care settings. The department prepares students for careers in human service and physical and mental health settings such as governmental agencies, rehabilitation centers, non-profit community based residential and non-residential programs, educational institutions, and private for-profit businesses. The department also prepares professionals who will provide service in managed care, case management, vocational rehabilitation, and related areas. Graduates will also have knowledge and understanding of gender, cultural, ethnic, and physical issues as they relate to people with disabilities. In addition, graduates are expected to have a service and research mission to enhance and advance the field of rehabilitation and health care for people with disabilities.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Education in rehabilitation counselor areas (M: 1)**

Adequate education in rehabilitation counselor required knowledge areas will be demonstrated by CRC exam, APACE reviews, CORE accreditation and departmental comprehensives.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. 3 Quality professional programs
2. 1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. 2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

**O/O 2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice (M: 2)**

Practice ethical codes consistent with Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) requirements and state licensing.

Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education

**O/O 3: Work with clients with disabilities (M: 3)**

Demonstrate competence in rehabilitation counseling with individually and with groups of clients with physical, cognitive and/or emotional disabilities

Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education

**O/O 4: Counsel and consult with diverse population (M: 4)**

Counsel and consult with diverse population including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, et al.

Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Certification tests and major exams (O: 1)**

- a) National certification exam by students/graduates
- b) Annual questionnaires to graduates or advisory committee or internship supervisors or employers
- c) Annual questionnaires by internship supervisors
- d) Departmental comprehensives
- e) Accreditation review
- f) APACE review

**Target for O1: Education in rehabilitation counselor areas**

- a) At least 90% pass rate on national certification exam
- b) Of questionnaire respondents, the program will be rated good or higher (3.0 on scale of 1 to 5)
- c) Of supervisors responding, 85% rate the program as good or higher
- d) 85% pass rate
- e) Continued accreditation by CORE
- f) APACE reviewers positive review of program

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Accreditation continues without conditions. All eligible students who elected to take the CRC passed, advisory committees and supervisor/employer questionnaires averaged 4.09 on a scale of 1 to 5, and recent APACE review was positive.

**M 2: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct (O: 2)**
Reviews during classes CPS 6050, 6450, 7430, 7660, 7680 as assessed by taped samples, site supervisor evaluation, Forms 1005, 1006 (rate 1-6), Comps, CRC

**Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice**
Passing grades in various classes and by supervisors.

*Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met*
All students achieved passing grades. Last year, 100% of students who took the CRC exam passed.

**M 3: Evaluation of work with people with disabilities (O: 3)**
Demonstration will be examined by a) At least 90% of students will successfully complete an assessment of the rehabilitation potential of a "real" client, adequate term paper on topics of disabilities in 8410 and 8420, help with presentations on disability related topics in 8410 and 8420. Also will achieve satisfactory written review of performance with clients in their practicum and internship sites by the instructor as well as site supervisors. b) Written evaluation and group evaluation experiential interaction in self-disclosure and core conditions-Scale 1-5, c) CPS 7660-Form 1005-35 item scale rated 1-6, d) CPS 7430 assessment project. e) 80 percent of internship supervisors will rate students good or better.

**Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities**
Achieving a pass grade or score.

*Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met*
All students achieved passing grades and scores

**M 4: Consultation project with diverse populations (O: 4)**
Students will demonstrate effective counseling and consulting with diverse population including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, et al.

**Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse population**
Passing grades for (a) project and (b) class knowledge content domains associated with assessment of rehabilitation potential (CPS 7430); acceptable evaluation by internship site supervisor, passing grade by faculty instructor for practicum and internship classes (7660, 7680). Post graduation evaluation to include periodic review of CRC exam pass rates to be equal to, or better than, national average which is approximately 80%.

*Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met*
All students achieved passing scores in related classes. All students who elected to take the CRC exam passed (100%).

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Counsel and consult with diverse populations**
Counsel and consult with diverse population including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, et al.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low

*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*
  - Measure: Consultation project with diverse populations | Outcome/Objective: Counsel and consult with diverse population

*Implementation Description:*
  Annually or as required within various classes

*Responsible Person/Group:*
  Faculty who teach internships and courses relating to helping skills

**Education in rehabilitation knowledge areas**
Adequate education in rehabilitation counselor required knowledge areas will be demonstrated by CRC exam, APACE reviews, CORE accreditation and departmental comprehensives.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low

*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*
  - Measure: Certification tests and major exams | Outcome/Objective: Education in rehabilitation counselor areas

*Implementation Description:*
  Annual general review; periodic review as required

*Responsible Person/Group:*
  Roger Weed

**Ethical practice**
Practice ethical codes consistent with Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) requirements and state licensing.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low

*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*
  - Measure: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct | Outcome/Objective: Certification and licensing ethical code practice

*Implementation Description:*
  Annual or as required within various classes

*Responsible Person/Group:*
  Faculty who teach ethics related courses and internships
Work with clients with disabilities
Demonstrate competence in rehabilitation counseling with individually and with groups of clients with physical, cognitive and/or emotional disabilities

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluation of work with people with disabilities | Outcome/Objective: Work with clients with disabilities
Implementation Description: Annual general review; periodic review as required
Responsible Person/Group: Various faculty who teach internships and helping skills

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The program consistently is rated very highly by outside reviewers, accreditation agencies, graduated students, employers and advisory committee members.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
New CORE accreditation standards will require relatively minor changes to most syllabi over the next year.

Annual Report Section Responses
Executive Summary
Goals were exceeded in that all students who graduated passed related courses and exams.

Contributions to the Institution
Provides positive “press” for the university when students are placed in the community in jobs which benefit citizens with disabilities, returning many to employment.

Highlights
100% of students who elected to take the CRC exam passed. All students passed the comprehensive exam. All students passed required classes, practicum and internships.

Challenges
The only significant challenge is related to recruitment for the program especially considering the numerous jobs available for our graduates.

Research and Scholarly Activities
Numerous faculty had peer and non-peer reviewed articles published or accepted for publication.

Public/Community Service
Many students contribute time to various organizations which help people with disabilities. The coordinator and one instructor contribute time to editing professional journals and conferences.

International Activities
No international activities were undertaken this past academic year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Religious Studies BA
As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
In the aftermath of September 11th, the importance of Religious Studies as a discipline has become strikingly evident. Educated students need to learn about religious beliefs, practices, and motivations in a scholarly and dispassionate setting, and they need to gain this knowledge not from those who already are committed to a particular set of beliefs but from scholars who are trained in the histories, languages, and practices of religions. Universities are one of the few venues in which such education about religion (rather than “religious education”) currently takes place. Given this fact, it is perhaps not surprising that Religious Studies has enjoyed incredible national growth since September 11th. Time Magazine (9/11/2002), the Atlanta Journal Constitution (8/6/2002) the Associated Press (9/11/2002), and the London Times (9/6/2002) each recently reported on this phenomenon. But it is important to note that the field has been growing for decades, with new degrees (either graduate or undergraduate) in Religious Studies being established during the last twenty years at such schools (to use the Southeast as an example) as the University of Georgia, Florida State University, Florida International, Duke, and UNC-Greensboro. Georgia State’s diverse student body and emphasis on international and multi-cultural education makes its Religious Studies Program absolutely essential to its larger projects. When the College of Arts and Sciences organized a lecture series in the aftermath of September 11th, Religious Studies provided as many speakers as any other program in the University. When CNN broadcast one of its first reports on the brand of Islam that may have inspired the September 11th attacks, it was a Georgia State Religious Studies faculty member who appeared live on prime time to explain the issues. Although it might be an overstatement to say that University projects like the new programs in Middle East Studies, Jewish Studies, and Asian Studies would not exist without Religious Studies participation, it is safe to say that these programs would be far weaker. Religious Studies is an integral part of the intellectual life of this University.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: General Religious History (M: 1, 2, 4)
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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

#### SLO 2: Specific Religious Traditions (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to synthesize detailed knowledge of specific religious traditions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

#### SLO 3: Major Religious Thinkers (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to understand, contextualize, and explain the thought of major religious thinkers.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

#### SLO 4: Major Theorists (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to explain, critique, and apply principles of major theorists in the study of religion.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

#### SLO 5: Theory and Method (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to understand, assess, and employ critical theories in the study of religion.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

#### SLO 6: Scholarly Categories (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to understand and apply basic scholarly categories in religious studies.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

#### SLO 7: Comparative Approach (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to compare two or more traditions with regard to specific themes.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
### Institutional Priority Associations

1. **Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences**
2. **Interdisciplinary research and educational programs**
3. **Global, cultural perspectives**
4. **Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity**

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Religion and Culture (M: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to recognize and explain the role religion plays historically in both popular and elite culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Historical Applications of Religion (M: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to comprehend the ways that people in different cultures develop and apply religious resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Reading Critically (M: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to read critically and with comprehension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Critical Thought and Expression (M: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to think critically and write persuasively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Applying Logical Principles (M: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to apply principles of logic to the religious studies discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Conducting Research (M: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to conduct effective research in religious studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Content) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13)
Each graduating major is solicited to submit a capstone paper from an upper-level Departmental course from his or her final semester in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated blindly by each member of the Assessment Committee (consisting of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members) with regard to intellectual content, i.e., knowledge of religious history, critical theory in the study of religion, comparative method, etc.

Target for O1: General Religious History
75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 61% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O2: Specific Religious Traditions
75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 61% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O3: Major Religious Thinkers
75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 61% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O4: Major Theorists
75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 61% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O5: Theory and Method
75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 61% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O6: Scholarly Categories
75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 61% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O7: Comparative Approach
75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.
## Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target:** Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Evaluations</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
<th>75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 78% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O8: Religion and Culture

75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

### Target for O9: Historical Applications of Religion

75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

### Target for O10: Reading Critically

75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

### Target for O13: Conducting Research

75% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

### M2: Student Surveys (Narrative) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)

Graduating Majors are solicited to identify particular strengths of the program and to offer detailed suggestions for improvements to the program.

### Target for O1: General Religious History

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

### Target for O2: Specific Religious Traditions

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

### Target for O3: Major Religious Thinkers

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

Target for O4: Major Theorists

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

Target for O5: Theory and Method

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

Target for O6: Scholarly Categories

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

Target for O7: Comparative Approach

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

Target for O8: Religion and Culture

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

Target for O9: Historical Applications of Religion

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.
Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

**Target for O10: Reading Critically**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

**Target for O11: Critical Thought and Expression**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

**Target for O12: Applying Logical Principles**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

**Target for O13: Conducting Research**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students were unanimous in their praise of the faculty, the sense of community they establish, and the general esprit de corps among students, faculty, and staff. Several students also mentioned favorably the opportunities to employ a range of theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject matter, the emphasis on learning a wide range of religious traditions, and the stress on enhancement of research and writing skills. No single aspect of the program was cited by more than one student as an area for improvement, and the specific recommendations – for additional faculty, more frequent skill-building workshops, and a more significant presence of Religious Studies in the Core Curriculum – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

**M 3: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Skills) (O: 11, 12)**

Each graduating major is solicited to submit a capstone paper from an upper-level Departmental course from his or her final semester in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated blindly by each member of the Assessment Committee (consisting of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members) with regard to technical skills.

**Target for O11: Critical Thought and Expression**

75% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

89% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B- or higher. 83% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 67% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked 3.67 (A-) or higher

**Target for O12: Applying Logical Principles**

75% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B+ or higher.
89% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B- or higher. 83% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B or higher. 67% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 39% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked 3.67 (A-) or higher.

### Target for O1: General Religious History

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher.

The mean scores of student evaluations:
- Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88
- Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.50
- Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88
- Ability to conduct research: 4.88

By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

### Target for O2: Specific Religious Traditions

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher.

The mean scores of student evaluations:
- Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88
- Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.50
- Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88
- Ability to conduct research: 4.88

By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

### Target for O3: Major Religious Thinkers

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher.

The mean scores of student evaluations:
- Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88
- Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.50
- Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88
- Ability to conduct research: 4.88

By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

### Target for O4: Major Theorists

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher.

The mean scores of student evaluations:
- Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88
- Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.50
- Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88
- Ability to conduct research: 4.88

By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

### Target for O5: Theory and Method

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher.

The mean scores of student evaluations:
- Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88
- Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.50
- Ability to conduct research: 4.88

By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.
below average for any of the articulated goals.

**Target for O6: Scholarly Categories**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88 Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers 4.50 Understanding theory/method in the field 4.63 Ability to compare traditions thematically 4.88 Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically 4.63 Ability to think and write critically 4.75 Ability to conduct research 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

**Target for O7: Comparative Approach**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88 Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers 4.50 Understanding theory/method in the field 4.63 Ability to compare traditions thematically 4.88 Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically 4.63 Ability to think and write critically 4.75 Ability to conduct research 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

**Target for O8: Religion and Culture**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88 Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers 4.50 Understanding theory/method in the field 4.63 Ability to compare traditions thematically 4.88 Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically 4.63 Ability to think and write critically 4.75 Ability to conduct research 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

**Target for O9: Historical Applications of Religion**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88 Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers 4.50 Understanding theory/method in the field 4.63 Ability to compare traditions thematically 4.88 Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically 4.63 Ability to think and write critically 4.75 Ability to conduct research 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

**Target for O10: Reading Critically**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88 Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers 4.50 Understanding theory/method in the field 4.63 Ability to compare traditions thematically 4.88 Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically 4.63 Ability to think and write critically 4.75 Ability to conduct research 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

**Target for O11: Critical Thought and Expression**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88 Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers 4.50 Understanding theory/method in the field 4.63 Ability to compare traditions thematically 4.88 Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically 4.63 Ability to think and write critically 4.75 Ability to conduct research 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.
with diverse religious phenomena. 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically. 4.63 Ability to think and write critically. 4.75 Ability to conduct research. 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

**Target for O12: Applying Logical Principles**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88 Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.50 Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.63 Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88 Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.63 Ability to think and write critically: 4.75 Ability to conduct research: 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

**Target for O13: Conducting Research**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88 Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.50 Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.63 Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88 Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.88 Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.63 Ability to think and write critically: 4.75 Ability to conduct research: 4.88 By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 100% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 63% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Possible Curricular Changes

Departmental faculty should meet to discuss the appropriateness of adding distributional requirements within the major and/or a capstone course, in order to ensure that students take a sufficient number of courses making major contributions to articulated learning goals, particularly to the goal of conducting effective research in the field.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Evaluating Capstone Papers (Content) | **Outcome/Objective:** Comparative Approach
  - **Measure:** Student Surveys (Narrative) | **Outcome/Objective:** Comparative Approach
  - **Measure:** Student Surveys (Numerical) | **Outcome/Objective:** Comparative Approach

#### Implementation Description:
February 2007

#### Responsible Person/Group:
Departmental Assessment Committee

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

This assessment indicates that students receiving the B.A. in Religious Studies are, as a whole, achieving the Department’s articulated learning goals. The students overwhelmingly indicated their perception that all individual goals were met very well. In both their numerical and narrative evaluations, students praised the faculty for its excellence, indicated that their knowledge of the field had grown immensely and that course content was strong, and had almost no substantive criticisms beyond the often-expressed wish for more faculty, courses, and workshops. In no single area of evaluation did students rate their experience lower than 4.50 (on a 5.0 scale), the average score assigned by students was over 4.75. This positive evaluation was corroborated by the overall high grades assigned by faculty evaluators to the student papers, in the areas of both intellectual content and technical skills.

#### What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The faculty is engaged in an extended discussion about the nature of the major, required courses, and adding a capstone course. These discussions should continue in light of the results of assessments of the capstone papers and surveys.

---

Georgia State University
Mission / Purpose

In the aftermath of September 11th, the importance of Religious Studies as a discipline has become strikingly evident. Educated students need to learn about religious beliefs, practices, and motivations in a scholarly and dispassionate setting, and they need to gain this knowledge not from those who already are committed to a particular set of beliefs but from scholars who are trained in the histories, languages, and practices of religions. Universities are one of the few venues in which such education about religion (rather than “religious education”) currently takes place. Given this fact, it is perhaps not surprising that Religious Studies has enjoyed incredible national growth since September 11th. Time Magazine (9/11/2002), the Atlanta Journal Constitution (8/6/2002) the Associated Press (9/11/2002), and the London Times (9/6/2002) each recently reported on this phenomenon. But it is important to note that the field has been growing for decades, with new degrees (either graduate or undergraduate) in Religious Studies being established during the last twenty years at such schools (to use the Southeast as an example) as the University of Georgia, Florida State University, Florida International, Duke, and UNC-Greensboro. Georgia State’s diverse student body and emphasis on international and multi-cultural education makes its Religious Studies Program absolutely essential to its larger projects. When the College of Arts and Sciences organized a lecture series in the aftermath of September 11th, Religious Studies provided as many speakers as any other program in the University. When CNN broadcast one of its first reports on the brand of Islam that may have inspired the September 11th attacks, it was a Georgia State Religious Studies faculty member who appeared live on prime time to explain the issues. Although it might be an overstatement to say that University projects like the new programs in Middle East Studies, Jewish Studies, and Asian Studies would not exist without Religious Studies participation, it is safe to say that these programs would be far weaker. Religious Studies is an integral part of the intellectual life of this University.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: History of Religions (M: 1, 3, 4)

Ability to understand the role religion plays historically in both popular and elite culture, to extrapolate a general working knowledge of at least four religious traditions and to synthesize a detailed knowledge of two traditions, e.g., Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 2: Theories of Religion (M: 1, 3, 4)

Ability to explain, critique, and apply principles of at least three theorists or thinkers in the academic study of religion, and to demonstrate fluency in major terms and concepts in the field.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 3: Methodological Approaches to Religion (M: 1, 3, 4)

Ability to understand and apply at least two critical and methodological approaches to the study of religion.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 4: Theoretical categories and concepts (M: 1, 3, 4)

Ability to understand and apply major terms and concepts in the field.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 5: Comparative Approach (M: 1, 3, 4)

Ability to compare two or more traditions with regard to at least one specific theme.

Institutional Priority Associations
SLO 6: Role of Religious Experience and Practice (M: 1, 3, 4)
Ability to recognize and explain the role religion plays historically in both popular and elite culture.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 7: Reading Scholarly Texts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The ability to read scholarly texts critically and with comprehension.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 8: Conducting Research (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The ability to conduct effective scholarly research in religious studies.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 9: Critical Thought and Expression (M: 2, 3, 4)
The ability to construct clearly written arguments and commentary.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Evaluating Masters Theses (Content) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee assigns each thesis a letter grade (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on mastery of content knowledge.

Target for O1: History of Religions
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O2: Theories of Religion
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O4: Theoretical categories and concepts
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O5: Comparative Approach
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O6: Role of Religious Experience and Practice
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O7: Reading Scholarly Texts
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O8: Conducting Research
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

M 2: Evaluating Masters Theses (Skills) (O: 7, 8, 9)
For each graduating student, the masters thesis is read by at least three faculty members. Before reading a thesis, the faculty members review the learning goals for the M.A. in Religious Studies. Each member of the committee assigns each thesis a letter grade (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on mastery of skills appropriate to the academic study of religion.

Target for O7: Reading Scholarly Texts
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O8: Conducting Research
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

Target for O9: Critical Thought and Expression
90% of theses are ranked B or higher. 75% of theses are ranked B+ or higher. 25% of theses are ranked A- or higher.
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

### Student Surveys (Numerical)

Each graduating student is solicited to fill out and submit an exit survey, where the respondent was asked to assess the effectiveness of the Religious Studies degree with regard to specific learning outcomes, i.e., knowledge of the history of religions, familiarity with theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of religion, ability to conduct research and write critically, etc. Students ranked goals on a five-point scale, with 1 being the lowest, 5 being the highest ranking.

#### Target for O1: History of Religions

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

#### Target for O2: Theories of Religion

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

#### Target for O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

#### Target for O4: Theoretical categories and concepts

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

#### Target for O5: Comparative Approach

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

#### Target for O6: Role of Religious Experience and Practice

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

#### Target for O7: Reading Scholarly Texts

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O8: Conducting Research**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O9: Critical Thought and Expression**

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**M 4: Student Surveys (Narrative) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Graduating students are solicited to identify particular strengths of the program and to offer detailed suggestions for improvements to the program.

**Target for O1: History of Religions**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O2: Theories of Religion**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O4: Theoretical categories and concepts**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O5: Comparative Approach**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O6: Role of Religious Experience and Practice**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.
The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O7: Reading Scholarly Texts**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O8: Conducting Research**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Target for O9: Critical Thought and Expression**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The Religious Studies Department began the first year of its graduate program during the 2005-2006 academic year, so no assessment has been completed yet. Assessment will begin in spring 2007, when the first graduate students admitted to the M.A. in Religious Studies degree program complete their degrees.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Initiation of Assessment**

The Department will initiate the Assessment Plan at the conclusion of the 2006-2007 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Evaluating Masters Theses (Content) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
  - Conducting Research | History of Religions | Methodological Approaches to Religion | Reading Scholarly Texts | Role of Religious Experience and Practice | Theoretical categories and concepts | Theories of Religion
- Measure: Evaluating Masters Theses (Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
  - Critical Thought and Expression | Reading Scholarly Texts
- Measure: Student Surveys (Narrative) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
  - Conducting Research | Critical Thought and Expression | History of Religions | Methodological Approaches to Religion | Reading Scholarly Texts | Role of Religious Experience and Practice | Theoretical categories and concepts | Theories of Religion
- Measure: Student Surveys (Numerical) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
  - Conducting Research | Critical Thought and Expression | History of Religions | Methodological Approaches to Religion | Reading Scholarly Texts | Role of Religious Experience and Practice | Theoretical categories and concepts | Theories of Religion

**Implementation Description:** Summer of 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

This is not applicable until the Department initiates its Assessment after the 2006-2007 academic year.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

This is not applicable until the Department initiates its Assessment after the 2006-2007 academic year.
**Mission / Purpose**

Our mission is to prepare knowledgeable respiratory therapists and future leaders in the profession of respiratory care. We have approximately 100 undergraduate and graduate students.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: communication skills both orally and in writing (M: 1, 12)**

Students will be able to communicate effectively as a member of the healthcare team both orally and in writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: advanced respiratory therapy skills (M: 2, 3, 4, 13, 14)**

Students will be able to demonstrate respiratory therapy skills at the advanced registry level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Technology--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: technical performance of advanced skills (M: 5, 6, 7)**

Students will be able to perform proficiently as it relates to patient care and the technical aspects of respiratory care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Technology--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: professional behaviors expected of advanced-level (M: 8, 9, 10)**

Students will exhibit professional behaviors as a member of the healthcare team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Oral Communication--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: use of technology (M: 11)**

Students will be able to use technology proficiently as it relates to patient care.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care (M: 15)
Students will be able to think logically and in meaningful ways so that their actions reflect their critical thinking.

---

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 1. Case presentations (O: 1)
All students must successfully orally present a case study to the faculty and students at least once during the clinical seminar as part of their clinical practice rotation.

Target for O1: communication skills both orally and in writing
Case presentation scores will average 88% based on standard rubric for the Division.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Thirty-nine senior RT students during fall 2006 semester scored from 60 to 79 points for an average of 72 out of 80 possible points with a mean percentage of 90%. During spring 2005, 37 junior RT student scored from 53 to 69 for an average of 63 out of 70 possible points with the mean of 90%.

M 2: NBRC Written Registry Exam (O: 2)
NBRC Written Registry exam is a measure of cognitive mastery on advanced therapist skills and procedures taken after graduation, and involves predominantly ‘application’ and ‘analysis’ items. This is a web-based exam.

Target for O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills
passing score as determined by the NBRC

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The class of 2005 had an 88% pass rate (14 of 16 graduates). The national average for this cohort was 75%. For the class of 2006, we gave the students the option of taking the registry exam instead of the exit final (use the registry exam as the exit final). There were 32 of 39 students who attempted the written registry exam for a first attempt pass rate of 81%. These percentages may change as the remaining students will attempt the exam after graduation.

M 3: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam (O: 2)
NBRC Clinical Simulation exam is another measure of cognitive mastery on advanced therapist skills and procedures taken after graduation, and involves demonstration of higher-level patient management ability, including therapeutic procedure initiation and modification. This is a web-based exam.

Target for O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills
passing score as determined by the NBRC

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
The class of 2005 has a 56% pass rate (9 of the 16 graduates). The national average for this cohort was 75%. For the class of 2006, we gave the students the option of taking the clinical simulation exam instead of the exit final (use this as part of the exit final). There were 12 of 39 students who attempted the clinical simulation exam prior to graduation for a first attempt pass rate of 39%. These percentages may change as the remaining students are yet to attempt the exam.

M 4: Departmental Exit Exam (O: 2)
A cumulative and comprehensive assessment of understanding and minimal competency of content areas in Respiratory Therapy. This is a web-based exam.
**Target for O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills**

Score of 75% or greater

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Since we piloted the option of students taking the NBRC written registry as opposed to a self-assessment on-line exam, only the scores for the written registry are used. Of the graduating seniors in May who opted for this exam (32/39), raw scores ranged from 60 to 88 with the mean at 81%.

**M 5: Employer Survey-Psychomotor (O: 3)**

Following graduation from the program, a nationally standardized survey instrument on students' clinical skills is sent to the graduate’s employer.

**Target for O3: technical performance of advanced skills**

For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Responses were received from 5 employers who hired graduates of the class of 2005. No scores < 3 were reported on clinical proficiency (mean 4.5).

**M 6: Graduate Survey-Psychomotor (O: 3)**

Six-month post graduation, graduates are asked to evaluate their satisfaction with the program preparation for performance of clinical skills in Respiratory Therapy. This is obtained through a nationally standardized survey instrument of a graduate’s clinical skills.

**Target for O3: technical performance of advanced skills**

For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Responses were received from three graduates of the Class of 2005. No scores < 3 were reported regarding clinical proficiency (mean 4.6).

**M 7: Summative Psychomotor Evaluation (O: 3)**

For program completion, each student must demonstrate adequate clinical skills as rated by an instructor.

**Target for O3: technical performance of advanced skills**

Grading is Pass/Fail.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All graduating seniors (100%) in May scored satisfactorily on their final clinical externship skills check-off.

**M 8: Employer Survey- Affective (O: 4)**

Following graduation, a nationally standardized survey instrument on students' professional behavior is sent to the graduate’s employer.

**Target for O4: professional behaviors expected of advanced-level**

For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Responses were received from 5 employers who hired graduates of the class of 2005. No scores < 3 were reported regarding behavioral skills (mean 4.9).

**M 9: Graduate Survey-Affective (O: 4)**

Six-months post graduation, students are asked to evaluate their satisfaction with the program preparation for professional behavior in Respiratory Therapy.

**Target for O4: professional behaviors expected of advanced-level**

For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Responses were received from three graduates of the class of 2005. No scores < 3 were reported regarding behavioral skills (mean 4.8).

**M 10: Summative Affective Evaluation (O: 4)**

Each student must demonstrate adequate professional behavior as rated by an instructor prior to graduation.

**Target for O4: professional behaviors expected of advanced-level**

Grading is Pass/Fail.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All graduating seniors in spring 2005 (100%) demonstrated adequate professional behavior in their clinical practice.
**M 11: Entry Level Self Assessment Exam (O: 5)**

Students must complete this exam at the end of fall semester of the senior year, as a formative exercise to prepare for the first phase of the national board exam (Entry Level CRT). This is given in a web-based format.

**Target for O5: use of technology**

This secure exam given via the Web and feedback is provided on each content area.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Fall semester 2005, scores were from 105 to 138 with the mean score of 126.

**M 12: Capstone course (O: 1)**

RT 4085 “Professional Trends to Extended Long-term Care” is a writing intensive capstone course that concentrates on a series of reflective assignments designed to allow the senior student to demonstrate their proficient writing skills in respiratory therapy.

**Target for O1: communication skills both orally and in writing**

Students should achieve 85% or higher on written and oral assignments.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Thirty-nine students enrolled for a class average for written assignments of 92%.

**M 13: Mid-Program comprehensive exam (O: 2)**

Upon completion of the first year of the respiratory care program, graduates will demonstrate competent understanding of advanced skills. This exam is given at the end of the summer semester via a web-based format.

**Target for O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills**

A score of 75% or greater

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scores ranged from 101 to 134 out of 140 with average score of 122 (87%).

**M 14: NBRC Entry Level CRT (O: 2)**

All students must successfully complete the National Board for Respiratory Care’s (NBRC) Entry Level Exam, and obtain the “Certified Respiratory Therapist” credential to demonstrate cognitive mastery of entry level skills. The exam is given via a web-based format.

**Target for O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills**

passing score as determined by the NBRC

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The pass rate during spring semester for first time attempts was 92% (36/39) and all students passing prior to graduation. For comparison, the national average for passing on the first attempt in 2005 was 58%.

**M 15: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam (O: 6)**

This exam is a measure of cognitive mastery on advanced therapist skills and procedures taken after graduation. The exam consists of 10 separate patient management problems. The clinical setting and patient situation for each problem are designed to simulate reality and be relevant to the clinical practice of respiratory care. This exam also involves demonstration of higher-level patient management ability, including therapeutic procedure initiation and modification.

**Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care**

A passing score is required on this exam in addition to that on the Written Registry, to obtain the credential of ‘Registered Respiratory Therapist’ (RRT).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The class of 2005 has 14 of the 16 graduates (88%) who earned the RRT credential.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Employer Survey-Affective**

Will plan to use DataArc a web-based tracking system to ask employers for feedback. This should increase response rate.

**Established in Cycle: 2005-2006**

**Implementation Status: Planned**

**Priority: Medium**

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Employer Survey- Affective
- Outcome/Objective: professional behaviors expected of advanced-level

**Implementation Description: Fall 2006**

**Responsible Person/Group: Lynda Goodfellow**
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
In spring 2005, RT 4075, Patient Care Management, was revised to emphasize analysis of patient care management strategies for the respiratory therapist. After 2 offerings of this revised course (2005 & 2006), the first time pass rates on the written RRT went from 88% to 82%. The option of allowing students to take the first part of their registry exam before graduation resulted in 26 of 39 students (66%) completing this exam prior to graduation and not afterwards.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
First time pass rates will continue to be monitored.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Respiratory Therapy MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Our mission is to expand the knowledge of respiratory therapists who will be the future leaders and educators in the profession of respiratory care. We have a small cohort of graduate students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Critical thinking in the application of research (M: 1)
An entry-level understanding in the design, interpretation and ethical conduct of research

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics (M: 1)
Demonstrate advanced level competence in the use, interpretation, and troubleshooting of advanced ventilatory techniques and cardiopulmonary monitoring

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Technical and scientific communication skills (M: 1)
Demonstrate technical and scientific oral and written communication skills;

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 4: Evaluation of RT literature (M: 2)**

Intensive review of respiratory care literature to prepare for thesis or project

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 5: Understanding Health Policy in the US (M: 2, 3)**

Evaluate contemporary principles of health policy in the U.S. and other countries to better understand the essential components of delivering health services

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Demonstrate appreciation of research process (O: 1, 2, 3)**

There are two possible options: thesis or project. Evaluation of oral communication competence is evaluated by faculty members during the thesis defense or presentation of project.

**Target for O1: Critical thinking in the application of research**

completion of thesis or graduate project for graduation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The graduate curriculum is structured to cover all of the learning outcomes in required coursework. All students are required to maintain a 3.0 or better GPA, with no course credit for a grade lower than a C. The three core RT courses include completion of a significant project, or development and completion of a thesis. The thesis experiences requires establishment of a three-person committee, approval of a proposal prior to beginning the thesis, and communication of the thesis in written and oral form to graduate students and faculty. The thesis committees must approve the final written and oral reports. One student's work on comparing End-tidal CO2 and PaCO2 values in the NICU was accepted as a abstract publication in the Respiratory Care Journal and presented at the Respiratory Care International Congress as a poster presentation.

**Target for O2: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics**

completion of thesis or graduate project for graduation
The graduate curriculum is structured to cover all of the learning outcomes in required coursework. All students are required to maintain a 3.0 or better GPA, with no course credit for a grade lower than a C. The three core RT courses include completion of a significant project, or development and completion of a thesis. The thesis experiences requires establishment of a three-person committee, approval of a proposal prior to beginning the thesis, and communication of the thesis in written and oral form to graduate students and faculty. The thesis committees must approve the final written and oral reports. One student's work on comparing End-tidal CO2 and PaCO2 values in the NICU was accepted as an abstract publication in the Respiratory Care Journal and presented at the Respiratory Care International Congress as a poster presentation.

**Target for O3: Technical and scientific communication skills**
 completion of thesis or graduate project for graduation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students completed RT 6030 Advanced Topics in Ventilator Support and RT 6040 Advanced Cardiopulmonary Monitoring with a C or better, as well as HHS 8000 Trends Affecting Health Policy with a grade of C or better.

**Target for O5: Understanding Health Policy in the US**
 meets course requirements

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students completed RT 6030 Advanced Topics in Ventilator Support and RT 6040 Advanced Cardiopulmonary Monitoring with a C or better, as well as HHS 8000 Trends Affecting Health Policy with a grade of C or better.

**M 3: Understanding Health Policy in the US (O: 5)**
Students will show mastery of material by successful passage of a comprehensive final examination in HHS 8000.

**Target for O5: Understanding Health Policy in the US**
 meets requirements of completion of course

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Review of literature in respiratory care research**
Master’s level seminar course to review newer and emerging technologies specific to the cardiopulmonary system

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Demonstrate appreciation of research process
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics
  - **Critical thinking in the application of research**
  - **Technical and scientific communication skills**

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lynda Goodfellow

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Weaknesses in the structure for conducting graduate seminar for literature review
Mission / Purpose

RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION: To enhance social well being by developing knowledge and providing education in risk and its management. RMI DEPARTMENT VISION: To be the world's leader in risk management scholarship and education. Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the selection and design of individual, organizational, and societal strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 3: Graduates value the program (M: 1, 3)
MS-RMI (MRM) graduates value the program.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
1.7 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 4: Understand technical concepts (M: 4)
The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will demonstrate they understand the micro-economic foundations of risk sharing and equilibrium price determination.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
1.7 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 5: Perform valuations of traded financial assets (M: 4, 7)
The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be able to perform valuations of traded financial assets commonly used in financial risk management.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
1.7 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 6: Quantify and analyze stochastic risk exposures (M: 5)
The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be able to quantify and analyze various financial and operational stochastic risk exposures.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
1.7 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 7: Ability to analyze data and construct models (M: 6)

Our graduates will be able to analyze data, model financial returns and construct forecasting models of financial and economic time series.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 8: Construct and value financially engineered assets (M: 8)

The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be able to design, construct, and value non-traded assets and liabilities, asset-backed securities, and other complex financially engineered assets.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 9: Make recommendations about firm’s risk exposures (M: 9)

The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be able to analyze the costs and opportunities of a firm’s various risk exposures and recommend which risks should be managed and the tools available that will most efficiently achieve the firm’s objectives.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 10: Communicate mathematical and statistical analyses (M: 10)

The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be able to communicate mathematical and statistical analyses to both technical and non-technical audiences.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Faculty find program rigorous and current

Faculty find the MS-RMI (MRM) program to be a rigorous and current in its treatment of financial risk management concepts.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

O/O 2: Employers recruit MRM graduates (M: 2)
Employers find the MS-RMI (MRM) graduates to be highly sought after job candidates.

Strategic Plan Associations
4.4 External Relations
6.1 Recruitment

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Alumni Survey - Course Evaluation (O: 3)
Beginning in the Spring 2008 semester, at the earliest, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni on an annual basis. The questions will survey alumni attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of specific courses.

Target for O3: Graduates value the program
Beginning in the Spring 2008 semester, at the earliest, alumni will report satisfaction with the program. Following the program’s restructuring from a two-semester to a three-semester program, no students graduated during the 2005-2006 academic year.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
Because the MRM program was restructured from two-semesters to three-semesters, this portion of the assessment program will not be implemented until the Spring of 2007.

M 2: MRM Business Advisory Committee (O: 2)
An MRM Business Advisory Committee comprised of the RMI Program Director, at least one other RMI professor, and successful professionals from the RMI industry was established in the Spring of 2006. The Committee meets at least once per year. A report of the advisory group meeting will be forwarded to the departmental executive committee and will become part of the program’s learning outcomes evaluation.

Target for O2: Employers recruit MRM graduates
The Advisory Board will find the MRM curriculum relevant and MRM graduates to be highly sought after job candidates.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
There was general agreement that our program was unique among quantitative financial engineering programs with our emphasis on risk management and the integration of actuarial science and mathematical finance. The specific comments raised were as follows: 1. The group liked the case studies courses we require of students but wanted to know if we could further emphasize the development of the students’ oral and written communication skills. They suggested having students present problems in a formal setting, be video-taped and have that tape reviewed by faculty together with the student. 2. The group was not sure where we cover liquidity risk in the program. We do not currently cover liquidity risk in any meaningful application or case study. The group thought this would be an important element to add. See full report

M 3: Graduating Student Survey (O: 3)
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to graduating students to assess their attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change.

Target for O3: Graduates value the program
Graduating students will report satisfaction with the program and rate several suggested changes. The 2 or 3 top-rated suggested changes will be adopted.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
Following the program’s restructuring from a two-semester to a three-semester program, no students graduated from the program during the 2005-2006 academic year.

M 4: MRM 8600 exercises and examinations (O: 4, 5)
Evaluation of student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations in the referenced courses will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year. MRM 8600 is the first course students take in our MRM, MAS, and PhD programs. In addition, we often attract first-year PhD students from the finance department to take this course. The course covers economic models of risk and risky decision making, the microeconomic approach to asset valuation in both static and dynamic models, and end by introducing students to binomial PhD students of the term structure of interest rates. The primary goal of the course is to provide students a technically rigorous grounding in the underlying economic theory of risk management and asset valuation before they begin applying these concepts in more advanced coursework.

Target for O4: Understand technical concepts
The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
In general students performed very well although I would like to see the performance of the MAS students increase over time. This will happen as we manage the transition of the MAS program from one focused on the professional certification exams to one that has more emphasis on academic content. The grade point averages by major are here.

Target for O5: Perform valuations of traded financial assets
The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
In general students performed very well although I would like to see the performance of the MAS students increase over time. This will happen as we manage the transition of the MAS program from one focused on the professional certification exams to one that has more emphasis on academic content. The grade point averages by major are here.

M 5: MRM 8320, Econ 8750 exercises and examinations (O: 6)
Evaluation of student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations in the referenced courses will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year.

Target for O6: Quantify and analyze stochastic risk exposures
The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The Program Director and corresponding faculty members reported overall satisfaction in student performance on all assignments related to MRM 8320 and Econ 8750.

M 6: Econ 8780 exercises and examinations (O: 7)
Evaluation of student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations in the referenced courses will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year. ECON 8780 is a required course for students of the MRM program. It was offered for the first time in Fall, 2005. This course is designed to provide students with the necessary background to conduct applied empirical work using financial data, and covered the following topics: predictability of asset returns; modeling of volatility (ARCH-GARCH and stochastic volatility); high-frequency data (including bid-ask spreads, duration models, and high-frequency data volatility measures and the information they contain about volatility of lower frequency data); extreme values and VaR; multivariate time series analysis (VAR, cointegration, principal components, factor analysis); continuous-time models; and econometrics of option pricing models (with an emphasis on stochastic volatility) and term-structure of interest rates (some topics).

Target for O7: Ability to analyze data and construct models
The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Grades were determined by the average score on problems/exercises (mostly empirical and computer-based) assigned after each topic. Overall, seven MS in RMI (MRM) students took the class: six received A`s and one received a B. MRM students performed very well and demonstrated a great level of interest and commitment. >>see complete report.

M 7: MRM 8610 exercises and examinations (O: 5)
Evaluation of student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations in the referenced courses will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year.

Target for O5: Perform valuations of traded financial assets
The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The Program Director and corresponding faculty member reported overall satisfaction in student performance on all assignments related to MRM 8610.

M 8: MRM 8610, MRM 8630, and MRM 8620 (O: 8)
Evaluation of student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations in the referenced courses will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year.

Target for O8: Construct and value financially engineered assets
The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The Program Director and corresponding faculty member reported overall satisfaction in student performance on all assignments related to MRM 8610, MRM 8620, and MRM 8630. >>See MRM 8620 Report.

M 9: MRM 8620 and RMI 8370 (O: 9)
Evaluation of student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations in the referenced courses will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year. MRM 8620 is a core course that students take in our MRM program. In addition, students from the MAS and PhD programs often elect to take it. This course introduces several risk management models designed to allow risk managers of financial institutions to measure and manage market risk, interest-rate risk, default, and other forms of risk. Emphasis is on the development of "hands-on" experience, which includes implementing and calibrating models, interpreting results, and dealing with the complications of real world data in the context of idealized models. Several case studies of large financial disasters are presented and the models are evaluated in light of these events. This course is intended for all students considering a career in quantitative risk management, whether in the insurance, banking, or non-financial sector. RMI 8370 is the course students take in our MRM and MAS programs. In addition, we often attract MBA students from the finance department to take this course. The course discusses financial risks faced by non-financial corporations, approaches used by practitioners to measure the risks, rational for hedging and hedging strategies. The primary goal of the course is to provide students with an overview of approaches of managing financial risk in non-financial corporations. The structure of the course allows the students to acquire the tools and to discuss their implementations using a wide range of case studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Make recommendations about firm’s risk exposures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director and corresponding faculty member reported overall satisfaction in student performance on all assignments related to MRM 8620 (overall GPA = 3.56) and RMI 8370 (overall GPA = 3.17). >>See MRM 8620 Report >>See RMI 8370 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: RMI 8370 group presentations (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of student performance on group presentations in the referenced courses will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Communicate mathematical and statistical analyses**

The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on group presentations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director and corresponding faculty member reported overall satisfaction in student performance on group presentations for RMI 8370. >>See RMI 8370 Report

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Alumni evaluation of courses(survey)

Beginning in the 2006-2007 academic year, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni on an annual basis. The questions will survey alumni attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of specific courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alumni Survey - Course Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Graduates value the program
- **Implementation Description:** June 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips

#### Assessment of graduating students

Graduating students in the MRM Program will be assessed starting in the Spring 2007 semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Graduating Student Survey | Outcome/Objective: Graduates value the program
- **Implementation Description:** June 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips

#### Consider including liquidity risk management

The RMI faculty will consider revising the MRM curriculum to include meaningful coverage of liquidity risk management. The MRM Advisory Board thought this would be an important topic to add to the existing curriculum.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: MRM Business Advisory Committee | Outcome/Objective: Employers recruit MRM graduates
- **Implementation Description:** 2007-2008 academic year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips

#### Further emphasize student communication skills

Revise courses to further emphasize the development of students' oral and written communication skills. The MRM Advisory Board suggested having students present problems in a formal setting, be video-taped, and have that tape reviewed by faculty together
with the student. This suggestion may be implemented
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: MRM Business Advisory Committee | Outcome/Objective: Employers recruit MRM graduates
Implementation Description: 2007-2008 academic year
Responsible Person/Group: Richard Phillips

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
As a new program, this analysis is tentative. The positives to date include encouraging enrollment level and high quality students. Also, the initial response from the Advisory Committee was quite positive.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The restructuring of the program from a 2-semester to 3-semester duration was in response to evolving appreciation of the breadth and depth of the necessary content of the program. Further growing pains are anticipated and will be monitored and responded to carefully.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Risk Management & Insurance (Risk & Insurance) MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION: To enhance social well being by developing knowledge and providing education in risk and its management. RMI DEPARTMENT VISION: To be the world’s leader in risk management scholarship and education. Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the selection and design of individual, organizational, and societal strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 3: Structure and solve problems (M: 1)
Our graduates will be able to structure and solve risk management and related business problems with sound analytical techniques.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 5: Identify and articulate sources of risk (M: 2)
The MS-RMI (R & I) graduate will be able to identify sources of risk for individuals, business organizations, and societies and be able to articulate their implications for decision making.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 6: Recommend risk management approaches (M: 3)
The MS-RMI (R&I) graduate will be able to recommend, from a variety of contractual, governmental, or market-based approaches, how to most efficiently manage individual, business, and societal risk exposures.
### Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### SLO 7: Quantify risk exposures and make recommendations (M: 4)

The MS-RMI (R&I) graduate will be able to quantify and analyze financial and operational stochastic risk exposures with statistical and probability distribution theory and be able to recognize the strengths and limitations of a modeling exercise and recommend future enhancements.

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### SLO 8: Effective professional oral/written communication (M: 5)

The MS-RMI (R&I) graduate will be able to prepare concise, focused, logical, and well-written documents that effectively communicate the author’s message to both technical and non-technical audiences.

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### SLO 9: Graduates value the program (M: 6, 7, 8, 9)

MS-RMI (R&I) graduates value the program.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Relevance to employers (M: 1)

Employers find the program relevant to their needs.

### Strategic Plan Associations

4.4 External Relations  
6.1 Recruitment

#### O/O 2: Career placement (M: 1, 6)

Our graduates will find appropriate careers upon graduation.

### Strategic Plan Associations

4.4 External Relations  
6.1 Recruitment
O/O 4: Relevance to various stakeholders

Our stakeholders find the MS-RMI (R & I) program to be current and relevant in its content and delivery.

Strategic Plan Associations

4.4 External Relations
6.1 Recruitment

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Biennial Industry Panel (O: 1, 2, 3)
The Industry Panel will include representation from all of the major areas of risk management and will be required to meet every two years. The Panel's agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the RMI Program to risk management education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development. The panel will include employers that regularly hire our graduates into permanent positions and our students as interns. They will review and report on the content of the program, as well as their assessments of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. The same panel will review undergraduate and graduate RMI programs.

Target for O1: Relevance to employers
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions with their firms.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
The Industry Panel will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair taking place in September 2006.

Target for O2: Career placement
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions with their firms.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
The Industry Panel will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair taking place in September 2006.

Target for O3: Structure and solve problems
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions with their firms.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met
The Industry Panel will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair taking place in September 2006.

M 2: RMI 8000 exercises and examinations (O: 5)
Evaluation of student performance on exercises and examinations in RMI 8000 will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year.

Target for O5: Identify and articulate sources of risk
The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on exercises and examinations in RMI 8000.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The Program Director and corresponding faculty member reported overall satisfaction in student performance on all assignments related to RMI 8000, including exercises and examinations.

M 3: RMI 8000 case studies (O: 6)
Evaluation of student performance on case studies in RMI 8000 will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year.

Target for O6: Recommend risk management approaches
The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on case studies in RMI 8000.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The Program Director and corresponding faculty member reported overall satisfaction in student performance on all assignments related to RMI 8000, including case studies.

M 4: RMI 8050 exercises and examinations (O: 7)
Evaluation of student performance on exercises and examinations in RMI 8050 will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year.

Target for O7: Quantify risk exposures and make recommendations
The Program Advisor will report satisfaction with student performance on exercises and examinations in RMI 8050.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
The Program Advisor was satisfied with the performance of the students in the Fall 2005 RMI 8050 course. The course is considered very difficult (students gave it 4.6/5 in difficulty on the evaluations and many individuals commented that it was the...
Despite this, the student learning was very good, and is reflected in the grades given. The end of the course, students were generally able to construct spreadsheet models and simulations of credit risk, interest rate risk, stock market risk and mortality risk as well as combinations of risks. They could estimate means, standard deviations and Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data and make comparisons.

**M 5: RMI 8000 & RMI 8050 writing assignments (O: 8)**

Evaluation of student performance on written assignments for RMI 8000 and RMI 8050 will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year.

**Target for O8: Effective professional oral/written communication**

The Program Director will report overall satisfaction with student performance, in terms of their ability to communicate (both written and oral) effectively. On exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations in RMI 8000 and RMI 8050.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The Program Director and teaching faculty member reported overall satisfaction in student performance on writing assignments for RMI 8000 and 8050.

**M 6: Graduating Student Survey (O: 2, 9)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to graduating students. The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of the program's strengths and weaknesses.

**Target for O2: Career placement**

Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the program's content and the services available to students at the university, college, and department levels.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There was an insufficient response rate to permit meaningful analysis. For the current assessment period, there were only 3 graduating students, and only 1 completed a survey.

**Target for O9: Graduates value the program**

Graduating students will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the program's content and the services available to students at the university, college, and department levels.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

There was an insufficient response rate to permit meaningful analysis. For the current assessment period, there were only 3 graduating students, and only 1 completed a survey.

**M 7: Alumni Survey - RMI Competency (O: 9)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni, two to three years removed from graduation. The questions will survey this group's attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses. This section assesses graduating students/alumni satisfaction in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Target for O9: Graduates value the program**

Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Alumni reported a high degree of satisfaction (mean = 4.33) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses. >>survey results

**M 8: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes (O: 9)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni, two to three years removed from graduation. The questions will survey this group's attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses. This section measures level of satisfaction across various program attributes.

**Target for O9: Graduates value the program**

Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Alumni were generally satisfied (mean = 3.40) across a variety of program attributes. "Enhancement of computer skills" was rated below average. >>survey results

**M 9: Alumni Survey - Student Services (O: 9)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni, two to three years removed from graduation. The questions will survey this group's attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses. This section measures level of satisfaction with various student services.

**Target for O9: Graduates value the program**

Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various university, college and department services for students.
Alumni were generally not satisfied with the student services offered by the university and the college. The college level "MS orientation" and "placement services" scored particularly low. Alumni were generally satisfied with department level services, especially advisement and placement services. **>>survey results**

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Create Industry Panel**
An Industry Panel will be created, comprised of representatives from all of the major areas of risk management. The Panel will meet once every two years, starting in the fall of 2006 and at two-year intervals thereafter. The Panel's agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the RMI Program to risk management education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development. The panel will include employers that regularly hire our students as interns and our graduates to discern attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. The same panel will review both the undergraduate and graduate RMI programs.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Biennial Industry Panel  
- Outcome/Objective: Career placement  
- Relevance to employers  
- Structure and solve problems

**Implementation Description:** December 1, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lorilee Schneider

**Improve student services**
At the department level, we have added a new position, Director of Student and External Services, to work with students and alumni to enhance career placement and external relations/outreach, including employer relations and recruiting activities. Additionally, the MS-RMI Program Advisor will work with RCB personnel to improve and enhance the services available to our students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Student Services  
- Outcome/Objective: Graduates value the program

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing  
**Responsible Person/Group:** William Feldhaus/Lorilee Schneider

**Improve tracking of graduating students**
Because the MS-RMI(R&I) program lacks a capstone course, it is difficult to track graduating students during their final semester at Georgia State. The Program Director will develop a procedure to contact graduating students within the first month of their last semester. The addition of a capstone course to the program will also be explored.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Graduating Student Survey  
- Outcome/Objective: Career placement  
- Graduates value the program

**Implementation Description:** February 1, 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** William Feldhaus

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Our graduates are competent in their ability to analyze complex business problems, including the modeling of risk and selecting appropriate techniques to deal with corporate risk. We plan to add features to the assessment plan that will clearly document these acquired skills. Our faculty are now more aware of assessment and its role in improving our academic programs.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The expectations regarding the written and verbal communication skills of graduates are not fully realized. Our steps to improve this area will be a more rigorous screening of international students to be sure they are given appropriate language support to enhance their learning experience and education in our masters programs.
### Mission / Purpose

RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION: To enhance social well being by developing knowledge and providing education in risk and its management. RMI DEPARTMENT VISION: To be the world’s leader in risk management scholarship and education. Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the selection and design of individual, organizational, and societal strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 3: Structure and solve problems (M: 1, 5, 6)**

Our graduates will be able to structure and solve risk management and related business problems with sound analytical techniques.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication—major  
3. Oral Communication—major  
7. Critical Thinking—major  
9. Contemporary Issues—major  
11. Quantitative Skills—major  
13. Technology—major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**SLO 4: Effective professional communication (M: 3, 4)**

Our graduates will be able to speak effectively to articulate their ideas one-on-one and in meetings as well as structure business correspondence that is both meaningful and technically proficient.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication—major  
3. Oral Communication—major  
5. Collaboration—major  
7. Critical Thinking—major  
13. Technology—major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Relevance to employers (M: 1, 2, 7, 8)**

Employers find the program relevant to their needs.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.4 External Relations  
6.1 Recruitment

**O/O 2: Career placement (M: 1, 2, 7, 8)**

Our graduates will find careers as: risk analysts; brokers/agents providing professional risk management/insurance/employee benefits counseling and market placement services for clients; as consultants and personal financial planners; in government; and in the underwriting, marketing, claims adjusting, planning, governmental relations, information systems, and financial management activities of insurers.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.4 External Relations  
6.1 Recruitment

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Biennial Industry Panel (O: 1, 2, 3)**
The industry panel will include representation from all of the major areas of risk management. The Panel will meet once every two years, starting in the spring of 2007. The Panel's agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the RMI Program to risk management education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development. The panel will include employers that regularly hire our continuing students as interns and our graduates as permanent graduates, to discern attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. The same panel will review undergraduate and graduate RMI programs separately.

### Target for O1: Relevance to employers
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions with their firms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
The Industry Panel will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair taking place in September 2006.

### Target for O2: Career placement
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions with their firms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
The Industry Panel will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair taking place in September 2006.

### Target for O3: Structure and solve problems
Employers will report that the program is relevant to their needs and will hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions with their firms.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
The Industry Panel will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair taking place in September 2006.

### M2: Alumni Survey (O: 1, 2)
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni two and three years after graduation. Alumni will report on their satisfaction with the extent to which the program contributed to their career competency across various knowledge and skill areas. Alumni will also provide their satisfaction rating of various university/college/department level services.

#### Target for O1: Relevance to employers
Alumni will report satisfaction (average score of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) in the extent to which the program contributed to career competence across various knowledge and skill areas.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Alumni reported overall satisfaction in the extent to which the program contributed to career competence across various knowledge areas (mean = 3.93) and skill areas (mean = 4.01). One knowledge area, "information systems," scored slightly below average. => survey results

#### Target for O2: Career placement
Alumni will report satisfaction (average score of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) in the extent to which the program contributed to career competence across various knowledge and skill areas.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Alumni reported overall satisfaction in the extent to which the program contributed to career competence across various knowledge areas (mean = 3.93) and skill areas (mean = 4.01). One knowledge area, "information systems," scored slightly below average. => survey results

### M3: Senior course presentations (O: 4)
The program director will submit a report of student evaluations on course presentations. To be completed each June for the prior academic year. Two of the senior-level BBA-RMI major required courses – RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 – require individual student presentations done in a board-room style, not unlike that found in actual business environments. In the RMI 4300 course, the presentation is informational and emphasizes a summary of lessons learned from the research conducted. In RMI 4700, the presentation is both informational and persuasive as the students select and debate their positions on a business issue based on research conducted.

#### Target for O4: Effective professional communication
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on course presentations

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The BBA-RMI program director reports general satisfaction with student performance on course presentations. For Fall 2005-Spring 2006, evaluations resulted in the following average assessment levels: RMI 4300: 3.75/5.00 RMI 4700: 4.10/5.00

### M4: Senior course writing requirements (O: 4)
The program director will submit a report of student evaluations on course writing requirements. To be completed each May for the prior academic year. Two of the senior-level BBA-RMI major required courses – RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 – require individual business memorandums. In RMI 4300, the memo is informational and emphasizes a summary of lessons learned from the research conducted. In RMI 4700, the memo is both informational and persuasive as the students select and debate their positions on a business issue, based on research conducted. RMI 4700 also requires a literature review on a pre-approved, current event topic within the RMI
Industry.

**Target for O4: Effective professional communication**
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on course writing requirements.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The BBA-RMI program director reports overall satisfaction with student performance on course writing requirements. For Fall 2005-Spring 2006, evaluations resulted in the following median assessment levels: RMI 4300: B-; RMI 4700: B

**M 5: Faculty Survey (O: 3)**
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to RMI faculty members that teach in the BBA-RMI program to obtain their perspectives on student achievement of the program's learning outcomes.

**Target for O3: Structure and solve problems**
Faculty will report satisfaction with the level of achievement of the program's learning outcomes.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
The faculty survey process will be completed this fall, by October 31.

**M 6: Senior RMI assessments within coursework (O: 3)**
The Program Director will submit a report of senior student evaluations on assignments and exams, to be completed each May for the prior academic year.

**Target for O3: Structure and solve problems**
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The BBA-RMI program director reports overall satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams within the coursework. The average GPA in our senior-level coursework tends to hover around a 3.00, which is acceptable for our objectives. Overall, grades in the senior-level RMI courses were in an acceptable range, with one exception. RMI 4530 taught in Summer 2006 carried an unusually low average numeric grade, based mostly on performance in a multiple-choice exam environment. With a mix of MGS and RMI students (among others) taking the course, it is still difficult to tell whether BBA-RMI students performed above, below, or right at the class average. A few items of note in evaluating student performance: 1) Students that enter the courses having already taken Fi 3300 tend to perform noticeably better than those who do not. Thus, we are considering requesting Fi 3300 as a prerequisite to our 4000-level courses. 2) Students, within RMI courses in general, seem to perform better on exam questions that are short-answer or essay in nature than on the multiple-choice variety. We do not know whether this is because MC questions tend to be good differentiators of knowledge acquired or whether there is more potential for a "bad" question within MC than in other question formats. This is something we are investigating. Most of our RMI faculty in the 4000-level coursework use much more of the short-answer and essay style than MC, so the issue is somewhat limited in its effect. 3) RMI major student performance on analytical projects, especially those involving basic statistics and/or Excel work is not satisfactory to several RMI faculty members. In the RMI 4300 course, for instance, the professor spends at least two class meetings teaching statistical concepts and formulas so the students can manage the RMI applications later in the course.

**M 7: Graduating Student Survey - Career Competence (O: 1, 2)**
On an annual basis, a questionnaire will be administered to graduating students. The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of the program's strengths and weaknesses. This section measures student satisfaction with the level of proficiency to succeed in business provided by the program. Proficiency is measured across core business knowledge/skills and RMI related knowledge.

**Target for O1: Relevance to employers**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (average scores of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the level of proficiency to succeed in business provided by the program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students reported a high degree of satisfaction with the overall level of proficiency to succeed in business provided by the program (mean = 4.34).

**Target for O2: Career placement**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (average scores of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the level of proficiency to succeed in business provided by the program.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Graduating students reported a high degree of satisfaction with the overall level of proficiency to succeed in business provided by the program (mean = 4.34).

**M 8: Graduating Student Survey - Services (O: 1, 2)**
On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered to alumni graduating three years previously. The questions will generally survey alumni attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of the program's strengths and weaknesses and their satisfaction with a variety of student services. This section measures student satisfaction with various university and department level services.

**Target for O1: Relevance to employers**
Graduating students will report satisfaction (average scores of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with various university and department level services.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Graduating students reported a high level of satisfaction with department level services (mean = 4.36) and a slightly lower level of satisfaction with university level services (mean = 3.89).

**Target for O2: Career placement**

Graduating students will report satisfaction (average scores of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with various university and department level services.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Graduating students reported a high level of satisfaction with department level services (mean = 4.36) and a slightly lower level of satisfaction with university level services (mean = 3.89).

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Complete faculty survey process

A written questionnaire survey will be administered to RMI faculty members that teach in the BBA-RMI program to obtain their perspectives regarding the achievement of the program's learning outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty Survey | Outcome/Objective: Structure and solve problems
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lorilee Schneider

#### Consider Fi3300 as prerequisite

Students that enter senior-level RMI courses having already taken Fi 3300 tend to perform noticeably better than those who do not. Thus, members of the RMI faculty are considering requesting Fi 3300 as a prerequisite to our 4000-level courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Senior RMI assessments within coursework | Outcome/Objective: Structure and solve problems
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lorilee Schneider and select RMI faculty

#### Create Industry Panel

An Industry Panel will be created, comprised of representatives from all of the major areas of risk management. The Panel will meet once every two years, starting in the fall of 2006 and at two-year intervals thereafter. The Panel's agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the RMI Program to risk management education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development. The panel will include employers that regularly hire our students as interns and our graduates to discern attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. The same panel will review both the undergraduate and graduate RMI programs.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Biennial Industry Panel | Outcome/Objective: Career placement | Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems
- **Implementation Description:** December 1, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lorilee Schneider

#### Revise curriculum to include use of technology

Consider revising the BBA-RMI curriculum to include more assignments that require the use of technology (e.g., specialized computer application packages, online research, etc.).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Career placement | Relevance to employers
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lorilee Schneider

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on
This assessment shows overall graduating student/alumni satisfaction with the career placement and career competency contributions by the program. More specifically, our graduates are competent in their ability to structure and solve business problems and in selecting appropriate techniques to deal with various risk exposures. Our graduates are generally able to speak effectively, to articulate their ideas, and to structure meaningful, technically proficient business correspondence.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Our BBA-RMI assessments showed writing and presentation skills in senior coursework that, on average, are below departmental long-term expectations. Also, the program may need to investigate further and address the lack of satisfaction with "information systems" knowledge perceived to be gained from the program by former students. The RMI faculty will consider revising the BBA-RMI curriculum to include more assignments that require the use of technology (e.g., specialized computer application packages, online research, etc.).

**Mission / Purpose**

The Mission of the Bachelors of Business Administration (BBA) program is to provide broad general education and the core business knowledge and skills to prepare both traditional and non-traditional students for entry-level position in public, private, and not-for-profit organizations and to stimulate in students a desire for life-long learning.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Effective Communication Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9)**

Students will demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major  
3 Oral Communication--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Effective Use of Computer Technology (M: 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students will show the ability to effectively use and manage technology of business related purposes.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Effective Analytical Skills (M: 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13)**

Students will demonstrate analytical skills in solving business problems.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major  
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Effective Team Membership (M: 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15)**

Students will show the ability to function as effective members of a team.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Collaboration--major
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Self Assessed Written Communication Skills (O: 1)

Student responses on EBI Exit Survey to: To what extent did the Business program enhance your Writing skills?

**Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills**

To earn a higher than average performance rating when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Rank 1st among 7 schools in the "Pick 6" comparison; ranked 4th among 46 schools in our Carnegie Class; ranked 18th among 163 schools participating in the EBI survey. This year’s mean is 5.56, up 0.15 from last year.

#### M 2: Assessment of Presentation Skills (O: 1)

Student responses on EBI Exit Survey to: To what extent did the Business program enhance your: Presentation skills?

**Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills**

To earn a higher than average performance rating when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Rank 2nd among 7 schools in the "Pick 6" comparison; ranked 4th among 46 schools in our Carnegie Class; ranked 22nd among 163 schools participating in the EBI survey. This year’s mean is 5.97, up 0.27 from last year.

#### M 3: Synthesizing, Arranging & Presenting -- Written (O: 1, 3, 4)

Student will demonstrate effective communication skills by synthesizing, arranging and presenting complex material competently in written form and adapting presentations to specific audiences and purposes. The measurement will be through student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale.

**Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scale score of 5.53 with low variation.

**Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scale score of 5.53 with low variation.

**Target for O4: Effective Team Membership**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scale score of 5.53 with low variation.

#### M 4: Synthesizing, Arranging & Presenting -- Oral (O: 1, 3, 4)

Student will demonstrate effective communication skills by synthesizing, arranging and presenting complex material competently in
oral form and adapting presentations to specific audiences and purposes. The measurement will be through student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Scale score of 5.28 with normal distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Scale score of 5.28 with normal distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Effective Team Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Scale score of 5.28 with normal distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Material Presentation -- Audience (O: 1, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will demonstrate effective communication skills presenting their material in a manner consistent with the audience that they were addressing and for the purpose that was set out in the assignment. The measurement will be through student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Scale score of 5.14 with normal distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Scale score of 5.14 with normal distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Effective Team Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Scale score of 5.14 with normal distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Ability to Use Technology (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the BBA program enhance students’ ability to use technology? This will be measured by the students' self-reported ability on the two questions of the Use and Manage Technology Factor on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey. Q 67 To what extent did the Business program enhance your Ability to use technology Q 68 To what extent did the Business program enhance your Ability to manage technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Effective Use of Computer Technology**
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Rank 2nd among 7 schools in the "Pick 6" comparison; ranked 12th among 46 schools in our Carnegie Class; ranked 53rd among 163 schools participating in the EBI survey. This year's mean is 5.36, up 0.24 from last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Ability to Manage Technology (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the BBA program enhance students’ ability to manage technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Effective Use of Computer Technology**
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Computer Software Usage – Written (O: 1, 2, 4)</th>
<th>Students effectively exhibiting competency with computer software (word processing, spreadsheets, graphics) in their final, written project. The measurement will be through student team projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills</td>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Scale score of 6.02 with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Effective Use of Computer Technology</td>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Scale score of 6.02 with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Effective Team Membership</td>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Scale score of 6.02 with low variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Computer Software Usage – Oral Presentation (O: 1, 2, 4)</th>
<th>Students effectively exhibiting competency with computer software (word processing, spreadsheets, graphics) in their final, oral presentation. The measurement will be through student team projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills</td>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>Scale score of 5.44 with normal variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Effective Use of Computer Technology</td>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>Scale score of 5.44 with normal variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Effective Team Membership</td>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>Scale score of 5.44 with normal variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Ability to Think Critically (O: 3)</th>
<th>The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to think critically.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills</td>
<td>To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2005-2006 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Rank 1st among 7 schools in the “Pick 6” comparison; ranked 5th among 46 schools in our Carnegie Class; ranked 28th among 163 schools participating in the EBI survey. This year’s mean is 5.36, up 0.15 from last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Ability to Define Problems (O: 3)</th>
<th>The extent to which the BBA program enhances students’ ability to define problems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills</td>
<td>To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Rank 1st among 7 schools in the "Pick 6" comparison; ranked 4th among 46 schools in our Carnegie Class; ranked 19th among 163 schools participating in the EBI survey. This year’s mean is 5.36, up 0.15 from last year.

M 12: Ability to Solve Problems (O: 3)
The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to solve problems.

Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Rank 1st among 7 schools in the "Pick 6" comparison; ranked 4th among 46 schools in our Carnegie Class; ranked 19th among 163 schools participating in the EBI survey. This year’s mean is 5.36, up 0.15 from last year.

M 13: Ability to Analyze an Interpret Data (O: 3)
The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to analyze and interpret data.

Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Rank 1st among 7 schools in the "Pick 6" comparison; ranked 3rd among 46 schools in our Carnegie Class; ranked 11th among 163 schools participating in the EBI survey. This year’s mean is 5.36, up 0.22 from last year.

M 14: Ability to Work on Teams (O: 4)
The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to work in teams.

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Rank 4th among 7 schools in the "Pick 6" comparison; ranked 21st among 46 schools in our Carnegie Class; ranked 84th among 163 schools participating in the EBI survey. This year’s mean is 5.36, up 0.15 from last year.

M 15: Ability to Function in a Team Environment (O: 4)
The extent to which students in their team projects exhibited the ability to function as a team in executing their roles with respect to the semester-long simulation and the final project desirables. The measurement will be through student team projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale.

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Scale score of 5.51 with a long left tail.

M 16: Further Education -- Self Report (O: 5)
This measure reports the number of students anticipating continuing formal education after completion of their BBA degree.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning
Less than 25% indicating no interest in pursuing further education.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
Only 8% of students responded by saying they will not pursue their education further. Another 26% indicated that they are "unsure" about further education.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The business communications objectives were largely met at a high level relative to other schools. The technology usage skills were largely met with respect to written reports but there were mixed results in oral presentation usage of technology. Students’ self reports indicate a strong sense of their ability at think critically, define and solve problems, and to analyze and interpret data. These numbers are extremely high relative to the self reports of peer schools on all levels. Student work on teams is good but could show improvement. Students seem to be interested in and understand the importance of further education.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
On the communications objectives the College should continue to improve the effective Business Communications program. Students need to increase their effective usage of presentation technology in a large number of cases. Attention to team development needs to be given. While many teams score well, there is too high a level of outliers. We need to increase throughout the program an appreciation of continuing education as a key to personal and professional life-long success in the 21st century.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2005-2006 Robinson College of Business MBA**
(As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
The Master of Business Administration degree program is designed for individuals with work experience who aspire to organizational or entrepreneurial leadership positions. The program enhances general management abilities and provides an opportunity to place emphasis on a functional area of expertise. The primary objectives of the program are for students to develop and integrate:
1. analytical skills for decision making that incorporate global, ethical, and culturally diverse dimensions,
2. skills in assessing organizational performance and developing approaches for improvement,
3. leadership skills, and
4. interpersonal skills that contribute to teamwork.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Creative Decision Making Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13)**
Creative Decision-making Skills that Incorporate Global and Ethical Dimensions

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13)**
Identify critical success factors for the business, analyze the organization’s performance by assessing its resources and capabilities, and analyze the organization’s performance by assessing its competitive environment.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team (M: 12, 13)**
Skills for Individuals to be Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team: Student is a productive member of a team that was responsible for a specified task and the student contributes functional expertise to a problem solving cooperative project.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Development of Leadership Skills (M: 11, 12, 13)**
Students should be able to demonstrate leadership skills including: inspiring a shared vision, challenging conventional processes, and motivating others.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Reasoned analysis integrated functional dimensions (O: 1, 2)**
Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale for a reasoned analysis integrated functional dimensions in the business decision process.

**Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Rating is 5.3 with a high skew

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Rating is 5.3 with a high skew

---

**M 2: Reasoned analysis integrated global dimensions (O: 1, 2)**
Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ reasoned analysis integrated global dimensions in the business decision process.

**Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
Rating of 4.33 with bi-polar results.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
Rating of 4.33 with bi-polar results.

---

**M 3: Reasoned analysis integrated ethical dimensions (O: 1, 2)**
Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ reasoned analysis integrated ethical dimensions in the business decision process.

**Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
Scale score of 4.05 with bi-polar variation.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
Scale score of 4.05 with bi-polar variation.

---

**M 4: Recommendation integrated functional dimensions (O: 1, 2)**
Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ recommendation integrated functional dimensions in the business decision process.

**Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Scale score of 5.61 with bi-polar variation.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
Scale score of 5.61 with bi-polar variation.

---

**M 5: Recommendation integrated global dimensions (O: 1, 2)**
Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ recommendation integrated global dimensions in the business decision process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Recommendation integrated ethical dimensions (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of 4.48 with bi-polar distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of 4.48 with bi-polar distribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Developed and defended business/corporate strategy (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of 4.02 with a strong bi-polar distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of 4.02 with a strong bi-polar distribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Identification of Critical Success Factors (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of 5.52 with a heavy right skew.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Assessment of Resources and Capabilities of a Firm (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of 5.52 with a heavy right skew.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### M 10: Analysis of Competitive Environment (O: 2)

Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ skills to analyze an organization’s performance by assessing its competitive environment.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Scale score of 4.66 with a tight, normal distribution.

### M 11: Business Leadership Skills (O: 1, 4)

An assessment of students’ performance on assignments in the business communications course.

**Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**

Not yet developed

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

No findings in the 2005-06 assessment cycle.

**Target for O4: Development of Leadership Skills**

Not yet developed

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

No findings in the 2005-06 assessment cycle.

### M 12: Productive Membership on a Team (O: 3, 4)

Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ functioning as productive members of a team that was responsible for a specified task.

**Target for O3: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>right skewed with a long left tail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Scale score of 5.33; right skewed with a long left tail.

**Target for O4: Development of Leadership Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>right skewed with a long left tail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

Scale score of 5.33; right skewed with a long left tail.

### M 13: Functional Expertise Contributions (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ contributing their functional expertise to problem solving in a cooperative project.

**Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>right skew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scale score of 6.03 with a right skew.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>right skew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scale score of 6.03 with a right skew.

**Target for O3: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>right skew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Scale score of 6.03 with a right skew.
Target for O4: Development of Leadership Skills

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Scale score of 6.03 with a right skew.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Develop of Leadership and Communications Items

Items for measurement of leadership items in the communications course have not been developed. These will have to be fully developed.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: March 1, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: William C. Bogner
Additional Resources: Time & people.

Review of assessment measures

Review and revise as needed all assessment measures.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Analysis of Competitive Environment | Outcome/Objective: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Assessment of Resources and Capabilities of a Firm | Outcome/Objective: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Developed and defended business/corporate strategy | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
| Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Functional Expertise Contributions | Outcome/Objective: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team
| Creative Decision Making Skills | Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Identification of Critical Success Factors | Outcome/Objective: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Productive Membership on a Team | Outcome/Objective: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team
Measure: Reasoned analysis integrated ethical dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
| Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Reasoned analysis integrated functional dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
| Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Reasoned analysis integrated global dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
| Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Recommendation integrated ethical dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
| Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Recommendation integrated functional dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
| Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Measure: Recommendation integrated global dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
| Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance

Implementation Description: March 1, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: William C. Bogner
Additional Resources: Time and people

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Little difference between the 05-06 cycle and the 2004-95 cycle,

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Students in the redesigned program have yet to matriculate to the assessment point. Higher skilled student selection and movement of core concepts to an earlier point in the curriculum should improve performance across the board. The same will likely be true of the impact of the Strategic Business Communications course.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Robinson College of Business PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The doctoral program of the College of Business Administration develops for graduates a high level of competence in conducting research and in teaching business disciplines by requiring (1) training in theory; (2) training in general research techniques as well
as research techniques specific to a discipline; (3) research experience with faculty members on contemporary research problems and issues; and (4) training on teaching methodology reinforced with active classroom teaching experience.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Ensure mastery of body of knowledge of discipline (M: 2, 3)

Students should be able to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research. Students should be able to conduct original research in collaboration with college faculty.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- Written Communication--major
- Oral Communication--major
- Collaboration--major
- Critical Thinking--major
- Contemporary Issues--major
- Quantitative Skills--major
- Technology--major

#### SLO 2: Develop high level of competence in research (M: 4)

Students should be able to successfully defend original research conducted within the program and to conduct during their professional career research streams which do not directly involve research conducted within the program.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- Written Communication--major
- Oral Communication--major
- Collaboration--major
- Critical Thinking--major
- Contemporary Issues--major
- Quantitative Skills--major
- Technology--major

#### SLO 4: Develop a high level of competence in teaching (M: 7)

Student should be able to present theoretical and applied material to a diverse group of students. Graduates will accept positions at institutions where the teaching skills learned in the program are utilized and further developed.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- Oral Communication--major
- Critical Thinking--major
- Quantitative Skills--major
- Quantitative Skills--core
- Technology--major

#### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 3: Place graduates in research-oriented institutions (M: 5, 6)**

Graduates will accept positions at institutions where the research skills learned in the program will be utilized and further developed.

**O/O 5: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 1)**

This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures & Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Coursework (O: 5)**

It is important that each student be an active participant in the design of his/her program of study. Although there are a number of required courses for all Ph.D. students, each program of study is individually tailored to meet the student’s particular needs and goals. A student designs an individually meaningful program within a larger context of the discipline. Input from faculty and fellow students can be valuable. Courses should be chosen to enhance substantive knowledge and research skills.

**Target for O5: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

Strong performance in coursework is expected of all students.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

A very small percentage of students have to be placed on scholastic warning or terminated due to grades.
**M 2: Comprehensive examinations (O: 1)**
Comprehensive examination to determine mastery of the major area and to include subject matter covered in the quantitative and research methods breadth requirement of the program. To be taken upon completion of coursework.

**Target for O1: Ensure mastery of body of knowledge of discipline**
The successful completion of comprehensive examination as judged by a committee of appropriate faculty members.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The examination includes questions that draw upon the subject matter covered in the quantitative and research methods breadth requirement of the program. It is a written examination, supplemented in some cases by an oral examination. Students are not permitted a second attempt to pass the examination except upon recommendation, by majority vote, of the group of faculty members who graded the examination. A maximum of two attempts is permitted to pass this examination. Students who do not pass are counseled out of the program.

**M 3: Aspects of Research (O: 1)**
Ability to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research. Ability to publish and present research co-authored with faculty members.

**Target for O1: Ensure mastery of body of knowledge of discipline**
Students should be able to conduct original research independently and in collaboration with GSU faculty. Students should be able to co-author publishable papers with faculty and to present findings at professional venues. Target of 4.0 score on student and alumni survey regarding these aspects of research.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The majority of students and alumni publish and present at conferences.

**M 4: Dissertation (O: 2)**
Successful defense of dissertation conducted before a faculty committee.

**Target for O2: Develop high level of competence in research**
The student’s dissertation proposal should include a summary of the following: the purpose of the study; the nature of the subject to be investigated and its importance; an appropriate review of the literature; the theory, if any, to be developed; the empirical methodology, techniques, and data sources, if any, to be used; the nature of the hypotheses to be developed or tested, where appropriate; and a timeframe for completion of the dissertation. Once the student and the committee chair are satisfied that the student has successfully completed the objectives outlined in the proposal and written a cogent dissertation, the student must orally present and defend his/her research in a final oral defense.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The student’s committee must vote unanimously to pass the student’s proposal. Students who do not pass their proposal defense must petition for a second proposal defense. Students who cannot successfully defend the proposal are counseled out of the program. The final defense of the dissertation also requires unanimous approval of the dissertation committee. Students who cannot successfully defend the dissertation in its final form are not awarded the degree and are terminated from the program.

**M 5: Placement of graduates (O: 3)**
Initial placement statistics.

**Target for O3: Place graduates in research-oriented institutions**
No precise standards are possible. An interpretation of our placements indicates that they meet this goal. We are regularly placing graduates into peer or better institutions. Some of our students choose to take positions in non-peer teaching schools, but the majority are placed in research oriented institutions.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
An interpretation of the placements indicates that we are meeting this goal.

**M 6: Alumni - career tracking (O: 3)**
Alumni surveys to monitor professional progress as reflected by continued employment in research institutions.

**Target for O3: Place graduates in research-oriented institutions**
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated ‘Target Performance Level for Program’ field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
As stated previously in Measure 6, the Placement of Graduates, no precise standards are possible. Periodic surveys and internet searches of alumni indicate that they meet this goal. Most are consistently advancing in their careers, either at the school of initial placement or at schools of comparable or higher ranking.

**M 7: Teaching course (O: 4)**
Teaching expertise
Target for O4: Develop a high level of competence in teaching

Students will develop a high level of competence in conducting university level teaching. Target score of 4.0 out of 5.0 in survey of students and alumni concerning preparation.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students are required to take a course in teaching preparation offered by one of our premier teaching faculty. In surveys of alumni and current students, scores averaged 4.1 and 4.28 respectively as to the respondents’ assessment of their preparation as an instructor.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Monitoring student mastery of body of knowledge

Academic units will continue to evaluate students with the comprehensive examination. Units are being encouraged to have a formal review of students at the end of the first year. Students will be evaluated through the preliminary dissertation defense and the final oral defense of the dissertation.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Aspects of Research | Outcome/Objective: Ensure mastery of body of knowledge of discipline
- Measure: Comprehensive examinations | Outcome/Objective: Ensure mastery of body of knowledge of discipline
- Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Develop high level of competence in research

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: academic unit doctoral coordinators, associate director of Doctoral Program.

Pedagogical training

Require all students who are slated to teach to take the Teaching Seminar course. Review student evaluations from the courses taught by doctoral students. Each academic unit should have a teaching mentor who works with students concerning all aspects of teaching, including course preparation and classroom management.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching course | Outcome/Objective: Develop a high level of competence in teaching

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: academic unit doctoral coordinators, academic unit chair

Placement of graduates in research institutions

Successful placement of graduates is contingent on many factors. Admissions committees in each academic unit must seek applicants who are interested in research (as well as academically qualified). Students must be actively engaged in research from the outset of their studies and should be actively mentored by a research-active faculty member. Students should attend conferences and present papers in order to gain recognition of faculty from other research universities. Students must produce a thoughtful and well-researched dissertation. Once placed, alumni should remain active researchers.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni - career tracking | Outcome/Objective: Place graduates in research-oriented institutions
- Measure: Aspects of Research | Outcome/Objective: Ensure mastery of body of knowledge of discipline
- Measure: Placement of graduates | Outcome/Objective: Place graduates in research-oriented institutions

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: academic unit doctoral coordinators, associate director of Doctoral Program.
Additional Resources: More funding for conference travel. Access to all relevant journals and databases.

Promoting research

All students should be actively engaged in research under the guidance of a graduate faculty member.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: academic unit doctoral coordinator
Responsible Person/Group: ongoing

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We surveyed our current students and our alumni. Based on this result, we are meeting our goals in teaching students their core subjects, helping them to become socialized to their chosen professions, and in preparing them to teach in the university setting.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Some current students indicated in survey responses that they are not presenting dissertation work at conferences and publishing non-dissertation work in journals. In retrospect, these responses may have resulted in questions appropriate for late stage students being directed to all students. The survey will be amended in the future to address these questions to the appropriate student level.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 School Counseling EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds. Graduates are equipped to counsel pupils as well as parents and teachers; to consult with parents, teachers and other school and community personnel, to advocate for students and parents and to coordinate the resources of the school and the community in order to meet the developmental needs of the students. The role calls for facilitating, nurturing persons knowledgeable of educational objectives and accustomed to working with others in providing leadership and expertise in child growth and development, assessment, group process facilitation, interviewing and consultation skills, classroom intervention techniques, interpersonal dynamics, and the curriculum of the school.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 3)
Counselors are committed to their pupils and their growth and development.
Relevant Associations: Based on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 4)
Counselors understand and practice effective counseling skills.
Relevant Associations: Based on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

O/O 3: Manages and monitors pupil learning/development (M: 5)
Counselors are responsible for managing and monitoring pupil growth and development.
Relevant Associations: Based on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

O/O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 2)
Counselors think continually about their practice and learn from that experience.
Relevant Associations: Based on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

O/O 5: Participates in profession`s learning communities (M: 1)
Counselors are members of learning communities.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Small group feedback (O: 5)
Students meet in small groups to analyze and critique each other’s audio-taped supervision sessions. Students use a standard form and provide both written and oral feedback to their peers, following a peer consultation modal. CPS 8480 Supervisor Feedback Form
Supervisor: _________________________ Tape No. _______ Peer Listener: _______________________ #SKILLSYESNON/A
1Supervisor greeted SEE in friendly, warm manner. 2Supervisor opened session with an appropriate amount of structure. 3Supervisor and SEE set and worked on specific goals during the session. 4Supervisor facilitated SEE’s talking during sessions by using appropriate active listening skills. 5Supervisor offered constructive feedback about SEE’s weaknesses. 6Supervisor provided alternative ways of intervening or responding, especially when correcting SEE’s errors. 7Supervisor encouraged SEE’s professional reflection. 8Supervisor and SEE are able to discuss the supervisory relationship when needed. 9Supervisor kept the session on track. 10Supervisor was supportive of SEE. 11Supervisor closed the session appropriately. Supervisor’s Strengths: Suggestions:

Target for O5: Participates in profession`s learning communities
At least 90% of the students will play the required number of tapes in the group in order to receive feedback and will provide appropriate feedback for other students in the group.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students played the required number of tapes and provided appropriate feedback to other students.

M 2: Supervision Session Summary Form (O: 4)
The Session Summary Form includes information about the supervisee, a session analysis, a description of supervisor’s (student) strengths and weaknesses, and plans for the next session. It is acceptable if all areas are satisfactorily completed.

Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
At least 90% of the students will submit 6 complete, acceptable Session Summary Forms.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students submitted 6 completed, acceptable Session Summary Forms.

M 3: Action Research Project (O: 1)

Students will implement a selected accountability protocol following the ASCA National Model. Students will be required to: a) adapt the original template to the ASCA Guidance Curriculum Results Report template and make any necessary changes b) implement the intervention, c) evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention based on the adapted template, d) complete the Guidance Curriculum Results Report, and e) evaluate the original lesson plans, include and explain the rationale for any adapted lesson plans, and describe process, lessons learned, and implications for your school counseling program. The finished product will be an easy to understand program evaluation manual to evaluate Academic, Personal/Social, and Career Preparedness interventions used when working with individual students, small groups of students, and in classroom guidance at the elementary, middle, and high school levels to promote learning and development. The intent of this assignment is to produce a finished product that can be used by school counselors across the state. Scoring Guide for Action Research Project in CPS 8661 CPS 8661 Research Project Scoring Guide Conversion of table to ASCA recommended protocol table30 pts. Implementation of Project (individual counseling, small group50 pts. counseling or classroom guidance) Description of Lesson plans (20 pts) Time table(20 pts) Weekly check-ins (10 pts) Evaluation: Process data, Perception Data, Results Data, and 50 pts. Implications Process data(20 pts) Perception data(20 pts) Implications(10 pts) Table Completion40 pts. Lesson Plans Evaluation and Implications Write up30 pts Total200 pts

Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development
At least 90% of the students will earn a grade of B or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a grade of A.

M 4: Audio tape critique of counseling skills (O: 2)

Students will provide direct services (demonstrate effective individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance and consultation skills) to students, parents and teachers in the school setting. An audio tape of one such session will be critiqued by the class to indicate effective counseling skills that will promote student/parent/teacher development. Tape Critique Form Individual, parent, teacher, etc. Purpose of session Summary of session Counselor’s Strengths Suggested Changes

Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development
At least 90% of the students will earn a satisfactory grade on the tape presented.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a satisfactory grade on the tape presented.

M 5: Action Research Project (O: 3)

Students will implement a selected accountability protocol following the ASCA National Model. Students will be required to: a) adapt the original template to the ASCA Guidance Curriculum Results Report template and make any necessary changes b) implement the intervention, c) evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention based on the adapted template, d) complete the Guidance Curriculum Results Report, and e) evaluate the original lesson plans, include and explain the rationale for any adapted lesson plans, and describe process, lessons learned, and implications for your school counseling program. The finished product will be an easy to understand program evaluation manual to evaluate Academic, Personal/Social, and Career Preparedness interventions used when working with individual students, small groups of students, and in classroom guidance at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The intent of this assignment is to produce a finished product that can be used by school counselors across the state. Scoring Guide for Action Research Project in CPS 8661 CPS 8661 Research Project Scoring Guide Conversion of table to ASCA recommended protocol table30 pts. Implementation of Project (individual counseling, small group50 pts. counseling or classroom guidance) Description of Lesson plans (20 pts) Time table(20 pts) Weekly check-ins (10 pts) Evaluation: Process data, Perception Data, Results Data, and 50 pts. Implications Process data(20 pts) Perception data(20 pts) Implications(10 pts) Table Completion40 pts. Lesson Plans Evaluation and Implications Write up30 pts Total200 pts

Target for O3: Manages and monitors pupil learning/development
At least 90% of the students will earn a grade of B or better.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a grade of A.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Action Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Is committed to student learning and development
Implementation Description: On-going
Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling faculty
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The assessments indicated that our students are achieving the objectives associated with each course listed. Although there is no professional counseling organization that accredits the Ed. S. program in School Counseling, the program meets the standards established by the Professional Standards Commission in Georgia. The assessment goals are in line with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and with the College of Education’s conceptual framework for advanced educator preparation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The assessments did not indicate any areas that require continued attention in order to meet the standards set. However, course content and requirements are revised in accordance with new expectations for school counselors as suggested by professional counseling organizations such as the American School Counselor Association. The assessment goals are in line with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and with the College of Education’s conceptual framework for advanced educator preparation.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 School Counseling MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The School Counseling program within the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services at Georgia State University is dedicated to training school counselors who are prepared to provide a developmentally appropriate, preventive school counseling program for all students, teachers, parents, administrators and community members.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Understands career development & life factors (M: 4)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of career development and related life factors, including career development theories, resources, and planning.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 2: Understands counseling and consultation process (M: 5)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of counseling and consultation processes, including characteristics and behaviors that influence the helping process, essential interviewing and counseling skills, and counseling theories that provide a consistent model(s) for selecting appropriate counseling interventions.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 3: Understands group purpose for counseling (M: 6)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of group purpose, development, dynamics, counseling theories, methods and skills for different types of group work including task, psycho educational and counseling groups.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 4: Understands individual and group approaches (M: 15)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of individual and group approaches to assessment and evaluation, including statistical concepts, and selecting, administering, and interpreting appropriate instruments.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 5: Understands educational research methods (M: 7)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of research methods, statistical analysis, needs assessment, and program evaluation.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 6: Understands the foundations of school counseling (M: 8)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the foundations of school counseling including history, professional identify, leadership, the school setting, diversity, barriers and enhancements to achievement, technology, and ethical and legal considerations.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 7: Understands contextual dimensions of SCO (M: 11)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the contextual dimensions of school counseling including, advocacy for all students and programs, coordination, collaboration, referral and team-building, promotion of a positive school climate, planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating comprehensive developmental counseling programs, and knowledge of prevention and crisis intervention strategies.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
O/O 8: Understands program development (M: 9)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of program development, implementation, and evaluation
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 9: Demonstrates skills in counseling and guidance (M: 10, 12, 16)
Students will demonstrate skills in counseling and guidance including individual, small group counseling, and classroom guidance approaches; peer facilitation; dealing with specific issues such as abuse, eating disorders, drug abuse, etc.; working with systems; and developing partnerships with others.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 10: Demonstrate skills in consultation (M: 13, 14)
Students will demonstrate skills in consultation including strategies to promote teamwork, theories of consultation and change, strategies and methods of working with parents, families and communities to empower them, and conducting programs to enhance students' developmental needs.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 11: Understands cultural context (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the cultural context of relationships, issues and trends in a diverse society including such factors as culture, ethnicity, nationality, age, gender, sexual orientation, mental and physical characteristics, education, family values, religious and spiritual values, socioeconomic status and unique characteristics of individuals, couples, families, ethnic groups, and communities.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 12: Understands learners` developmental levels (M: 3)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the nature and needs of individual at all developmental levels, including theories of development across the lifespan, theories of learning and personality development, aspects of human behavior, and strategies for facilitating optimum development over the lifespan.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 13: Understands professional functioning (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional functioning including the history and philosophy of the school counseling profession, professional roles and credentialing, and ethical and legal standards related to the profession.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Comprehensive Test in CPS 6020/6030 (O: 13)
CPS 6020/6030 provides an overview of the unique issues of school counseling, including history and philosophy, professional roles and credentialing, and ethical and legal standards related to the profession. The comprehensive test covers all aspects of the course to assess student knowledge.

Target for O13: Understands professional functioning
At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the test.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a B or better on the comprehensive test.

M 2: Multicultural experience/paper (O: 11)
Students will attend a social event or cultural happening focusing on a group whose race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation differs from their own. Submit a 4-5 page paper to address the following: (1) briefly describe the experience and why you selected it, (2) tell what you learned, (3) describe your feelings and expectations before the event and compare these feelings with those during and after the event. What did you learn about yourself? (4) What is the value, implications of this experience and how can you apply what you learned in your work?

Target for O11: Understands cultural context
At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the paper.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a B or better on the paper.

M 3: Paper on Individual Development (O: 12)
Students will complete a ten-page developmental paper. The developmental paper, which counts for twenty percent of your final grade, should consist of a psychological history of an individual who has experienced a developmental crisis. This crisis may consist of a variety of life experiences that had a profound impact on the individual. The paper should contain the following major areas.
• Identification of the individual (age, sex, marital status, etc.) • Identification of developmental crisis • Background psychosocial history • History of medical, psychiatric or psychotherapy • Identification of support systems • Crisis, revolution, resolution • Discuss any theoretical applications to this individual • Clinical assessment and prognosis

Target for O12: Understands learners` developmental levels
At least 90% of the students will earn a Satisfactory grade on the first submission of the paper.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the first submission of the paper.

**M 4: Career Development/Counseling Intervention (O: 1)**

Students will work in small groups to develop career development or career counseling interventions. Students will a) identify a need for career development/counseling services, b) write a rationale for the intervention including a literature review and a problem statement, c) develop an intervention that is theoretically grounded, research based, culturally sensitive, and developmentally appropriate, and d) demonstrate how the intervention will be evaluated. Papers must be written in APA format (5th edition) and should be 8-10 pages (not including appendices). Student groups will conceptualize this intervention within a specific work setting and directed towards meeting a particular client population's needs, so students are encouraged to pick a client population and work setting that is relevant to their professional interests.

**Target for O1: Understands career development & life factors**

At least 90% of the students will earn a grade of B or better on the intervention.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

95% of the students earned a grade of B or better on the intervention.

**M 5: Quizzes & Final Test CPS 6410 Interpersonal Skills (O: 2)**

Students must earn 80% on each of the 12 quizzes to be eligible to take the final test. Students must earn 86% on the final test.

**Target for O2: Understands counseling and consultation process**

At least 90% of the students must earn 80% on each of the 12 quizzes and 90% must earn at least 86% on the final test.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

98% of the students earned 80% or higher on the quizzes and 100% of the students earned at least 86% on the final test.

**M 6: Group Prospectus (O: 3)**

Students will work in small groups to prepare a detailed proposal for the development and implementation of a group you might lead in the near future. Each Prospectus is expected to include the following: a) Data collected to perform the needs assessment b) A brief introduction to the problem being addressed, with a analysis of relevant data and a concise purpose statement c) A literature review related to the goals of the strategy and the literature related to the goals of the strategy d) A rationale for the structure of your group, including your theoretical orientation, group format, and group membership. e) A review of relevant literature related to the goals of the strategy f) A rationale for the structure of your group, including your theoretical orientation, group format, and group membership. g) Discussion of potential issues around diversity and ethical considerations h) References i) An appendix with an outline of content/exercises, handouts, release forms, and evaluation forms

**Target for O3: Understands group purpose for counseling**

At least 90% of the students will earn a grade of B or better for the prospectus.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a grade of B or better.

**M 7: Closing the Gap Project (O: 5)**

Students must analyze the demographic data from their school and determine a gap between demographic groups in achievement, formulate a plan to close the gap, and implement that plan. A research method will be selected to evaluate the results of the plan. They will then write a paper describing their efforts. Program Evaluation Outline Major Headings (this is to be completed for the Closing the Gap project.) Use APA style. (10 points) I.Topic for Classroom Guidance Unit or Small-Group Counseling Experience (1-2 pages). Rationale for selection based on demographic needs and goals of the school (10 points) II.Literature review of the topic including best practices on addressing this topic (3-4 pages) (10 points) III.Detailed description of lesson plans used to address the topic (15 points) IV.Detailed Description of the Population Served (1-2 paragraphs) (10 points) V.Detailed Description of the Method of Evaluation and Type of Analysis Used (15 points) VI.Results of the Evaluation (based on academic or behavioral indicators, attendance, or students' perception of school climate) (10 points) VII.Discussion Include a summary of your findings, what you learned, what you would and wouldn't do next time (15 points) VIII.Reference page (5 points)

**Target for O5: Understands educational research methods**

At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

90% of the students earned a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.

**M 8: Comprehensive test in CPS 6020/6030 (O: 6)**

CPS 6020/6030 provides an overview of the unique issues of school counseling, including history and philosophy, professional roles and credentialing, and ethical and legal standards related to the profession. The comprehensive test covers all aspects of the course to assess student student knowledge.

**Target for O6: Understands the foundations of school counseling**

At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the comprehensive test.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the comprehensive test.
M 9: Closing the Gap Project (O: 8)

Students must analyze the demographic data from their school and determine a gap between demographic groups in achievement, develop and implement a program to close the gap, and evaluate the program. A research method will be selected to evaluate the results of the plan. They will then write a paper describing their efforts. Program Evaluation Outline Major Headings (this is to be completed for the Closing the Gap project.) Use APA style. (10 points) I.Topic for Classroom Guidance Unit or Small-Group Counseling Experience (1-2 pages). Rationale for selection based on demographic needs and goals of the school (10 points) II.Literature review of the topic including best practices on addressing this topic (3-4 pages) (10 points) III.Detailed description of lesson plans used to address the topic Include any resources used (15 points) IV.Detailed Description of the Population Served (1-2 paragraphs) (10 points) V.Detailed Description of the Method of Evaluation and Type of Analysis Used (15 points) VI.Results of the Evaluation (based on academic or behavioral indicators, attendance, or students’ perception of school climate) (10 points) VII.Discussion Include a summary of your findings, what you learned, what you would and wouldn’t do next time (15 points) VIII.Reference page (5 points)

Target for O8: Understands program development
At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
90% of the students earned a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.

M 10: Site Supr’s Eval of Individual Counseling Skills (O: 9)

The site supervisor will evaluate the student on the following individual counseling skills: establishes the interview, establishes/maintains open and honest communication, responds empathetically, uses appropriate questioning techniques, reflects content, allows silence when appropriate, identifies and discloses goal of misbehavior, offers alternatives when appropriate, summarizes, and uses appropriate closure techniques.

Target for O9: Demonstrates skills in counseling and guidance
At least 90% of the students will be rated effective or highly effective on all of the skills listed.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students were rated effective or highly effective on all of the skills listed.

M 11: Site Supervisor’s Overall Evaluation (O: 7)

The site supervisor evaluates students on all aspects of contextual knowledge of school counseling, including coordination, referral, delivering a comprehensive developmental program and demonstrating knowledge of crisis intervention strategies.

Target for O7: Understands contextual dimensions of SCO
At least 90% of the students will be rated at the effective or highly effective level.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students were rated as effective or highly effective.

M 12: Site Supr’s Eval of Classroom Guidance Skills (O: 9)

The site supervisor will evaluate the student on the following individual counseling skills: session goals are well defined, structures the group, materials used are age appropriate, uses variety of activities, keeps group on task, classroom management skills, pacing, and uses appropriate summary/closure techniques.

Target for O9: Demonstrates skills in counseling and guidance
At least 90% of the students will be rated effective or highly effective on all of the skills listed.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
91% of the students were rated effective or highly effective on all of the skills.

M 13: Quizzes (2) in CPS 7550 Consultation (O: 10)

Two quizzes in CPS 7550 allow students to demonstrate their knowledge of consultation, including theories of consultation, methods of working with parents, families and communities to empower them and conducting programs to enhance students’ developmental needs.

Target for O10: Demonstrate skills in consultation
At least 90% of the students will earn a grade of B or better on each quiz.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a grade of B or better on each quiz.

M 14: Site Supr’s Eval of Consultation Skills (O: 10)

The site supervisor will evaluate the student on the following consultation skills: establishes rapport, structures the interview, responds empathetically, reflects content, gives encouragement/support, identifies goal of misbehavior, defines and focuses on problem areas, helps to develop a plan of action or treatment strategy and helps consultee learn to advocate for self as appropriate, plans for follow-up session, uses appropriate closure techniques.

Target for O10: Demonstrate skills in consultation
At least 90% of the students will be rated effective or highly effective on all of the skills listed.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95% of the students were rated effective or highly effective on all of the skills.

**M 15: Case Study in Appraisal (O: 4)**

I. Content (10 pts) a. Definition of Assessment b. How Assessment relates to the counseling process c. Intake questions d. Anticipated Responses e. Issues that need to be addressed f. Evaluated further g. Selected Instruments h. Rationale for Selection i. Legal, Ethical, Moral issues j. Resolutions k. Multicultural Considerations

II. Organization (2 pts) a. Reasonable Order b. Subheadings

III. Written Expression (4 pts) a. Citations b. Reference Page c. Spelling and Grammar

IV. Quality / General Comments (4 pts) a. Thoroughness b. Creativity c. Integration of Course Material

**Target for O4: Understands individual and group approaches**

At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the case study.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a B or better on the case study.

**M 16: Site Supr’s Eval of Small Group Counseling Skills (O: 9)**

The site supervisor will evaluate the student on the following small group counseling skills: structures the group, ground rules/consequences are established or reviewed, sas general plan/activity for the group, maintains an open/relaxes atmosphere, reflects content and feelings of group members, all group members are invited/encouraged to participate, and uses appropriate summary/closure techniques.

**Target for O9: Demonstrates skills in counseling and guidance**

At least 90% of the students will be rated effective or highly effective on all of the skills listed.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated effective or highly effective on all of the skills listed.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Maintain and monitor**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** On-going
- **Responsible Person/Group:** School counseling faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

The goal of the M. Ed. program in School Counseling is to train school counselors who are prepared to deliver a developmentally appropriate, preventive school counseling program for all students, teachers, parents, administrators and community members. By successfully completing the objectives/outcomes listed, these students are prepared to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate a developmentally appropriate, preventive school counseling program for all students, teachers, parents, administrators and community members.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

The program objectives are in line with the standards set by the Council on the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The program is also approved by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission, the Georgia Board of Regents and accredited by NCATE. The assessments did not indicate any areas that require continued attention in order to meet the standards set. However, course content and requirements are revised in accordance with new expectations for school counselors as suggested by the accrediting agencies cited.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 School Psychology EdS**

(As of: 12/13/2016 02:45 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

The goal of the Masters/Ed.S. program in School Psychology is to train school psychologists to become certified for work in the schools. By successfully completing the courses, practica and internships in this program, the graduating school psychologists are
prepared to continue to provide and evaluate effective school psychological services that include consultation, preventive intervention, counseling as well as data based decision making and psycho-educational diagnosis targeted to students, teachers, parents, administrators and community members affiliated with public schools. In addition, graduates develop advanced knowledge and skills in using research methodology and statistics, in planning, implementing, and evaluating school-based evaluation research, in understanding current trends in the field of school psychology, in ethical issues relevant to the practice of psychology in educational settings and in using technology to facilitate practice in school settings.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Implements Data-Based Decision Making (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Students will be able to implement effective Data-Based Decision Making

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
4. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
5. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 2: Effective at Consultation and Collaboration (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Students will practice effective consultation and collaboration in schools

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs
2. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 3: Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Students will understand the developmental progress of Cognitive and Academic competencies in children

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs
2. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 4: Understands Socialization and Life Competencies (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Students will understand the development of socialization skills and Life Competencies in school age children

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs
2. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 5: Understands diversity re: development & learning (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Students will understand student diversity in development and learning in the schools.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs
2. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 6: Understands School Organization, Policy & Climate (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs
2. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 7: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children’s mental health.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 8: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 9: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 10: Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop. (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will understand school psychology practice in multiple settings and adopt appropriate professional practices.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 11: Effectively utilizes Information Technology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will understand and utilize information technology effectively.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Practicum Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**
Practicum Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports, consultation reports, assigned activities and the site-based supervisor’s rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student’s acquisition of required skills and competency in targeted areas.

**Target for O1: Implements Data-Based Decision Making**
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O2: Effective at Consultation and Collaboration**
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O3: Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O4: Understands Socialization and Life Competencies**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O5: Understands diversity re: development & learning**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O6: Understands School Organization, Policy & Climate**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O7: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O8: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O9: Understands Research and Program Evaluation**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O10: Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

**Target for O11: Effectively utilizes Information Technology**

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All students met at least the minimum level for passing each of the relevant sections of the practicum portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M 2: Supervisor Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship supervisor’s rate the students’ skill and acquisition of primary school psychology skills across the identified objectives of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Implements Data-Based Decision Making</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as “adequate” or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Effective at Consultation and Collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as “adequate” or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as “adequate” or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Understands Socialization and Life Competencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as “adequate” or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Understands diversity re: development &amp; learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as “adequate” or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Understands School Organization, Policy &amp; Climate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as “adequate” or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as “adequate” or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O8: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as “adequate” or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for <strong>O9</strong>: Understands Research and Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as &quot;adequate&quot; or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O10</strong>: Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as &quot;adequate&quot; or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O11</strong>: Effectively utilizes Information Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students who completed the internship in 2006 were rated as &quot;adequate&quot; or better on all relevant areas of the internship supervisor’s rating form. Students did particularly well on areas related to communication and collaboration (objectives 2 &amp; 8) (range 1.06 to 1.25, 1=exceptional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Internship Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**

The Internship Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports, consultation reports, assigned activities and the site-based supervisors’ rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student’s performance and mastery of required skills and competency in program objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: Implements Data-Based Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Effective at Consultation and Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Understands Socialization and Life Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Understands diversity re: development &amp; learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Understands School Organization, Policy &amp; Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.

Target for O7: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.

Target for O8: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.

Target for O9: Understands Research and Program Evaluation
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.

Target for O10: Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.

Target for O11: Effectively utilizes Information Technology
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students met at least minimum requirements on all of the relevant sections of the internship portfolio.

M 4: Faculty STARS Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
Faculty rate the students on the School Psychology Survey at the end of the program. (STARS-related survey)

Target for O1: Implements Data-Based Decision Making
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

Target for O2: Effective at Consultation and Collaboration
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

Target for O3: Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

Target for O4: Understands Socialization and Life Competencies
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

Target for O5: Understands diversity re: development & learning
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Target for O6: Understands School Organization, Policy & Climate**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Target for O7: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Target for O8: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Target for O9: Understands Research and Program Evaluation**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Target for O10: Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Target for O11: Effectively utilizes Information Technology**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
- All students (100%) received at least a satisfactory rating on each relevant area of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Develop better data management procedures**
Regular need for easy access to data collected as part of the program means we need to develop a better way to store, organize, and access data.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
- **Measure:** Internship Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
- **Measure:** Practicum Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
- **Measure:** Supervisor Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
  | Effective at Consultation and Collaboration | Effectively utilizes Information Technology | Implements Data-Based Decision Making | Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration | Understands diversity re: development & learning | Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention | Understands Research and Program Evaluation | Understands School Organization, Policy &
Monitor and Maintain
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
- **Measure:** Internship Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
- **Measure:** Practicum Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
- **Measure:** Supervisor Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Stephen D. Truscott, Program Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The school psychology MEd/EdS program continues to be strong in most respects. Our students' performance on all objectives is consistently better than required in most cases and all students met at least minimum requirements in all areas.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Our primary focus will be on maintaining our current results, monitoring program progress, and developing a better data-management process.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 School Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The GSU school psychology PhD is an innovative program that seeks to develop and amplify the role of the school psychologist beyond their traditional roles and functions. Training is oriented toward developing students who are proficient practitioners and researchers. Students refine their knowledge and skills in assessment, prevention/intervention, and consultation. Students develop a cognate that reflects their particular interests and intended area of specialization. PhD school psychology students are also trained to be producers of research.

Outcomes/Objectives
**O/O 1: Understands the practice of school psychology (M: 1)**
Graduates understand the practice of school psychology and are prepared for employment as professional psychologists.

Relevant Associations: APA and NASP

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 2: Use and Conduct Research (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Graduates use and conduct research.
Relevant Associations: APA and NASP

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 3: Follow the tenets of ethical practice (M: 1, 4)**
Graduates demonstrate the tenets of ethical practice.
Relevant Associations: APA and NASP

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 4: Understands principles of psych. and school psych. (M: 1, 4)**
Graduates demonstrate knowledge of advanced principles of psychology and school psychology
Relevant Associations: APA and NASP

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**O/O 5: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization (M: 1, 5)**
Graduates acquire and demonstrate adequate mastery of a subspeciality that strengthens their skills as psychologists.
Relevant Associations: APA and NASP

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Evaluation of employment status (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Graduates will find employment in a position that utilizes the skills and knowledge gained in the doctoral program.

**Target for O1: Understands the practice of school psychology**
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have had few graduates from the PhD program in the past few years, but of those, all are employed in settings appropriate for their training (e.g., academic, clinics, schools)

**Target for O2: Use and Conduct Research**
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have had few graduates from the PhD program in the past few years, but of those, all are employed in settings appropriate for their training (e.g., academic, clinics, schools)

**Target for O3: Follow the tenets of ethical practice**
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have had few graduates from the PhD program in the past few years, but of those, all are employed in settings appropriate for their training (e.g., academic, clinics, schools)
**Target for O4: Understands principles of psych. and school psych.**
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have had few graduates from the PhD program in the past few years, but of those, all are employed in settings appropriate for their training (e.g., academic, clinics, schools)

**Target for O5: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization**
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
We have had few graduates from the PhD program in the past few years, but of those, all are employed in settings appropriate for their training (e.g., academic, clinics, schools)

**M 2: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research (O: 2)**
PhD students must complete a pre-dissertation research project as part of the program and prior to taking the comprehensive exam.

**Target for O2: Use and Conduct Research**
100% of students must successfully complete their pre-dissertation research prior to taking comprehensive exams.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
4 students passed their pre-dissertation project last year. Other students are in progress. We have re-emphasized the need to progress on these projects.

**M 3: Successful completion of dissertation research (O: 2)**
A doctoral dissertation that represents independent scholarly research is required from each student.

**Target for O2: Use and Conduct Research**
All students must successfully complete their dissertation research prior to graduation.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
2 students completed their dissertations last year. Several other defended their dissertation proposals.

**M 4: Successful completion of comprehensive examination (O: 2, 3, 4)**
A comprehensive examination that assesses knowledge of advanced principles of psychology, school psychology, ethics, and professional practice must be passed prior to graduation.

**Target for O2: Use and Conduct Research**
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
6 of 7 students passed the comprehensive exam in 2005/2006

**Target for O3: Follow the tenets of ethical practice**
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
6 of 7 students passed the comprehensive exam in 2005/2006

**Target for O4: Understands principles of psych. and school psych.**
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
6 of 7 students passed the comprehensive exam in 2005/2006

**M 5: Successful completion of cognate (O: 5)**
All students must complete a 5-course “cognate” in a specialization area before graduation.

**Target for O5: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization**
All students will successfully complete the cognate that is designed in consultation with their advisory committee to indicate mastery of the material.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All graduating students successfully completed the cognate. In addition, many other students at various points in the process have completed or nearly completed their cognate sequence.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Monitor and encourage progress
The program faculty will improve our monitoring of student progress in the programs and encourage students to complete various elements of the program in a more timely manner.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Successful completion of cognate | Outcome/Objective: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization
- Measure: Successful completion of comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Follow the tenets of ethical practice
  | Understands principles of psych. and school psych. | Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and Conduct Research

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Steve Truscott
Additional Resources: None

Monitor and Maintain
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluation of employment status | Outcome/Objective: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization
  | Follow the tenets of ethical practice | Understands principles of psych. and school psych. | Understands the practice of school psychology | Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of cognate | Outcome/Objective: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization
  | Follow the tenets of ethical practice | Understands principles of psych. and school psych. | Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Follow the tenets of ethical practice
  | Understands principles of psych. and school psych. | Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and Conduct Research

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Stephen D. Truscott, Program Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our program is strong, graduates do well, and the quality of our students' research and academic performances remains high.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We need to place more emphasis on program completion. Too few students are progressing through the various stages of the program in an efficient and timely manner.

Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
The GSU school psychology program continues to meet expectations, excel in research, and provide superior training. Overall, the program is in very good condition, enrollment is up, national ranking is up (currently 7th in research productivity), external funds are up. We are undergoing a program redesign to bring the extremely credit heavy and long PhD program (168 credits BA to PhD) in line with national standards (typically 110-120 credits)

Contributions to the Institution
We have key faculty who serve in critical roles throughout the university. External funding is increasing. Research productivity is high. Student GRE scores and undergrad GPAs are among the highest in the COE. Meyers directs the School Safety Center, which is interdisciplinary and has projects across the state.

Highlights
Ranked 7th in Research productivity among school psychology programs nationally. Truscott and Meyers ranked in top 50 school psychology scholars nationally for 1995 to 2005. Varjas, Decker, Roach named as "talented early career scholars." Enrollment is up, yet we are getting most of our top admissions picks (6 accepts for 6 admits for 2007) Faculty received national recognition (Meyers, Truscott, Varjas, Decker, Roach) 18 students presented at 2007 meeting of National Association of School Psychologists. Truscott is Editor Elect of Journal of Educational and psychological Consultation. Roach won Early Career Research article for Council for Exceptional Children. School-based research programs in 3 metro districts.

Challenges
Maintaining excellence with increasing requirements for documentation of program, faculty, student outcomes (such as this). Multiple accrediting and internal documentation demands- APA, NCATE, Georgia PSC, LOA, FIMS, APACE- to name primary ones. Increasing EdD enrollment places demands on faculty time. Changes in program is needed to increase successful program completion. Funding of students is becoming increasingly challenging. Having some "growing pains" as we shift from regional to national recruitment.

Teaching Activities
Teaching ranks high in importance. All faculty teach in the program. We have improved opportunities for PhD students to co-teach and teach in the early parts of the program.
Research and Scholarly Activities
see highlights. This is a terrific and productive faculty.

Public/Community Service
Students provide many hours of service to local districts. Faculty provide consultation to local districts. Meyers, through school safety center provides service to many non-school agencies (e.g., Atlanta Housing Authority, PBS). Faculty and students serve on national committees (e.g., Truscott on NASP LD Identification advisory committee). Cadenhead on Board of Directors for Georgia Association of School Psychologists.

International Activities
Varjas is working in Sri Lanka and India. Is beginning international survey of mental health services. Cadenhead is working in Mexico and began cross cultural studies class there this year.
O/0 10: Strives for continuous professional growth (M: 9)

Teachers of science strive continuously to grow and change, personally and professionally, to meet the diverse needs of their students, school, community, and profession. They have a desire and disposition for growth and betterment.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit (O: 2)

Teacher candidates develop an SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SSI issues, science in the community, and assessment). The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

Target for O2: Engages learners in the nature of Science

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of’2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

M 2: Portfolio element:Curriculum Exploration/Analysis (O: 3)

The curriculum exploration and analysis paper will require teacher candidates to generate a list of criteria after consulting professional documents to evaluate curriculum materials. Using these criteria, the teacher candidates will examine two science curricula: one traditional curriculum developed by textbook publishing companies and one NSF reform based curriculum. The teacher candidates will write a report based on the criteria highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each curriculum. The curriculum explorations paper is graded using a rubric on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates exceed expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates has not met the criteria.

Target for O3: Can engage learners in inquiry

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of’2’ or higher’ on element rubric

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

M 3: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit (O: 4)

Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SSI issues, science in the community, and assessment). The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

Target for O4: Understand issues in science and technology

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of’2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

M 4: Portfolio Element: Peer teaching/Reflection paper (O: 5)

Teacher candidates use one of the lesson plans in the SSI unit to do peer teaching. For the purpose of Peer teaching, they the lesson plan must include: objectives to be taught; activity materials; development of a problem-solving experience for the students; contextualizing the lesson plan in a specific context. The peer teaching will take place in class between 15 to 20 minutes. Post peer-teaching, the teacher candidates will document reflective thoughts about the lesson (two pages). They will answer the following questions: To what extent did you achieve the objectives, rationale, or purpose of the lesson? What did you feel were the strengths of the lesson? The weaknesses of the lesson? What was your perception of the classroom climate? How would you describe the students’ behavior during the presentation? What would you suggest for improvement in teaching the lesson? The peer teaching is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 5 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the components of effective teaching in their peer teaching with a strong emphasis, 4 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the components of effective teaching in their peer teaching with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates the teacher candidates taught the lesson ineffectively using various components, and rating of 0-2 indicates that the teacher candidates did not demonstrate various components of effective teaching in their peer teaching.

Target for O5: Has effective teaching skills for science

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of’2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met

No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Portfolio element: Research Paper (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidates will identify a minimum of 5 peer-reviewed articles that encompass student and teacher interactions (for e.g. classroom management, modification for ESOL learners, science teaching in urban settings, and technology integration etc.). The students will summarize the articles, reflect on the findings of the articles, and discuss the implications for a classroom. The lesson plan is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the student exceeds expectation), 2 indicates that the student meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the students has not met the criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Can plan and implement science curriculum**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2 or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006** - **Target: Not Met**

No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Plan (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the components, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Promotes science in the community**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2 or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006** - **Target: Not Met**

No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Portfolio component: SSI lesson plan (assessment) (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. This lesson plan will focus on student assessment. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Constructs and uses assessments effectively**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2 or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006** - **Target: Not Met**

No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Portfolio Element: Safety Certification (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidates will be required to attend the safety certification course at Georgia State University. Students will attach a copy of the certificate in their portfolio using the format provided below. The safety certification will be used as satisfactory way to meet the safety standard Student Name SSN Date of Safety Certification Class Either attach a copy of your completion certificate or scan your certificate and insert it at the bottom of this document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Promotes learners’ safety and welfare**

90% of teacher candidates will attend the safety certification workshop.

**Findings 2005-2006** - **Target: Not Met**

No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Professional Growth Plan (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidates will submit at least three documents/artifacts demonstrating professional growth activities/plan within the last two years. Teacher candidates will be given choices in terms selecting the artifacts such as becoming active members of NSTA/GSTA (National Science Teachers Association/ Georgia Science Teachers Association), in-service professional development workshops, presentations at conferences, and publications in scholarly journals etc. Teacher candidates will describe what they learnt from their experiences with the help of a reflection paper. They will describe the artifacts that document their professional growth. They will evaluate their own professional growth, list their ongoing goals and design a plan to meet these goals. The professional growth plan and the reflection paper will be graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the student exceeds expectation), 2 indicates that the student meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the students has not met the criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Strives for continuous professional growth**
90% of students attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty is currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

**M 10: Student portfolio element: Lesson Plan (O: 1)**
Demonstration of content skills through a lesson plan. The Content knowledge section of the portfolio focuses on candidates’ understanding of the foundations of science (NSTA standard 1) through the development of a Socio-Scientific Issues Science (SSI) Unit that covers a science topic of social relevance. These units include all lesson plans, assessments, and resources for teaching the unit. The lesson plan is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates exceeds expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates has not met the criteria.

**Target for O1: Knows and can apply modern science content**
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**
No data presently available for this assessment. Program faculty are currently collecting data on this outcome/objective.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Gather baseline data in 2006-2007**
Faculty has an approved assessment plan for all learning outcomes. Data will be collected in the 2006-2007 academic year and reported in June of 2007

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Portfolio component: SSI lesson plan (assessment) | **Outcome/Objective:** Constructs and uses assessments effectively
- **Measure:** Portfolio element: Peer teaching/Reflection paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Has effective teaching skills for science
- **Measure:** Portfolio element: Research Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Can plan and implement science curriculum
- **Measure:** Portfolio element: Safety Certification | **Outcome/Objective:** Promotes learners’ safety and welfare
- **Measure:** Portfolio element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit | **Outcome/Objective:** Understand issues in science and technology
- **Measure:** Portfolio element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages learners in the nature of Science
- **Measure:** Portfolio element-Curriculum Exploration/Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Can engage learners in inquiry
- **Measure:** Portfolio element: Socio-Scientific Issues Plan | **Outcome/Objective:** Promotes science in the community
- **Measure:** Professional Growth Plan | **Outcome/Objective:** Strives for continuous professional growth
- **Measure:** Student portfolio element: Lesson Plan | **Outcome/Objective:** Knows and can apply modern science content

**Implementation Description:** June 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Data are currently being collected for 2006-2007. This analysis will be completed and submitted by June 1 of 2007.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Data are currently being collected for 2006-2007. This analysis will be completed and submitted by June 1 of 2007.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Science Education--TEEMS MAT**

*As of: 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST*

*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Understands student development re: learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how students different in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Uses communication skills and technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Can effectively plan for instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: Practices professional reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of her/his choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 10: School and Community Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because at least one Measure was not linked to an Outcome/Objective in version 3.5. Please review the Measures &amp; Findings section in version 4.0 for any Measures that do not display an association with one or more real program Outcomes/Objectives. After you have created appropriate Measure-Outcome/Objective associations for all such Measures and pasted any Achievement Targets and Findings, using Measure Edit, return to delete this Data Conversion Outcome/Objective. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 11)**

Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

- 100% of candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

- 100% of candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**

- 100% of candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 11)**

Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and
supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 2: Understands student development regarding learning.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 2: Understands student development regarding learning.

**M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 11)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

**Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 3: Effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 11)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

**Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 11)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 5: Can motivate and manage student learning.

**M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 11)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6.

**Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 6: Uses communication skills and technology.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 11)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.

**Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target:
100% of all candidates met Standard 7: Can effectively plan for instruction.

M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 11)
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.

Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target:
100% of candidates met Standard 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning.

M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 11)
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9.

Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target:
100% of all candidates met Standard 9: Practices professional reflection.

M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 11)
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades, student interviews and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.

Target for O11: Outcome/Objective Not Specified
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target:
100% of candidates met Standard 10: School and Community Involvement.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives? Based on the assessments, program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program. Faculty will make modifications in the methods courses systematically document data, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention? Based on the assessments, program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program. Faculty will make modifications in the methods courses systematically document data, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Social Foundations MS

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Social Foundations of Education is a broadly conceived field of educational study that derives its character from a number of academic disciplines and the interdisciplinary studies. At Georgia State University, the disciplines involved in social foundations inquiry are history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, and political science; the interdisciplinary field is cultural studies. The purpose of social foundations study is to bring the intellectual resources derived from these areas to bear in developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives of educational theory, policy, and practices, both inside of and outside of schools.
## Outcomes/Objectives

### O/O 1: Understands and can apply critical perspectives (M: 2)
The student understands how the foundations of education knowledge base of resources, theories, distinctions, and analytical techniques provide instruments for the critical analysis of education in its various forms.

Relevant Associations: Principle #3 of the Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation for the Council for Social Foundations of Education/2002

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 2: Understands and can apply normative perspectives (M: 1)
The student understands and employs value orientations and ethical perspectives and theories in analyzing and interpreting educational ideas, practices, and events.


**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 3: Can design and conduct research (M: 3)
The student demonstrates the ability to design a major research study, appropriate at the Masters’ level.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Critical analysis essays (O: 2)
Critical analysis essays are focused on current educational ideas and practices, research, and events. The assessment scoring was based on the following scale: (a) 1 = did not meet outcome expectations, (b) 2 = met outcome expectations, and (c) 3 = exceeded outcome expectations. For essays, a score of 1 was given for a grade below “C,” 2 was given for a grade of “C,” and 3 was given for a grade of “A” or “B”.

**Target for O2: Understands and can apply normative perspectives**
95% of critical analysis essays will achieve a rating of 2 or higher, as evaluated by program faculty.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: **Met**
Ten students were assessed, all met or exceeded expectations.

### M 2: Issues-related research papers (O: 1)
Issues-related research papers demonstrate an understanding of the foundations of education. The assessment scoring was based on the following scale: (a) 1 = did not meet outcome expectations, (b) 2 = met outcome expectations, and (c) 3 = exceeded outcome expectations. For papers, a score of 1 was given for a grade below “C,” 2 was given for a grade of “C,” and 3 was given for a grade of “A” or “B”.

**Target for O1: Understands and can apply critical perspectives**
95% of issues-related research papers will achieve a rating of 2 or higher, as evaluated by program faculty.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: **Met**
Seven students were assessed, all met or exceeded expectations.

### M 3: Research Study (O: 3)
A thesis or project advancing an original point of view as a result of Social Foundations research. The method of assessment was the student’s ability to complete a master’s level project or thesis. If a student completed a master’s project, he/she was considered to have met the expectation—rated “2”; if a student completed a thesis, he/she was considered to have exceeded the expectation—rated “3”.

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: **Met**
Seven students were assessed, all met or exceeded expectations.
Target for O3: Can design and conduct research
95 percent will meet or exceed expectations.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% (n = 4) of the students met or exceeded the expectations.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
evaluate master’s projects and theses
Program faculty will establish a scoring rubric for master’s projects and theses.
  Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: Medium
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Research Study | Outcome/Objective: Can design and conduct research
  Implementation Description: May 2007
  Responsible Person/Group: Social Foundations program faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Learning Outcome Assessments addressed uses of theory and the Social Foundations knowledge base in formulating critical analysis essays and issues-related research papers; and evaluation of research study in the master's level thesis/project requirement. Overall: 95 percent of students met or exceeded outcomes #1 and #2. All students met the expectations for master's projects/theses.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Program faculty will refine the grading scale and create a rubric for scoring master's thesis/project requirements.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Social Studies Education MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 1)
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

Institutional Priority Associations
  1.3 Quality professional programs
  3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
  6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 2)
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

Institutional Priority Associations
  1.3 Quality professional programs
  3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
  6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 3)
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.
Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 4)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Participates in profession`s learning communities (M: 5)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development  
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the M. Ed. Social Studies students rated on Stars Standard 1 with respect to their commitment to their students` learning and development met the standard.

M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 2)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development  
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the M. Ed. Social Studies program completers rated on Stars Standard 2 scored above an intermediate level (3) with regard to their ability to apply expertise to ensure students` learning and development.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development  
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the M. Ed. Social Studies program completers rated on Stars Standard 3 scored above an intermediate level (3) with regard to their ability to manage and monitor their students` learning and development.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.
Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the M. Ed. Social Studies program completers rated on Stars Standard 4 scored above an intermediate level (3) with regard to their ability to reflect on and learn from their professional experiences.

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

Target for O5: Participates in profession’s learning communities

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the M. Ed. Social Studies program completers rated on Stars Standard 5 scored above an intermediate level (3) with regard to their participation in professional learning communities.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Maintain Continuity of Instruction
Students in the M.Ed. SS program performed well on all performance assessments. In 2005-2006, 2 new faculty have joined the program and the 2 previous full time faculty have left the program. The primary focus for this year will be to ensure all faculty understand the program design and content and are able to maintain the quality of the program.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Is committed to student learning and development
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Participates in profession’s learning communities

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: Social Studies Faculty: Joe Feinberg and Chara Bohan

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
M.Ed. SS completers scored above expectations on all measures.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Due to the change over in SS faculty, all objectives/outcomes will continue to receive attention to ensure program continuity.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Social Studies Education--TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 1)
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
### 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 2: Understands student development re: learning (M: 2)

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 4)

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 7: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 7)

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 8)
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

_**Institutional Priority Associations**_
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 9: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

_**Institutional Priority Associations**_
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 10: Involves school and community in learning (M: 10)
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

_**Institutional Priority Associations**_
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 1 (O: 1)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
98% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge" at the expected level.

**M 2: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 2 (O: 2)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O2: Understands student development re: learning**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
98% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Understands student development re: learning" at the expected level.

**M 3: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 3 (O: 3)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.
Target for **O3**: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - **Target: Met**

97% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners" at the expected level.

**M 4: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 4 (O: 4)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for **O4**: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - **Target: Met**

96% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies" at the expected level.

**M 5: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 5 (O: 5)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for **O5**: Can motivate and manage students for learning

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - **Target: Met**

95% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Can motivate and manage students for learning" at the expected level.

**M 6: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 6 (O: 6)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for **O6**: Uses communication skills and technology

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - **Target: Met**

96% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Uses communication skills and technology" at the expected level.

**M 7: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 7 (O: 7)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for **O7**: Can effectively plan for instruction

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - **Target: Met**

96% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Can effectively plan for instruction" at the expected level.

**M 8: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 8 (O: 8)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for **O8**: Understands and uses assessment for learning

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings** 2005-2006 - **Target: Met**

96% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Understands and uses assessment for learning" at the expected level.
setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
93% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Understands and uses assessment for learning" at the expected level.

### M 9: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 9 (O: 9)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O9: Practices professional reflection**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
91% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Practices professional reflection" at the expected level.

**M 10: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 10 (O: 10)**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
96% of our students in the Social Studies TEEMS program met "Involves school and community in learning" at the expected level.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Analysis of Alternative Models of Field Experience
Over the next year, TEEM SS Faculty, practicum and student teaching supervisors, and cooperating teachers will collaboratively consider alternative models for field experience. Currently, the TEEMS SS program completes a 6 week internship in fall with middle grades students and a full time internship in spring in high schools. We wish to examine the possibilities of year-long internships in PDS sites. These changes are designed to increase interns’ abilities to work with diverse learners, to understand how to link ongoing assessment to classroom instruction, and to motivate and manage classrooms as a novice teacher.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
  - Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
  - Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
- **Implementation Description:** Development 2005-2006, Implementation 2007-2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS SS faculty: Joe Feinberg and Chara Bohan

#### Analysis of Content Requirements
Changes in Social Studies certification in Georgia have resulted in the elimination of the Broad Field Social Studies certification and adoption of individual certifications in History, Economics, Geography, Psychology, and Sociology. There is a need to analyze the current requirements for SS content courses in light of these changes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 2006-2007 school year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS SS faculty: Joe Feinberg and Chara Bohan

#### Increase Collaboration and Communication
The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts will be made to have at least 2 meetings with all faculty and all supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program design, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors will visit practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating teachers and provide an overview of the program and expectations. We expect this initiative to strengthen the overall success of our interns when in the field.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 2 | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 4 | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 6 | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 7 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 9 | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS SS faculty: Joe Feinberg and Chara Bohan

Maintain Continuity of Instruction
Students in the TEEMS SS program performed well on all performance assessments. In 2005-2006, 2 new faculty have joined the program. The primary focus for this year will be to ensure all faculty understand the program design and content and are able to maintain the quality of the program with the increased size of our cohort.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 2 | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 4 | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 6 | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 7 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 9 | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS SS faculty: Joe Feinberg and Chara Bohan

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
TEEMS Social Studies Education students perform at high levels on all assessment measures.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Contextual changes in terms of certification requirements and new faculty will result in the need to focus attentively on all performance areas within the next year in order to ensure interns continue to perform at expected levels.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Social Work BSW

Mission / Purpose
The Mission of the BSW Program is to prepare entry-level, generalist social workers to assume responsibility for a range of services that deal with the problems experienced by people in a multicultural society.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action (M: 3, 5, 12, 13, 15)
Students demonstrate critical thinking skills through the gathering of client information and formulating, in collaboration with the client, a plan of action.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Collaboration--major

SLO 2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics (M: 1, 6, 7, 8, 12)
Students demonstrate critical thinking skills through the application of the values and ethics of the profession of social work to specific client, organizational, and community issues.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations (M: 10, 11, 13, 20)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate written communication skills through research and position papers in subject areas affecting vulnerable populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Written Communication: Social Work (M: 2, 3, 7, 9, 13, 14, 18, 19)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate written communication skills specific to social work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Oral Communication: Field Based (M: 4)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate oral communication skills through the completion of a class presentation on their respective field agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice (M: 5, 7)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate oral communication skills specific to social work practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Collaboration: Case Planning (M: 2)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate collaboration skills through case planning with clients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Collaboration: Social Agencies (M: 4, 6, 15)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate collaboration skills through partnering with other social agencies on behalf of their clients during field internships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis (M: 9)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate critical thinking through the development of testable hypotheses and interpreting and analyzing data related to client and system problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning (M: 4, 6, 7)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate critical thinking skills through a personal examination of the experiential learning in field education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related (M: 8, 16, 18)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of contemporary issues through the integration of the theories of the larger social environment on individuals, families, and communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Contemporary Issues: Legislative (M: 15, 16)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate analytic skills in contemporary issues through the analysis of a bill before the legislature using a framework for assessing the bill’s impact on specific populations within the state that includes making personal contact with the bill’s sponsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Quantitative Skills: Evidenced Based Practice (M: 9, 17)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate quantitative skills through the development of evidenced based practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students demonstrate quantitative skills through translating research into working with their clients during their field internship, known as evidenced based practice.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**SLO 14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice (M: 9, 17, 18, 19)**
Students demonstrate quantitative, as well as qualitative skills through their evaluation of their practice in their field internships

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**SLO 15: Technology (M: 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19)**
Students demonstrate their technological skills accessing online resources, utilizing data bases, and preparing papers and power point presentations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
13 Technology--major

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: SW 4930 & 4940: Field Education Seminar (O: 2)**
Field Supervisor Evaluation Rating (Section III- SW Values and Ethics) in field internship

**Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**
90% of students will receive Excellent or Good Rating

**M 2: SW 3720 Social Work Practice I (O: 4, 7)**
Paper on Client’s Social History /Personal Values and Diversity

**Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work**
90% of students receive B or higher on assignment

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of students achieved an A or B grade on assignment

**Target for O7: Collaboration: Case Planning**
90% of students receive B or higher on assignment

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of students achieved an A or B grade on assignment

**M 3: SW 3730 Social Work Practice II (O: 1, 4)**
Paper on goals, interventions, and achievement for a client system; social history and case plan

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of students received a B or higher on assignment

**Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of students received a B or higher on assignment

**M 4: SW 4930: Field Education Seminar (O: 5, 8, 10)**
Presentations on Agency Placement

**Target for O5: Oral Communication: Field Based**
95% of students receive B or higher on presentation

**Findings** 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Only 3% of students received a grade lower than an A or B
### Target for O8: Collaboration: Social Agencies
95% of students receive B or higher on presentation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Only 3% of students received a grade lower than an A or B

### Target for O10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning
95% of students receive B or higher on presentation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Only 3% of students received a grade lower than an A or B

### M 5: SW 3610 Communication Skills in Social Work (O: 1, 6)
Video interview with client

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action**
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
8% of students received a grade of C or lower on assignment

**Target for O6: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice**
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
8% of students received a grade of C or lower on assignment

### M 6: SW 4930 & 4940 Field Education (O: 2, 8, 10)
Field internship evaluations

**Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**
90% of students will receive a Good or Excellent evaluation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
93% of students received an excellent or good evaluation in field education

**Target for O8: Collaboration: Social Agencies**
90% of students will receive a Good or Excellent evaluation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
93% of students received an excellent or good evaluation in field education

**Target for O10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning**
90% of students will receive a Good or Excellent evaluation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
93% of students received an excellent or good evaluation in field education

### M 7: SW 4390 & 4940 Field Education (O: 2, 4, 6, 10)
Field Supervisor Evaluation Rating (Section V - SW Skills) in field internship

**Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**
95% of students will receive Excellent or Good ratings on evaluation final evaluation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
93% of students received an excellent or good on SW skills

**Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work**
95% of students will receive Excellent or Good ratings on evaluation final evaluation

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
93% of students received an excellent or good on SW skills

**Target for O6: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice**
95% of students will receive Excellent or Good ratings on evaluation final evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Grade Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 8: SW 4390 &amp; SW 4940</td>
<td>Field Education (O: 2, 11)</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>93% of students received an excellent or good on SW skills</td>
<td>10% of students received a grade of C or lower on this assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9: SW 3020</td>
<td>Research in Social Work Practice (O: 4, 9, 13, 14, 15)</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>90% of students will receive B or higher</td>
<td>10% of students received a grade of C or lower on this assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10: SW 3330</td>
<td>Human Behavior I (O: 3)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>10% of students received a grade of C or lower on this assignment</td>
<td>5% of the students received a grade of C or lower on this assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11: SW 3340</td>
<td>Human Behavior II (O: 3)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>10% of students received a grade of C or lower on this assignment</td>
<td>5% of the students received a grade of C or lower on this assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 12: SW 4930 & SW 4940: Field Education Seminar (O: 1, 2)
Field Supervisor Evaluation Rating (Section II - Development of Professional Orientation) in field internship

Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action
90% of students will receive Good or Excellent evaluation

Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics
90% of students will receive Good or Excellent evaluation

M 13: SW 4930 & SW 4940: Field Education Seminar (O: 1, 3, 4)
Instructor Review of weekly log during internship experience

Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action
Instructor evaluation of content as appropriate for entry level SW practitioner

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
33% of the weekly log assignments received a grade of C or lower

Target for O3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations
Instructor evaluation of content as appropriate for entry level SW practitioner

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
33% of the weekly log assignments received a grade of C or lower

Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work
Instructor evaluation of content as appropriate for entry level SW practitioner

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
33% of the weekly log assignments received a grade of C or lower

M 14: SW 3320; Social Welfare Institutions (O: 4)
Course final exam

Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work
80% of students will receive a B or higher on final exam

M 15: SW 3930 Social Welfare Policy (O: 1, 8, 12, 15)
Assignment on Environmental and Policy issues

Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action
80% of students will receive a B or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
18% of students received a grade of C or lower

Target for O8: Collaboration: Social Agencies
80% of students will receive a B or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
18% of students received a grade of C or lower

Target for O12: Contemporary Issues: Legislative
80% of students will receive a B or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
18% of students received a grade of C or lower

Target for O15: Technology
80% of students will receive a B or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
18% of students received a grade of C or lower

M 16: SW 3930: Social Welfare Policy (O: 11, 12, 15)
Target for **O11**: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related  
80% of students will receive a B or higher

Target for **O12**: Contemporary Issues: Legislative  
80% of students will receive a B or higher

Target for **O15**: Technology  
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**M 17: SW 3720 & SW 3720 Social Work Methods I & II (O: 13, 14, 15)**  
Case analysis and intervention assignments

Target for **O13**: Quantitative Skills: Evidenced Based Practice  
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2005-2006** - **Target: Met**  
100% of students received a B or higher grade on the assignments

Target for **O14**: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice  
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2005-2006** - **Target: Met**  
100% of students received a B or higher grade on the assignments

Target for **O15**: Technology  
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2005-2006** - **Target: Met**  
100% of students received a B or higher grade on the assignments

**M 18: SW 4930 & 4940 Field Education seminar (O: 4, 11, 14, 15)**  
Evaluation of Practice Paper

Target for **O4**: Written Communication: Social Work  
90% of students will receive a B or higher

Target for **O11**: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related  
90% of students will receive a B or higher

Target for **O14**: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice  
90% of students will receive a B or higher

Target for **O15**: Technology  
90% of students will receive a B or higher

**M 19: SW 4940 (O: 4, 14, 15)**  
Evaluation of Practice Assignment

Target for **O4**: Written Communication: Social Work  
90% of students will receive a B or higher

Target for **O14**: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice  
90% of students will receive a B or higher

Target for **O15**: Technology  
90% of students will receive a B or higher

**M 20: SW 3020: Methods of Social Work Research (O: 3)**  
Final Exam for the course

Target for **O3**: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations
80% of students will receive a grade of B or higher

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
9% of grades were C or below

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The overwhelming majority of students achieved satisfactory grades on targetting assignments. Assignments appeared to be well linked to course outcomes, and to learning outcomes of the degree programs.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The one area where the goal was not met was based upon weekly logs (journal entries) that were linked to internships. This issue will be addressed within the accompanying seminar course - it might be that the weekly requirement is too frequently to have meaningful entries into the journal.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Social Work MSW
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the MSW program is to prepare students for leadership roles in the effort to solve, in partnership with others, the existing and developing challenges that confront communities in the United States and internationally.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical Thinking: Values and Ethics (M: 3, 8)
Students demonstrate the capacity to assess, critique, and evaluate modes of practice, beliefs and research with the Social Work Code of Ethics and values of the profession.

SLO 2: Critical Thinking: Social and Economic Justice (M: 3, 8)
Students demonstrate the capacity to consider, evaluate, and integrate alternative or opposing points of view in the context of social and economic justice.

SLO 3: Community/organizational Communications (M: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
Students demonstrate professional written and oral modes of interaction and relationship building between individuals, groups, organizations, and communities.

SLO 4: Community Assessment and Resource Development (M: 4, 7, 10)
Students demonstrate the ability to apply collaborative and cooperative methods and interpret agreed upon needs and goals, and to collectively act towards achieving those goals.

SLO 5: Community/Organizational Development (M: 6, 11, 12)
Students demonstrate the ability to formulate, maintain, and strengthen relationships and partnerships that build healthy communities.

SLO 6: Leadership and Management (M: 10, 13)
Students demonstrate the capacity to analyze, integrate, assess, and apply the concepts, skills and knowledge derived from management, organizational theory, and community social work and social administration to address social problems at the macro level.

SLO 7: Research, Evaluation, and Technology (M: 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14)
Students demonstrate the ability to apply evaluative measures, technological processes, and the management of information to understand and facilitate healthy communities.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: SW 7100 Foundation of Community Partnerships (O: 7)
Research paper
Target for O7: Research, Evaluation, and Technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 2: SW 8900 Field Education (O: 7)</td>
<td>Practice intervention paper</td>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
<td>Target: Research, Evaluation, and Technology</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% of students received less than a B on the assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: SW 8100 Skills and Techniques of Community Partner (O: 1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>Community Project Proposal papers</td>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher on this assignment</td>
<td>Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Values and Ethics</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The total distribution on the papers were 315 As and 5 Bs</td>
<td>Target for O2: Critical Thinking: Social and Economic Justice</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The total distribution on the papers were 315 As and 5 Bs</td>
<td>Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: SW 8500 and SW 8900 Field Education (O: 3, 4)</td>
<td>Field Instructor Final Evaluation - Section V, on Social Work Skills</td>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher on this evaluation by their field instructor</td>
<td>Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5: SW 7100 Foundations of Community Partnerships (O: 7)</td>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
<td>Target for O7: Research, Evaluation, and Technology</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% of students received a grade lower than a B on the assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6: SW 8500 and 8900 Field Education (O: 3, 5)</td>
<td>Field instructor evaluation of Section II of final field evaluation</td>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher on this evaluation by their field instructor</td>
<td>Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Findings 2005-2006</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7: SW 8800</td>
<td>Community project (O: 3, 4)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher on evaluation by field instructor</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8: SW 8500 and 8900</td>
<td>Field Education (O: 1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher on evaluation by field instructor</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9: SW 8800</td>
<td>Community project (O: 3, 7)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher on evaluation by field instructor</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006**

- **Target for O5: Community/Organizational Development**
  - 90% of students receive Good or Excellent or higher
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
  - 90% of students receive B or higher
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O4: Community Assessment and Resource Development**
  - 90% of students receive B or higher
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Values and Ethics**
  - 90% of students receive Excellent or Good evaluations
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O2: Critical Thinking: Social and Economic Justice**
  - 90% of students receive Excellent or Good evaluations
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
  - 90% of students receive Excellent or Good evaluations
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O7: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
  - 90% of students receive B or higher
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
  - 90% of students receive Good or Excellent or higher
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O7: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
  - 90% of students receive B or higher
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

- **Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
  - 90% of students receive Good or Excellent or higher
  - Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target:</th>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 11: SW 7100 Foundations of Community Partnership (O: 3, 5, 7)</td>
<td>Community Experience Analysis Paper</td>
<td>O3: Community/organizational Communications</td>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher on the assignment</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: SW 8800 Community Partnerships (O: 5, 7)</td>
<td>Implementation of the memorandum of understanding with a host agency or organization</td>
<td>O5: Community/Organizational Development</td>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher on the assignment</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13: SW 8300 Leadership and Management (O: 6, 7)</td>
<td>Six analytic and research papers that comprise the class</td>
<td>O6: Leadership and Management</td>
<td>90% of students will receive a B or higher on final course grade</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Grading on papers ranged between 88 and 95% on all six assignments within the course.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O7: Research, Evaluation, and Technology</td>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>32 As on project</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>32 As on project</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
90% of students will receive a B or higher on final course grade.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Grading on papers ranged between 88 and 95% on all six assignments within the course.

**M 14: SW 8900 Field Education (O: 7)**
Final Program Evaluation paper that includes the role of technology in human services.

**Target for O7: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target:**
Assessment was not completed

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The MSW learning outcomes were all achieved. As most of the outcomes were grades on various assignments, it indicates students performed well on the the selected outcome indicators.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
While this situation is a good one, it also might question the validity of the actual indicators which were mostly grades on various assignments. Over the next year, the MSW faculty will incorporating other indicators and methods of evaluating student outcome performance.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2005-2006 Sociology BA**
(As of: 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge about social forces, social behavior, and social change. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the Department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions (M: 1, 8, 9)**
A. Students develop the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems B. Students analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
10 Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.3 International Initiatives
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 4, 5, 6)**
A. Students formulate research questions and formulate testable hypotheses B. Students are able to analyze and interpret data (hypothesis testing, drawing inferences, formulating conclusions) C. Students demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
4 Oral Communication--core
6 Collaboration--core
7 Critical Thinking--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Communication Skills (M: 5, 6)**
A. Students develop effective written communication and editing skills
B. Students show appropriate writing conventions and formats

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**
A. Students articulate key sociological concepts and theories
B. Students apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems
C. Students utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
3. Oral Communication--major
4. Oral Communication--core
5. Collaboration--major
6. Collaboration--core
7. Critical Thinking--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Analytical Skills (M: 1, 3, 5, 6)**
A. Students acquire the skills to collect data
B. Students demonstrate appropriate computer skills
C. Students are able to read and understand sociological research reports/articles

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
3. Oral Communication--major
4. Oral Communication--core
5. Collaboration--core
6. Collaboration--core
7. Critical Thinking--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: soci 1101 and soci 1160 exam questions (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)**
The goal assessment categories here are "Sociological Perspective," "Multicultural Issues," and "Global/International Issues." Five multiple-choice questions were designed to assess competence in each goal area. Instructors in all sections of Soci 1101 and Soci 1160 were requested to select at least one multiple choice in each of the three section and to embed the questions in their final exams. Instructors were free to select more than one question as long there was at least one question to assess each of the three goals.

**Target for O1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions**
Students should have mean aggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students exceeded the target performance level in every category. The aggregate median score for the "Sociological Perspective" exam questions was 94.6% (N= 510 students surveyed, but aggregate median scores are based on each class group being treated as one unit, regardless of size). The aggregate median score for the "Multicultural Issues" exam questions was 94.6% (with the same caveat noted above). The aggregate median score for the "Global/International Issues" exam questions was 85.8% (with the same caveat noted above).

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Students should have mean aggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Students exceeded the target performance level in every category. The aggregate median score for the "Sociological Perspective" exam questions was 94.6% (N= 510 students surveyed, but aggregate median scores are based on each class group being treated as one unit, regardless of size). The aggregate median score for the "Multicultural Issues" exam questions was 94.6% (with the same caveat noted above). The aggregate median score for the "Global/International Issues" exam questions was 85.8% (with the same caveat noted above).
### Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge

Students should have mean aggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students exceeded the target performance level in every category. The aggregate median score for the "Sociological Perspective" exam questions was 94.6% (N= 510 students surveyed, but aggregate median scores are based on each class group being treated as one unit, regardless of size). The aggregate median score for the "Multicultural Issues" exam questions was 94.6% (with the same caveat noted above). The aggregate median score for the "Global/International Issues" exam questions was 85.8% (with the same caveat noted above).

### Target for O5: Analytical Skills

Students should have mean aggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

Students exceeded the target performance level in every category. The aggregate median score for the "Sociological Perspective" exam questions was 94.6% (N= 510 students surveyed, but aggregate median scores are based on each class group being treated as one unit, regardless of size). The aggregate median score for the "Multicultural Issues" exam questions was 94.6% (with the same caveat noted above). The aggregate median score for the "Global/International Issues" exam questions was 85.8% (with the same caveat noted above).

#### M 2: soci 3030 final exam (O: 4)

Instructors’ evaluations of students’ final exams in "Sociological Theory"

#### Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

The median score for 46 students evaluated was "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

#### M 3: soci 3010 analytic skills (O: 5)

Instructors’ evaluations of students’ analytic skills in "Social Statistics."

#### Target for O5: Analytical Skills

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The median score for a total of 87 students evaluated in this course was "good" (2 on a 4-point scale).

#### M 4: soci 3010 critical thinking (O: 2)

Instructors’ evaluations of students’ critical thinking in "Social Statistics."

#### Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The median score for a total of 87 students evaluated in this course was "good" (2 on a 4-point scale).

#### M 5: soci 3020 course paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)

Instructors’ evaluations of students’ course papers in "Social Research Methods"

#### Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The median score for 87-97 students evaluated in this course was "good" in the category of "Analytic Skills" (2 on a 4-point scale), and "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale) in the categories of "Critical Thinking," "Communication," and "Acquisition of Knowledge." (Not all instructors evaluated all students on each measure.)

#### Target for O3: Communication Skills

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

#### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

The median score for 87-97 students evaluated in this course was "good" in the category of "Analytic Skills" (2 on a 4-point scale), and "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale) in the categories of "Critical Thinking," "Communication," and "Acquisition of Knowledge." (Not all instructors evaluated all students on each measure.)

#### Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).
**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The median score for 87-97 students evaluated in this course was "good" in the category of "Analytic Skills" (2 on a 4-point scale), and "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale) in the categories of "Critical Thinking," "Communication," and "Acquisition of Knowledge." (Not all instructors evaluated all students on each measure.)

**Target for O5: Analytical Skills**

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The median score for 87-97 students evaluated in this course was "good" in the category of "Analytic Skills" (2 on a 4-point scale), and "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale) in the categories of "Critical Thinking," "Communication," and "Acquisition of Knowledge." (Not all instructors evaluated all students on each measure.)

**M 6: soci 3020 final exam (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Instructors’ evaluations of students’ final exams in "Social Research Methods."

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**

The median scores should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The median score for 22-42 students evaluated in this course was between "good" and "very good" in the category of "Analytic Skills" (2.5 on a 4-point scale), "good" (2 on a 4-point scale) in the categories of "Critical Thinking," and "Acquisition of Knowledge," and "very good" (3) in the category of "Communication." (Not all instructors evaluated all students on each measure.)

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**

The median scores should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The median score for 22-42 students evaluated in this course was between "good" and "very good" in the category of "Analytic Skills" (2.5 on a 4-point scale), "good" (2 on a 4-point scale) in the categories of "Critical Thinking," and "Acquisition of Knowledge," and "very good" (3) in the category of "Communication." (Not all instructors evaluated all students on each measure.)

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge**

The median scores should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The median score for 22-42 students evaluated in this course was between "good" and "very good" in the category of "Analytic Skills" (2.5 on a 4-point scale), "good" (2 on a 4-point scale) in the categories of "Critical Thinking," and "Acquisition of Knowledge," and "very good" (3) in the category of "Communication." (Not all instructors evaluated all students on each measure.)

**Target for O5: Analytical Skills**

The median scores should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

The median score for 22-42 students evaluated in this course was between "good" and "very good" in the category of "Analytic Skills" (2.5 on a 4-point scale), "good" (2 on a 4-point scale) in the categories of "Critical Thinking," and "Acquisition of Knowledge," and "very good" (3) in the category of "Communication." (Not all instructors evaluated all students on each measure.)

**M 7: soci 3030 paper (O: 4)**

Instructors’ assessments of student papers in "Sociological Theory."

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge**

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

The median score for a total of 89 students evaluated in this course was "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**M 8: soci 3201 paper (O: 1, 4)**

Instructors’ evaluations of student papers in "Wealth, Power, and Inequality."

**Target for O1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions**

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The median score for a total of 59 students evaluated in this course was "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge**
The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
The median score for a total of 59 students evaluated in this course was "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**M 9: soci 3201 final exam (O: 1, 4)**
Instructors’ evaluations of students’ final exams in "Wealth, Power, and Inequality"

**Target for O1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions**
The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The median score for 17 students evaluated in this course was "good" (2 on a 4-point scale).

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge**
The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
The median score for 17 students evaluated in this course was "good" (2 on a 4-point scale).

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**soci 3010**
To improve students’ performance ("analytic skills" and "critical thinking") in "Social Statistics," to a median score of "very good."

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  Measure: soci 3010 analytic skills | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills  
  Measure: soci 3010 critical thinking | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills  
**Implementation Description:** fall, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors of 3010

**soci 3020**
To improve students’ performance in "Social Research methods," such that the median score in all categories will be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  Measure: soci 3020 course paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge  
  | Analytical Skills | Communication Skills | Critical Thinking Skills  
  Measure: soci 3020 final exam | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge  
  | Analytical Skills | Communication Skills | Critical Thinking Skills  
**Implementation Description:** fall, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors of soci 3020

**soci 3201 final exams**
To improve students’ performance on soci 3201 final exam.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  Measure: soci 3201 paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge  
  | Analysis of Contemporary Questions  
**Implementation Description:** fall, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** all instructors of soci 3201

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?  
Goals for outcomes and objectives are being met best in the theory (3030) and inequality courses (3201), and partially met in statistics (3010) and methods courses (3020).
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Students typically struggle most in major-level courses that demand mathematical skills -- statistics and methods. Ideally, all students would do well in these courses, but our majors do not always have ideal mathematical skills. We feel that we offer excellent instruction in and outside the classroom; not all students avail themselves of the extra lengths to which the professors who teach these classes go. If we find that, over time, a significant minority of students are unable to fulfill their major requirements because of poor performance in these classes (which is not the case now) we might wish to consider adding augmentive services, like peer-tutoring or special assistance labs staffed by graduate students. These efforts are not warranted by the data at this point, however.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Sociology MA**

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge about social forces, social behavior, and social change. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the Department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public. Note: Our program has approximately 80 graduate students and had 13 students graduate with the MA degree during this assessment cycle.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Analytical Skills (M: 1)**

(A) Students have acquired the skills to collect data. (B) Students have demonstrated appropriate analytical skills. (C) Students are able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports and articles.

---

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)**

(A) Students can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses. (B) Students are able to analyze and interpret data. (C) Students demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

---

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 3: Communication Skills (M: 1)**

(A) Students have developed effective written communication and editing skills. (B) Students show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

---

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills (M: 1)**

(A) Students articulate key sociological concepts and theories. (B) Students apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems. (C) Students utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

---

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills (M: 1)**

(A) Students have developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems. (B) Students analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

---

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.3 International Initiatives
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Thesis Defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Masters students orally defend their thesis to their thesis committee and other attending faculty members.
**Target for O1: Analytical Skills**

A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

A majority of MA students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically: 84.6% of students scored a 3 (very good) or 4 (excellent) on "The student has acquired the skills to collect data;" 91.7% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems;" and 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**

A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

A majority of MA students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically: 84.6% of students scored a 3 (very good) or 4 (excellent) on "The student has acquired the skills to collect data;" 91.7% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems;" and 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**

A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

A majority of MA students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically: 84.6% of students scored a 3 (very good) or 4 (excellent) on "The student has acquired the skills to collect data;" 91.7% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems;" and 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills**

A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

A majority of MA students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically: 84.6% of students scored a 3 (very good) or 4 (excellent) on "The student has acquired the skills to collect data;" 91.7% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems;" and 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions."
Target for O5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills

A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

A majority of MA students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically: 84.6% of students scored a 3 (very good) or 4 (excellent) on "The student has acquired the skills to collect data;" 91.7% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions;" 100% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats;" 84.6% scored 3 or 4 on "The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings;" 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems;" and 92.3% scored 3 or 4 on "The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Our assessments show that our MA students continue to demonstrate high levels of competence with regard to their Analytical skills, Critical Thinking skills, Communication skills, Acquisition of Knowledge skills, and Analysis of Contemporary Questions skills.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Our assessments do not identify any outcomes or objectives that require continued attention.

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge about social forces, social behavior, and social change. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the Department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public. Note: Our program has approximately 80 PhD-level graduate students and had 4 students graduate with the PhD degree during this assessment cycle.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills (M: 1)

(A) Students have developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems. (B) Students analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

Strategic Plan Associations

3.3 International Initiatives
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Analytical Skills (M: 1)

(A) Students have acquired the skills to collect data. (B) Students have demonstrated appropriate analytical skills. (C) Students are able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports and articles.

Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)

(A) Students can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses. (B) Students are able to analyze and interpret data. (C) Students demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience
SLO 4: Communication Skills (M: 1)
(A) Students have developed effective written communication and editing skills. (B) Students show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills (M: 1)
(A) Students articulate key sociological concepts and theories. (B) Students apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems. (C) Students utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Dissertation Defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Doctoral students orally defend their dissertation to their dissertation committee and other attending faculty members.

Target for O1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills
A majority of Doctoral dissertations will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
A majority of PhD students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically, for each of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 3 (very good) or a 4 (excellent). On eight of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 4 (excellent) on the scale.

Target for O2: Analytical Skills
A majority of Doctoral dissertations will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
A majority of PhD students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically, for each of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 3 (very good) or a 4 (excellent). On eight of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 4 (excellent) on the scale.

Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills
A majority of Doctoral dissertations will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
A majority of PhD students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically, for each of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 3 (very good) or a 4 (excellent). On eight of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 4 (excellent) on the scale.

Target for O4: Communication Skills
A majority of Doctoral dissertations will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
A majority of PhD students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically, for each of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 3 (very good) or a 4 (excellent). On eight of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 4 (excellent) on the scale.

Target for O5: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills
A majority of Doctoral dissertations will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
A majority of PhD students met or exceeded a score of 3 on a 4-point scale for each of the thirteen items on the departmental rubric. More specifically, for each of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 3 (very good) or a 4 (excellent). On eight of the thirteen items, 100% of PhD students scored a 4 (excellent) on the scale.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on
Our assessments show that our PhD students continue to demonstrate very high levels of competence with regard to their Analytical skills, Critical Thinking skills, Communication skills, Acquisition of Knowledge skills, and Analysis of Contemporary Questions skills.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Our assessments do not identify any outcomes or objectives that require continued attention.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department is to give students majoring in Spanish the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the Spanish language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of Spanish speaking countries, to promote their interest and involvement in international exchanges through study abroad programs, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching, business, translation and interpretation and other areas.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understanding spoken Spanish (M: 1, 7, 10)**

The student shall demonstrate the ability to understand the target language as spoken by a proficient speaker at normal conversational tempo on general and non-technical topics.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to understand at the ACTFL Intermediate High level.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 6 Collaboration--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 4.3 Technology

**SLO 2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures (M: 7)**

The student majoring more specifically in Teacher Education shall demonstrate proficiency in the target language and the ability to teach the target language and culture.

Relevant Associations: Required courses will reach Degree of Emphasis 3 (Extensive: Key course focus, variety of learning activities, multiple assessments) of the Conceptual Framework of the Professional Education Faculty of Georgia State University.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.1 Recruitment
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context (M: 8)**

The student majoring in Language and International Business shall demonstrate a working knowledge of the language and concepts of business and an understanding of appropriate cross-cultural behaviors in a business context.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
- 13 Technology--major
### Strategic Plan Associations

- 3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 3.3 International Initiatives
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 4: Speaking Spanish (M: 2, 7, 10, 11)
The student shall demonstrate the ability to speak the target language with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation and grammatical accuracy.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to speak at the ACTFL Intermediate High level

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 3 Oral Communication—major
- 4 Oral Communication—core
- 5 Collaboration—major
- 6 Collaboration—core

### SLO 5: Reading Spanish (M: 3, 7)
The student shall demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend general non-technical materials in the target language.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to read at the ACTFL advanced level

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 7 Critical Thinking—major
- 8 Critical Thinking—core
- 9 Contemporary Issues—major
- 10 Contemporary Issues—core

### SLO 6: Writing in Spanish (M: 4, 7)
The student shall demonstrate the ability to write in the target language with clarity and grammatical accuracy.

Relevant Associations: Student will be able to write at the ACTFL advanced level

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication—major
- 2 Written Communication—core
- 7 Critical Thinking—major

### SLO 7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries (M: 5, 7, 10, 11)
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language cultures.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication—major
- 3 Oral Communication—major
- 5 Collaboration—major
- 9 Contemporary Issues—major
- 13 Technology—major

### Strategic Plan Associations

- 3.3 International Initiatives
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language (M: 6, 7, 9)
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret literary texts, including their cultural contents.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication—major
- 3 Oral Communication—major
- 5 Collaboration—major
- 7 Critical Thinking—major
- 9 Contemporary Issues—major
### SLO 9: Oral proficiency (M: 10)

Interpersonal communication: To interact with peers in the target language. Presentational communication: To present ideas in the target language.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

4 Oral Communication--core

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Understanding Spoken Spanish (O: 1)

All Spanish majors scored 4.76.

**Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

#### M 2: Speaking Spanish (O: 4)

All Spanish majors scored 4.72.

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

#### M 3: Reading Spanish (O: 5)

All Spanish majors scored 4.51.

**Target for O5: Reading Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

#### M 4: Writing Spanish (O: 6)

All Spanish majors scored 4.63.

**Target for O6: Writing in Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

#### M 5: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries (O: 7)

All Spanish majors scored 4.57.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

M 6: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language (O: 8)
All Spanish majors scored 4.40.

Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

M 7: Ability to teach Spanish language and culture (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
Spanish majors whose concentration was Teacher Education scored 3.83.

Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O4: Speaking Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O5: Reading Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O6: Writing in Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

M 8: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context (O: 3)
Spanish majors whose concentration was Language and International Business scored 4.23.

Target for O8: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

M 9: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language (O: 8)
Spanish majors whose concentration was literature scored 5.32.

Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment; student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.

M 10: Interpersonal communication: Class interaction (O: 1, 4, 7, 9)
Task-based exercises such as interviews, surveys, and information-gap activities. The activities reflect the Communicative Objectives of each chapter and require language knowledge, use of communication strategies (e.g., turn-taking, asking for clarification, etc.), and cultural awareness.

Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish
4 on a scale of 6

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
For many foreign language programs in postsecondary institutions the question of horizontal articulation1 arises frequently due to the high number of multisection elementary courses taught by novice as well as experienced teachers. The need to provide all students who enter a course not only with quality of instruction, but also with a coherent sequence that will ensure a smooth transition to subsequent levels presents several challenges, among them: Class size, the integration of false beginners into elementary language classes and instructor preparation for foreign language teaching. Although the solution to these problems has yet to be found, this project looks into the development of oral proficiency at the elementary Spanish level. Class size As the size of languages classes swells due to budgetary restrictions in public universities, the indispensable interaction necessary for the development of communicative skills diminishes. The problem of class size is rooted in financial difficulties that institutions are experimenting nationwide. Of course, other factors have pedagogical repercussions in language learning, but during observations of novice teachers in the classroom it has become clear that they have difficulty managing and organizing larger classes. Many inexperienced GTAs end up giving teacher-fronted lessons that allow them more control over the class but restrict the kind of student interaction necessary for language development. Others, have turned to technology and have integrated lessons using Power Point presentations or the Internet in order to capture students attention. Support for GTAs in handling large classes comes from the department as well as the institution. If the ideal number of students cannot be met, GTAs are advised to plan their classes more carefully, organize their lessons to maximize effective use of class time, organize activities and provide clear instructions, monitor pair and group work effectively, and require participation from a variety of students. False Beginners in Elementary Language Classes The varied backgrounds of students who enrol in language classes is particularly evident in Elementary Spanish I, the practice of self-placing in a lower level as a way to enhance grade point average is wide-spread. The issue of false beginners in first-semester classes is promptly addressed during orientation meetings for new GTAs in an effort to prevent instructors from getting a false sense of accomplishment with regard to the group's progress, and true beginners from feeling overwhelmed by the pace of the course, which inexperienced instructors may inadvertently gear to the experienced learners. The presence of overqualified students in Elementary language classes has its effects in true beginners, the effects on the quality of instruction are also apparent when the instructor has to make adjustments to the pace of a class. What is more telling is the impact on oral activities in which false beginners perform well while true beginners struggle to form a sentence. Of course, one can see the unfairness of the proposition on true beginners, anxiety—which is already a part of adult language learning—in multilevel classes is increased unnecessarily. Another issue considered by the Program is the inadequate preparation of students for college-level courses. Many students with two or three years of high-school Spanish had not developed oral skills and were not prepared for a class taught in the target language because their courses had evidently emphasized reading and translation. In the summer of 2006 the first measures were taken in the form of oral assignments given at the end of the second week of classes and towards the end of the semester. The purpose of the test was two-fold: First, to help students realize their strengths; second, to help students identify problem areas and work on them early on the semester. The assignment also gave instructors a clearer picture of who needed help—and what kind—and who was misplaced early enough to address problems properly. The process of normalizing the assessment is still in progress, and only future research will determine its effectiveness and impact on the program. Methods Students’ oral proficiency development is assessed in two modes: Interpersonal communication: task-based activities that require interaction with classmates. This mode will be used to assess comprehension and comprehensibility. Interpersonal communication is assessed regularly in the classroom using task-based exercises such as interviews, surveys, and information-gap activities. The activities reflect the Communicative Objectives of each lesson and require language knowledge, use of communication strategies (e.g., turn-taking, asking for clarification, etc.) and cultural awareness. Since this is done several times during the semester, it is considered formative assessment. Summative assessment occurs at the end of the semester and it will be explained later. Scoring Rubric (Interpersonal Communication)
Performance Objectives: Cooperation: Is the student talking (or at least trying)? Is the talk relevant to the activity? Is the student on task? Does the student listen to his/her partner(s)? Does the student hinder the activity by his/her lack of cooperation? Accuracy: Is the student performing at an acceptable level? Does the student use the appropriate structures and vocabulary required for the task? The purpose of the in-class practice is to develop vocabulary and fluency by speaking. Instructors are asked to use paired activities often in class so that students have more opportunities to use the language. Also, instructors must emphasize the benefits of completing the Lab Manual exercises and vocabulary required for the task. The purpose of the in–class practice is to develop vocabulary and fluency by speaking.

Elementary Spanish I students are assessed for three parameters: (1) pronunciation, (2) language skills, and (3) communication skills. The first reflects an assessment of students ability to pronounce most sounds of Spanish with adequate accuracy to be understood by a native speaker without the need for interpretation. Language and communication skills reflect practical abilities to greet, convey basic ideas and describe their own surroundings using the vocabulary and structures covered in class. Elementary Spanish II students are assessed for language and communication skills only since they have had at least one semester of language instruction enough to deduce how a word is pronounced by its spelling.

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

4 on a scale of 6

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For many foreign language programs in postsecondary institutions the question of horizontal articulation1 arises frequently due to the high number of multisection elementary courses taught by novice as well as experienced teachers. The need to provide all students who enter a course not only with quality of instruction, but also with a coherent sequence that ensures a smooth transition to subsequent levels presents several challenges, among them: Class size, the integration of false beginners into elementary language classes and instructor preparation for foreign language teaching. Although the solution to these problems has yet to be found, this project looks into the development of oral proficiency at the elementary Spanish level. Class size As the size of languages classes swells due to budgetary restrictions in public universities, the indispensable interaction necessary for the development of communicative skills diminishes. The problem of class size is rooted in financial difficulties that institutions are experimenting nationwide. Of course, other factors have pedagogical repercussions in language learning, but during observations of novice teachers in the classroom it has become clear that they have difficulty managing and organizing larger classes. Many inexperienced GTAs end up giving teacher-fronted lessons that allow them more control over the class but restrict the kind of student interaction necessary for language development. Others, have turned to technology and have integrated lessons using PowerPoint presentations online and Internet in order to capture students attention. Support for GTAs in handling large classes comes from the department as well as the institution. If the ideal number of students cannot be met, GTAs are advised to plan their classes more carefully, organize their lessons to maximize effective use of class time, organize activities and provide clear instructions, monitor pair and group work effectively, and require participation from a variety of students. False Beginners in Elementary Language Classes The varied backgrounds of students who enroll in language classes is particularly evident in Elementary Spanish I, the practice of self-placing in a lower level as a way to enhance grade point average is wide-spread. The issue of false beginners in first-semester classes is promptly addressed during orientation meetings for new GTAs in an effort to prevent instructors from getting a false sense of accomplishment with regard to the group's progress, and true beginners from feeling overwhelmed by the pace of the course, which inexperienced instructors may inadvertently gear to the experienced learners. The presence of overqualified students in Elementary language classes has its effects in true beginners, the effects on the quality of instruction are also apparent when there is a lack of a native speaker in the class. What is more telling is the impact on oral activities in which false beginners perform well while true beginners struggle to form a sentence. Of course, one can see the unfairness of the proposition on true beginners, anxiety—which is already a part of adult language learning—in multilevel classes is increased unnecessarily. Another issue considered by the Program is the inadequate preparation of students for college-level courses. Many students with two or three years of high-school Spanish had not developed oral skills and were not prepared for a class taught in the target language because their courses had evidently emphasized reading and translation. In the summer of 2006 the first measures were taken in the form of oral assignments given at the end of the second week of classes and towards the end of the semester. The purpose of the test was two-fold: First, to help students realize their strengths; second, to help students identify problem areas and work on them early on the semester. The assignment also gave instructors a clearer picture of who needed help—and what kind—and who was misplaced early enough to address problems properly. The process of norming the assessment is still in progress, and only future research will determine its effectiveness and impact on the program. Methods Students' oral proficiency development is assessed in two modes: Interpersonal communication: task-based activities that require interaction with classmates. This mode will be used to assess comprehension and comprehensibility. Interpersonal communication is assessed regularly in the classroom using task-based exercises such as interviews, surveys, and information-gap activities. The activities reflect the Communicative Objectives of each lesson and require language knowledge, use of communication strategies (e.g., turn-taking, asking for clarification, etc.) and cultural awareness. Since this is done several times during the semester, it is considered formative assessment. Summative assessment occurs at the end of the semester and it will be explained later. Scoring Rubric (Interpersonal Communication) Performance Objectives: Cooperation: Is the student talking (or at least trying)? Is the talk relevant to the activity? Is the student on task? Does the student listen to his/her partner(s)? Does the student hinder the activity by his/her lack of cooperation? Accuracy: Is the student performing at an acceptable level? Does the student use the appropriate structures and vocabulary required for the task? The purpose of the in–class practice is to develop vocabulary and fluency by speaking. Instructors are asked to use paired activities often in class so that students have more opportunities to use the language. Also, instructors must emphasize the importance and benefits of completing the Lab Manual exercises as intended.

Elementary Spanish I students are assessed for three parameters: (1) pronunciation, (2) language skills, and (3) communication skills. The first reflects an assessment of students ability to pronounce most sounds of Spanish with adequate accuracy to be understood by a native speaker without the need for interpretation. Language and communication skills reflect practical abilities to greet, convey basic ideas and describe their own surroundings using the vocabulary and structures covered in class. Elementary Spanish II students are assessed for language and communication skills only since they have had at least one semester of language instruction enough to deduce how a word is pronounced by its spelling.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**

4 on a scale of 6

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

For many foreign language programs in postsecondary institutions the question of horizontal articulation1 arises frequently due to the high number of multisection elementary courses taught by novice as well as experienced teachers. The need to provide all students who enter a course not only with quality of instruction, but also with a coherent sequence that will ensure a smooth transition to subsequent levels presents several challenges, among them: Class size, the integration of false beginners into elementary language classes and instructor preparation for foreign language teaching. Although the solution to these problems has yet to be found, this project looks into the development of oral proficiency at the elementary Spanish...
Class size As the size of languages classes swells due to budgetary restrictions in public universities, the indispensable interaction necessary for the development of communicative skills diminishes. The problem of class size is rooted in financial difficulties that institutions are experimenting nationwide. Of course, other factors have pedagogical repercussions in language learning, but during observations of novice teachers in the classroom it has become clear that they have difficulty managing and organizing larger classes. Many inexperienced GTAs end up giving teacher-fronted lessons that allow them more control over the class but does not develop the kind of student interaction necessary for the development of communicative skills. Many inexperienced GTAs have turned to technology and have integrated lessons using Power Point presentations or the Internet in order to capture students attention. Support for GTAs in handling large classes comes from the department as well as the institution. If the ideal number of students cannot be met, GTAs are advised to plan their classes more carefully, organize their lessons to maximize effective use of class time, organize activities and provide clear instructions, monitor pair and group work effectively, and require participation from a variety of students. False Beginners in Elementary Language Classes The varied backgrounds of students who enroll in language classes is part of the evidence in Elementary Spanish I, the practice of self-placing in a lower level as a way to enhance grade point average is widespread. The issue of false beginners in first-semester classes is promptly addressed during orientation meetings for new GTAs in an effort to prevent instructors from getting a false sense of accomplishment with regard to the group’s progress, and true beginners from feeling overwhelmed by the pace of the course, which inexperienced instructors may inadvertently gear to the experienced learners. The presence of overqualified students in Elementary language classes has its effects in true beginners, the effects on the inexpeirenced instructors are lessened when the instructor has to make adjustments to the pace of a class. What is more telling is the impact on oral activities in which false beginners perform well while true beginners struggle to form a sentence. Of course, one can see the unfairness of the proposition on true beginners, anxiety—which is already a part of adult language learning—in multilevel classes is increased unnecessarily. Another issue considered by the Program is the inadequate preparation of students for college-level courses. Many students with two or three years of high-school Spanish had not developed oral skills and were not prepared for a class taught in the target language because their courses had evidently emphasized reading and translation. In the summer of 2006 the first measures were taken in the form of oral assignments given at the end of the second week of classes and towards the end of the semester. The purpose of the test was two-fold: First, to help students realize their strengths; second, to help students identify problem areas and work on them early on the semester. The assignment also gave instructors a clearer picture of who needed help—with whom the replacement early enough and—who was already a native speaker, and who was a non-native speaker. The process of norming the assessment is still in progress, and only future research will determine its effectiveness and impact on the program. Methods Students’ oral proficiency development is assessed in two modes: Interpersonal communication: task-based activities that require interaction with classmates. This mode will be used to assess comprehension and comprehensibility. Interpersonal communication is assessed regularly in the classroom using task-based exercises such as interviews, surveys, and information-gap activities. The activities reflect the Communicative Objectives of each lesson and require language knowledge, use of communication strategies (e.g., turn-taking, asking for clarification, etc.) and cultural awareness. Since this is done several times during the semester, it is considered formative assessment. Summative assessment occurs at the end of the semester and it will be explained later. Scoring Rubric (Interpersonal Communication) Performance Objectives: Cooperation: Is the student talking (or at least trying)? Is the talk relevant to the activity? Is the student on task? Does the student listen to his/her partner(s)? Does the student hinder the activity by his/her lack of cooperation? Accuracy: Is the student performing at an acceptable level? Does the student use the appropriate structures and vocabulary required for the task? The purpose of the in-class practice is to develop vocabulary and fluency by speaking. Instructors are asked to use paired activities often in class so that students have more opportunities to use the language. Also, instructors must emphasize the importance and benefits of completing the Lab Manual exercises as intended. Elementary Spanish I students are assessed for three parameters: (1) pronunciation, (2) language skills, and (3) communicative skills. The first assesses an assessment of students ability to pronounce Spanish words with adequate accuracy to be understood by a native speaker without the need for interpretation. Language and communication skills reflect practical abilities to greet, convey basic ideas and describe their own surroundings using the vocabulary and structures covered in class. Elementary Spanish II students are assessed for language and communication skills since they have had at least one semester of language instruction enough to deduce how a word is pronounced by its spelling.
students identify problem areas and work on them early on the semester. The assignment also gave instructors a clearer picture of who needed help—and what kind—and who was misplaced early enough to address problems properly. The process of norming the assessment is still in progress, and only future research will determine its effectiveness and impact on the program. Methods Students’ oral proficiency development is assessed in two modes: Interpersonal communication: task-based activities that require interaction with classmates. This mode will be used to assess comprehension and cooperation. Interpersonal communication is assessed regularly in the classroom using interviews, surveys, and information-gap activities. The activities reflect the Communicative Objectives of each lesson and require language knowledge, use of communication strategies (e.g., turn-taking, asking for clarification, etc.) and cultural awareness. Since this is done several times during the semester, it is considered formative assessment. Summative assessment occurs at the end of the semester and it will be explained later. Scoring Rubric (Interpersonal Communication) Performance Objectives: Cooperation: Is the student talking (at least trying)? Is the talk relevant to the activity? Is the student on task? Does the student listen to his/her partner(s)? Does the student listen to his/her lack of cooperation? Accuracy: Is the student performing at an acceptable level? Does the student use the appropriate structures and vocabulary required for the task? The purpose of the in–class practice is to develop vocabulary and fluency by speaking. Instructors are asked to use paired activities often in class so that students have more opportunities to use the language. Also, instructors must emphasize the importance and benefits of completing the Lab Manual exercises as intended. Elementary Spanish I students are assessed for three parameters: (1) pronunciation, (2) language skills, and (3) communication skills. The first reflects an assessment of students ability to pronounce most sounds of Spanish with adequate accuracy to be understood by a native speaker without the need for interpretation. Language and communication skills reflect practical abilities to greet, convey basic ideas and describe their own surroundings using the vocabulary and structures covered in class. Elementary Spanish II students are assessed for language and communication skills only since they have had at least one semester of language instruction enough to deduce how a word is pronounced by its spelling.

M 11: Presentational Communication: Individual oral test (O: 4, 7)

Presentational Communication is assessed in the Language Acquisition and Research Center (LARC) on the second and last week of classes. The first assessment is designed to establish fluency and proficiency at the outset of the course. Since student’s initial proficiency may determine the degree of improvement during the course, instructors are advised not to compare students with each other and not to consider native speakers as the standard for accuracy. The purpose of the in–class practice is to develop vocabulary and fluency by speaking. Instructors are asked to use paired activities often in class so that students have more opportunities to use the language. Also, instructors must emphasize the importance and benefits of completing the Lab Manual exercises as intended. Elementary Spanish I students are assessed for three parameters: (1) pronunciation, (2) language skills, and (3) communication skills. The first reflects an assessment of students ability to pronounce most sounds of Spanish with adequate accuracy to be understood by a native speaker without the need for interpretation. Language and communication skills reflect practical abilities to greet, convey basic ideas and describe their own surroundings using the vocabulary and structures covered in class. Elementary Spanish II students are assessed for language and communication skills only since they have had at least one semester of language instruction enough to deduce how a word is pronounced by its spelling.

Target for O4: Speaking Spanish

4 on a scale of 6

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

Presentational communication: tasks in which students create spoken language. This mode will be used to assess vocabulary use and fluency. Presentational Communication is assessed in the Language Acquisition and Research Center (LARC) on the second and last week of classes. The first assessment is designed to establish fluency and proficiency at the outset of the course. Since student’s initial proficiency may determine the degree of improvement during the course, instructors are advised not to compare students with each other and not to consider native speakers as the standard for accuracy. Elementary Spanish I students are assessed for three parameters: (1) pronunciation, (2) language skills, and (3) communication skills. The first reflects an assessment of students ability to pronounce most sounds of Spanish with adequate accuracy to be understood by a native speaker without the need for interpretation. Language and communication skills reflect practical abilities to greet, convey basic ideas and describe their own surroundings using the vocabulary and structures covered in class. Elementary Spanish II students are assessed for language and communication skills only since they have had at least one semester of language instruction enough to deduce how a word is pronounced by its spelling. Materials This study uses recorded samples from first-year Spanish students N = 259 (Oral assessment 1 & 2). The first oral assessment is given during the second week of classes, as Spanish I week 2 in the LARC. By this time students must have had completed oral assignments (Interpersonal mode). During the summer students in SPAN 1001 (n = 139) had to read a passage for pronunciation and describe a photograph for communication. SPAN 1002 students (n = 120) were asked to narrate a story based on a series of pictures. The first and second assignments were printed and given to students in the LARC. By fall 2006 it was evident that some changes had to be made specially regarding the delivery of the instrument. Therefore, the second oral assessment was delivered by way of WebCT. Using this Course management tool, it is possible to restrict the access to one location, deliver questions or topics ad-random and verify the time each student took to complete the task. Instructors were given the following guidelines for setting up recordings: Oral Assessment 1: Each instructor will be responsible for arranging time in the LARC (at least 30 min.) as marked on the syllabus, due to the number of sections in SPAN 1001, especially MWF classes, be prepared to reschedule the date of the first assessment. Be ready to explain the process and a description of the format. Going to the LARC as a group helps students become familiar with the equipment and the materials. Reassure students as much as possible. If you have a student who freezes during recorded assignments because of test anxiety, offer to do it in a separate room but do not announce this as an alternative for the whole class. Oral Assessment 2: Students will complete this assignment during the last two weeks of classes. They should go to the LARC on their own and make sure that the recording is saved or sent to you in a proper manner. The assignment will available to them on line. More information will be provided later in the semester. Data Collection and Analysis In the summer, instructors were asked to listen to the recording and score using and analytic scale. Two SPAN 1001 instructors (teaching 4 of the sections) decided instead to give a completion grade. The students’ recordings have not been rechecked for achievement. One SPAN 1002 instructor (teaching one section) changed the way the second oral assignment was conducted and did not use the grading scale. In fall 2006 there was a special effort for uniformity in the delivery and scoring of the oral assignments. Furthermore, the number of instructors and students more than doubled. During the communications regarding oral assessment instructions, special emphasis was made to prevent instructors from making changes to the instrument. This time, the instructors received a spreadsheet that require them to breakdown the scoring scale categories to prevent them from giving a completion grade. The preliminary results show that the lack of uniformity in the delivery, preparation and scoring of summer students, greatly hinders our ability to draw definitive conclusions. The data for fall 2006 is being analyzed in order to further improve the instrument.

Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophane countries
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Most of our B. A. students have met our performance objectives.
**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in Spanish the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the Spanish language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of Spanish speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department’s mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in Spanish, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the literatures and cultures of Spanish speaking countries, and in linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University’s mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Research and data collecting skills (M: 1)**

Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.3 International Initiatives
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.3 International Initiatives
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Acquisition of knowledge (M: 1)**

Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.3 International Initiatives
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)**
Students demonstrate communicative competence in written and oral Spanish.

Institutional Priority Associations
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Thesis, pedagogical project or research paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
A committee of Spanish professors will use the thesis, pedagogical research project, and/or research paper to evaluate mastery of the skills and learning outcomes of the M.A. candidate in Spanish.

**Target for O1: Research and data collecting skills**
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in Spanish complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 candidates received their M.A. (85.7%). Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Critical thinking skills**
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in Spanish complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 candidates received their M.A. (85.7%). Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Acquisition of knowledge**
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in Spanish complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 candidates received their M.A. (85.7%). Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Effective writing, communication and editing**
The program will have met its target if 80% of candidates for the M.A. in Spanish complete successfully the final project and receive the M.A. degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 candidates received their M.A. (85.7%). Students met our expectations to a large extent. Results are satisfactory, but we will continue to monitor them and take new data into account each semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

No action plan needed at this time.
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Our M.A. students have met our performance objectives. We plan no action at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We are satisfied with the results of our monitoring. Our M.A. students have met our performance objectives. We plan no action at this time.
### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Communication is firmly committed to the goals of academic excellence, strong research programs and international relevance set forth in the Georgia State University's Strategic Plan. The Department encompasses multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students’ oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication. Note: The Department has about 1,400 undergraduate majors; 108 major in Speech Communication.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: processes, theories, and research (M: 2, 3)

Students will understand the processes of human communication and their theories and how to read/conduct research relating to communication across the lifespan.

Relevant Associations: NCA

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
3. Oral Communication--major
4. Oral Communication--core
5. Collaboration--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 2: critical skills (M: 3, 4)

Students will gain the critical/cognitive skills needed to be an informed citizen.

Relevant Associations: NCA

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7. Critical Thinking--major
8. Critical Thinking--core
9. Contemporary Issues--major
10. Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 3: leadership competencies (M: 1, 3)

Students will possess communication competencies necessary for effective leadership.

Relevant Associations: NCA

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication--major
2. Written Communication--core
3. Oral Communication--major
4. Oral Communication--core
5. Collaboration--major
6. Collaboration--core
7. Critical Thinking--major
8. Critical Thinking--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: speech presentation (O: 3)
Students delivering speech presentations SPCH 3210, Business and Professional Communication.

**Target for O3: leadership competencies**
A grade of 70 (out of 100) or better for speech presentations and Competent Communicator Scale, an eight-item rubric for grading speech presentations.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
100% of students in Spch 3210 majoring in Speech Communication earned a grade of 70% or better on a speech presentation. No data was collected for the Competent Communicator Scale rubric.

#### M 2: exam (O: 1)
An exam specifically revised for the assessment of the curriculum by the faculty administered to students in Spch 4400 Communication Development across the Lifespan and in Spch 4450 Rhetorical Theory and Criticism

**Target for O1: processes, theories, and research**
A grade of 70 (out of 100) or better on each of the seven parts the exam.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
73% of the students in Spch 2650 earned 70% or better in content area of Models of Communication. 27% of the students earned 70% or better in the content area of Public Communication. 23% of the students earned 70% or better in the content area of Interpersonal Communication. 18% of the students earned 70% or better in the content area of Language and Communication. 5% of the students earned 70% or better in the content area of Diversity. 54% of the students earned 70% or better in the content area of Steps to Write a Research Paper. 0% of the students earned 70% or better in the content area of Rhetoric.

#### M 3: course exam (O: 1, 2, 3)
Exams covering course materials from Spch 2650, Interpersonal Communication.

**Target for O1: processes, theories, and research**
A grade of 70 out of 100 on the exam.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
77% of the students in Spch 4400 earned 70% or better on the course exam. 73% of the students in Spch 3210 earned 70% or better on the course exam.

**Target for O2: critical skills**
A grade of 70 out of 100 on the exam.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
77% of the students in Spch 4400 earned 70% or better on the course exam. 73% of the students in Spch 3210 earned 70% or better on the course exam.

**Target for O3: leadership competencies**
A grade of 70 out of 100 on the exam.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
77% of the students in Spch 4400 earned 70% or better on the course exam. 73% of the students in Spch 3210 earned 70% or better on the course exam.

#### M 4: research paper (O: 2)
Students in Spch 4450, Rhetorical Theory and Criticism, and students in Spch 4400, Communication Development across the Lifespan, will research a topic and write a report.

**Target for O2: critical skills**
A grade of 70 (out of 100) or better for the research paper and an evaluation summary based on a writing assessment instrument which is a 6 item rubric created by members of the GSU English Department faculty.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
95% of the students in Spch 4450 earned 70% for the grade on the research report. No data was collected for the writing instrument rubric.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**exam revision**
Several actions are required. First, the assessment exam may not be testing what is actually taught in the major courses and thus will be revised by the speech faculty. Second, the assessment exam tests information taught in courses currently not required of ALL
majors. Questions will be added to the exam to determine what courses students have already taken, but more importantly, the faculty will continue their discussion to revise the curriculum of the speech major. Finally, these curriculum revisions will require continued discussion about the appropriateness of the current goals and objectives for the speech major.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: exam | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories, and research
Implementation Description: Fall semester 06
Responsible Person/Group: Speech Communication faculty

implement CCS
Instructors will be directed to complete the Competent Communicator Scale for all future presentations used for assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: speech presentation | Outcome/Objective: leadership competencies
Implementation Description: Fall semester 06
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of Spch 3210, Business and Professional Communication

implement writing instrument
Instructors will be directed to complete the writing assessment instrument for all future papers used for assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: critical skills
Implementation Description: Fall semester 06
Responsible Person/Group: Speech Communication faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The majority of Speech majors continued to demonstrate that they were critical thinkers and were able to apply some aspects of human communication theories to the practical aspects of delivering information orally.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Speech faculty are considering a revision of the curriculum that may also include changes to outcomes/objectives and their measures. The components of the exam developed specifically for the assessment of the curriculum show that students are not learning a number of aspects of the objective related to the processes of human communication and their theories. The diversity component, in particular, was a problem.
Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will be familiar with the legal concepts in those areas that they are most likely to encounter in the sport business industry workplace.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Can conduct sport business research (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)
Student will be able to conduct basic sport management research specific to common methods used in the sport business industry.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Has work experience in sport business industry (M: 3, 5)
Student will perform work in a sport business setting.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management; Sport Marketing Association.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Can develop financial planning for sports (M: 1, 3)
Student will be able to develop financial planning techniques applicable to the sport business industry.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 6: Describes sport management functions (M: 1, 3)**

Students are able to describe management functions in sport business industry settings.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM); National Association for Sport & Physical Education (NASPE)

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

The student will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing fundamentals.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management; Sport Marketing Association.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)**

A culminating all-essay comprehensive exam that covers all required course content. The exams are evaluated by program faculty; each section is scored with a 0-5 scale. The student must average a 3.0 on all evaluated parts of the exam to pass.

**Target for O1: Understands socio-cultural context of sport**

90% of students will score a passing mark as described: exams are scored by specific professors with a 0 - 5 scale; student must average a 3.0 on all evaluated parts of the comprehensive exam to pass.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students passed the comprehensive exams.

**Target for O2: Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business**

90% of students will score a passing mark as described: exams are scored by specific professors with a 0 - 5 scale; student must average a 3.0 on all evaluated parts of the comprehensive exam to pass.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of students passed the comprehensive exams.

**Target for O3: Can conduct sport business research**

90% of students will score a passing mark as described: exams are scored by specific professors with a 0 - 5 scale; student must average a 3.0 on all evaluated parts of the comprehensive exam to pass.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students passed the comprehensive exams.

**Target for O5: Can develop financial planning for sports**
90% of students will score a passing mark as described: exams are scored by specific professors with a 0 - 5 scale; student must average a 3.0 on all evaluated parts of the comprehensive exam to pass.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students passed the comprehensive exams.

**Target for O6: Describes sport management functions**
90% of students will score a passing mark as described: exams are scored by specific professors with a 0 - 5 scale; student must average a 3.0 on all evaluated parts of the comprehensive exam to pass.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students passed the comprehensive exams.

**Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing**
90% of students will score a passing mark as described: exams are scored by specific professors with a 0 - 5 scale; student must average a 3.0 on all evaluated parts of the comprehensive exam to pass.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students passed the comprehensive exams.

**M 2: Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 7)**
Presentations in 50% of major required courses. Instructors in each course will evaluate the presentation with an emphasis on appropriate organization of the presentation; accuracy of information presented; and relevancy of information presented.

**Target for O1: Understands socio-cultural context of sport**
80% of students will score a high passing grade of 80% or higher on the instructor’s evaluation of the presentation in that course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of students passed the grade of 80% or higher on presentations.

**Target for O2: Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business**
80% of students will score a high passing grade of 80% or higher on the instructor’s evaluation of the presentation in that course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of students passed the grade of 80% or higher on presentations.

**Target for O3: Can conduct sport business research**
80% of students will score a high passing grade of 80% or higher on the instructor’s evaluation of the presentation in that course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of students passed the grade of 80% or higher on presentations.

**Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing**
80% of students will score a high passing grade of 80% or higher on the instructor’s evaluation of the presentation in that course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
95% of students passed the grade of 80% or higher on presentations.

**M 3: Evaluation of work experience in sport business (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Work experience in final credit hours; evaluated by specified professor in conjunction with the worksite supervisor. This evaluation will be conducted with an evaluation form developed by the faculty. The form contains a rating scale of 1 to 5 on appropriate areas such as "arrives to work on time," and "performs duties assigned accurately and on time." The form also contains a section in which the evaluator may write other information regarding the student’s performance.

**Target for O1: Understands socio-cultural context of sport**
85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
100% of students successfully completed work experience in the sport business industry; all scored a grade of "satisfactory."

**Target for O2: Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business**
85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.
### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students successfully completed work experience in the sport business industry; all scored a grade of "satisfactory."

### Target for O4: Has work experience in sport business industry

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students successfully completed work experience in the sport business industry; all scored a grade of "satisfactory."

### Target for O5: Can develop financial planning for sports

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students successfully completed work experience in the sport business industry; all scored a grade of "satisfactory."

### Target for O6: Describes sport management functions

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students successfully completed work experience in the sport business industry; all scored a grade of "satisfactory."

### Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students successfully completed work experience in the sport business industry; all scored a grade of "satisfactory."

### M 4: Major Projects (O: 3, 7)

The student will demonstrate conceptual understanding of unique aspects of sport business in major projects in courses. Each instructor will evaluate the projects with an emphasis on the accuracy of the application of course content to the project; organization of the project; and accuracy of research material used for the project.

### Target for O3: Can conduct sport business research

80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher) on the major project.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students scored a passing grade on the project.

### Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing

80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher) on the major project.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students scored a passing grade on the project.

### M 5: Papers (O: 1, 3, 4, 7)

Papers in each course will be evaluated by the instructor of that course. Evaluation emphasis will be on writing skills, coverage and accuracy of the content, and accurate citation with review of literature. Evaluation will be of equal parts of each item.

### Target for O1: Understands socio-cultural context of sport

80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students scored a passing grade (80% and above) on the examination.

### Target for O3: Can conduct sport business research

80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.

### Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met

100% of students scored a passing grade (80% and above) on the examination.

### Target for O4: Has work experience in sport business industry

80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.
Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of students scored a passing grade (80% and above) on the examination.

Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of students scored a passing grade (80% and above) on the examination.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Monitor levels of student performance.
Although all objectives were met for this assessment year, we will monitor every facet of the program in the new assessment year because this year will involve new students.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>Can conduct sport business research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of work experience in sport business</td>
<td>Can develop financial planning for sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing</td>
<td>Describes sport management functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business</td>
<td>Understands socio-cultural context of sport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>Can conduct sport business research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>Can conduct sport business research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has work experience in sport business industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Can conduct sport business research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: September 1, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Brenda Pitts, Professor, Sport Administration; Andy Doyle, DeptChair, Interim Program Coordinator
Additional Resources: Faculty with expertise in the content areas of sport law, sport finance, organizational behavior in sport, and sport sociology; increased department support of resources for teaching and research.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Based on the findings of 2005-06, our students continue to demonstrate competence in the content of sport management.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Because this program is large (student enrollment) compared to its number of faculty (2.5), it was considered that to improve the level of performance, it is necessary that the department/college/university continue and increase the current level of support for faculty lines with expertise in sport law, sport finance, organizational behavior in sport, and sport sociology; increased department support of resources for teaching and research.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Sports Medicine MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The program for the major in sports medicine prepares students for career opportunities in the field of athletic training. The program includes course work and laboratory experiences in the prevention, management, evaluation, and rehabilitation of athletic injuries. The purpose of this program is to provide qualified candidates with in-depth experiences beyond entry-level athletic training expectations. Additionally, all students must complete a minimum of 400 hours of clinical experience in an approved setting as part of the degree program requirements.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities (M: 1, 2, 7)
Students will demonstrate both practical and cognitive knowledge of therapeutic modalities.
O/O 2: Understands importance of professional development (M: 3, 4)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional development, responsibilities, and its importance to their continued growth in their chosen field.

O/O 3: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care (M: 5)
Students develop advance proficiency in the acute care and management of activity related injury and illness.

O/O 4: Demonstrates effective health Care Administration (M: 3)
Students through daily participation, demonstrate administrative functions in a variety of health care settings.

O/O 5: Understands and interprets current research (M: 6)
Students demonstrate knowledge and understanding of current research methods, and are able to read and interpret current research in their field.

O/O 6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt. (M: 2, 7)
Students demonstrate knowledge in orthopedic assessment and evaluation management.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Proficiency Exam (O: 1)
Students must demonstrate clinical proficiency on therapeutic modality units.

Target for O1: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
90% of students will demonstrate 90% or better proficiency scores on the required modalities.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
ALL STUDENTS DEMONSTRATED 100% PROFICIENCY ON REQUIRED MODALITIES.

M 2: Final Competency Exam (O: 1, 6)
Students will demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of curricular material.

Target for O1: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
90% of the students will demonstrate a 3.5/5 on the comprehensive examinations at the completion of their course work, prior to graduation.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
ALL STUDENTS PASSED THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAM WITH A 3.5/5.

Target for O6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.
90% of the students will demonstrate a 3.5/5 on the comprehensive examinations at the completion of their course work, prior to graduation.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
ALL STUDENTS PASSED THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAM WITH A 3.5/5.

M 3: Clinical Site Evaluation (O: 2, 4)
Site evaluations are performed twice yearly.

Target for O2: Understands importance of professional development.
By the completion of two years, 90% of students will have achieved an average score of 4/5 on all evaluative criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% OF STUDENTS ACHIEVED TARGETTED OUTCOMES.

Target for O4: Demonstrates effective health Care Administration
By the completion of two years, 90% of students will have achieved an average score of 4/5 on all evaluative criteria.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% OF STUDENTS ACHIEVED TARGETTED OUTCOMES.

M 4: Professional Presentations (O: 2)
To gain full understanding of professional issues, students must present a minimum of twice annually in a peer setting on a relevant professional issue.

Target for O2: Understands importance of professional development.
90% of students will complete two professional presentation per year.
**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% OF STUDENTS COMPLETED TWO PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

**M 5: Acute Care Certifications (O: 3)**

Students will obtain either AHA or Red Cross Professional CPR certification and Red Cross Emergency Responder Certification

**Target for O3: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care**

90% of all students obtain and maintain CPR certification

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% OF STUDENTS OBTAINED AND MAINTAINED PROFESSIONAL LEVEL CPR CERTIFICATION

**M 6: Thesis or Research Project (O: 5)**

Students must complete a thesis or research project prior to graduation

**Target for O5: Understands and interprets current research**

100% of students obtain and maintain CPR certification

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% OF STUDENTS OBTAINED AND MAINTAINED PROFESSIONAL LEVEL CPR CERTIFICATION

**M 7: Case Study (O: 1, 6)**

Students will demonstrate proficiency in completing all aspects of the case study by the end of the graduate program. The case study was designed to incorporate all aspects of health care charting, teaching the various means of initial injury evaluation, (all five essential components), the main components of treatment planning, and then the primary components of treatment and rehabilitation progression. The template was also designed to meet both collegiate setting requirements and state and federal reporting mandates.

**Target for O1: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities**

80% of students will complete 100% of a challenging case study, and demonstrate a proficiency of 70% or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

80% OF STUDENTS ACHIEVED A 70% OR BETTER ON THE FINAL CASE STUDY

**Target for O6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.**

80% of students will complete 100% of a challenging case study, and demonstrate a proficiency of 70% or better.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

80% OF STUDENTS ACHIEVED A 70% OR BETTER ON THE FINAL CASE STUDY

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Maintain and monitor**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Case Study | **Outcome/Objective:** Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.
- **Measure:** Final Competency Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.
- **Measure:** Final Competency Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

The Graduate Program in Sports Medicine demonstrates strengths in both cognitive and clinical applications. Students demonstrate knowledge in the classroom, and then apply this knowledge in a practical setting, that can be evaluated. This practical approach is bridged through assessment techniques such as proficiency exams and practical exams. The case study evaluations also teach a variety of applications that are then assessed for application in a real-life classroom setting. The program is clearly doing a good job of transferring knowledge from the book, to the practical, and then out to a variety of clinical settings, and assessing this knowledge application. This is a broad program strength and we, the program faculty will continue to emphasize the importance of these learning experiences.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued
Continued diligence on the part of the faculty is becoming a daily necessity to insure professionalism on the part of our students. To maintain the performance objectives as stated in the outcomes of the Professional Development Area, Measure Number 5 is becoming increasingly challenging. An increasing amount of work is required to intervene with students and teach professional behaviors and life skills, such that they function in a work setting, can negotiate appropriate interpersonal skills, and perform basic daily functions, such as arriving on time and dressed appropriately are becoming evident. This detracts from the instruction of more advanced concepts and places an increased burden on the program faculty. Continued attention and due diligence in this area will be required to meet our program standards.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Sports Science PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
( Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Kinesiology and Health in accord with the College of Education and the other colleges and departments of the university seeks an ever increasing degree of excellence in a wide variety of programs. The Department's mission includes instruction, research and scholarly activity, and community service in the areas of exercise science, sports administration, sports medicine, health and physical education, and recreation. The department provides professional preparation and continuing education in each of these fields, generates and communicates knowledge, and serves the community with particular emphasis on the urban setting of which it is a part. The Department recognizes the necessity of cross cultural competence and actively supports international development activities in research, teaching and service. Although the department is diverse in the disciplines it embraces, the members of the faculty are united in their interdisciplinary commitment to the highest quality in all of these pursuits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Develop an understanding of research (M: 1, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That graduates understand the concepts and application of exercise physiology and biomechanics research methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Technology--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrate good cultural sensitivity skills (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates are prepared to work with individuals who are culturally and individually different</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Embrace subspecialties to strengthen skills (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the program will have a subspecialty that strengthens their skills in their major concentration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quantitative Skills--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Technology--major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Develop grant writing and management skills (M: 4)

Graduates are prepared for careers that involve grant writing and management skills

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication--major
2. Collaboration--major
3. Critical Thinking--major
4. Quantitative Skills--major
5. Technology--major

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 5: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers (M: 2, 3)

Prepare graduates for careers as professors and researchers in higher and research institutions

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Collaboration--major
4. Critical Thinking--major
5. Quantitative Skills--major
6. Technology--major

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Pass statistics and research methods tests (O: 1)

That students successfully pass courses and projects that include statistical and research design and methods components

**Target for O1: Develop an understanding of research**

That 100% of successful students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: **Met**

Successful students from this program have met this requirement

#### M 2: Complete comprehensive exams and dissertation (O: 5)

Students pass comprehensive exams and write dissertations that make a contribution to the exercise physiology literature

**Target for O5: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers**

That 95% of students will successfully complete these requirements

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: **Met**

All students that complete the program have successfully passed these requirements

#### M 3: Refereed scientific papers at conferences (O: 1, 5)

Students must present papers at professional conferences before they are allowed to sit for comprehensive exams

**Target for O1: Develop an understanding of research**

That 100% of students complete this requirement

**Findings 2005-2006** - Target: **Met**
Of students that complete the program, 100% have presented at professional conferences before comps

**Target for O5: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers**
That 100% of students complete this requirement

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
Of students that complete the program, 100% have presented at professional conferences before comps

**M 4: Successful completion of seminars (O: 4)**
Successful completion of seminars and dissertation grant proposals

**Target for O4: Develop grant writing and management skills**
That 95% of graduates will meet this requirement

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
That 100% of graduates have met these requirements

**M 5: Completion of cognate requirement (O: 3)**
Successful completion of the cognate portion of their doctoral program

**Target for O3: Embrace subspecialties to strengthen skills**
That 100% of students that successfully complete the program will develop these skills

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All graduates of the program have successfully met this requirement

**M 6: Projects and exams within courses (O: 2)**
Cultural and individual sensitivity will be emphasized in coursework

**Target for O2: Demonstrate good cultural sensitivity skills**
That 100% of successful students in this program will successfully pass exams and projects that include this information

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
All graduates have successfully satisfied this requirement

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Enhance research component to program**
Faculty mentor students on research projects to insure they develop the research skills needed to complete research

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Pass statistics and research methods tests | Outcome/Objective: Develop an understanding of research
  - Measure: Referred scientific papers at conferences | Outcome/Objective: Develop an understanding of research

- **Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Physiology Faculty

**Enhance research design and completion skills**
Work with students in designing and carrying out research projects

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Referred scientific papers at conferences | Outcome/Objective: Develop an understanding of research
  - Measure: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers

- **Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty

**Implement annual reveiw of student development**
The graduate faculty will reveiw the progress of the students annually to insure appropriate development

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Completion of cognate requirement | Outcome/Objective: Embrace subspecialties to strengthen skills
  - Measure: Pass statistics and research methods tests | Outcome/Objective: Develop an understanding of research
Increase research involvement with advisor
To involve students more regularly in research with their advisor

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Complete comprehensive exams and dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers
  Measure: Refereed scientific papers at conferences | Outcome/Objective: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers

Maintain a program focus on improvement
That the graduate faculty maintain a strong focus to insure that continuous program improvement occurs

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Successful completion of seminars | Outcome/Objective: Develop grant writing and management skills

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessments showed that the students have a high level of exercise physiology knowledge and they have a good level of research and teaching skills for individuals completing a doctoral degree.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although they have relative good research skill, aiding students in developing better research and teaching skills will require continued faculty effort.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Studio Art BFA
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Studio Art BFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible undergraduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways:

• Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills
• Expand students understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts
• Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world
• Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Collaborative/Group Skills - Senior Level (M: 3)
Successfully participates in the Senior group exhibition for all BFA candidates.
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 Collaboration--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 11)
Demonstrates analytical skills in assessing and engaging formal concepts and original concepts in the visual arts
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 3: Communication (M: 1)
Effectively relays ideas and responses in oral and/or written communication as it relates to the visual arts
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 4: Analytical Skills (M: 10)
Effectively engages analytical skills in examining the visual arts and art history
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 5: Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level (M: 2)
 Participates in and contributes to course group assignments and class group critiques
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Quantitative Skills (M: 4)**
Demonstrates knowledge relating to perception, proportion, color, materials in studio work
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
11 Quantitative Skills--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 7: Technical Skill (M: 12)**
Demonstrates in studio work formal, perceptual, and technical skills in the visual arts
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 8: Interdisciplinary Knowledge (M: 5)**
Employs cross disciplinary and experimental approaches in the visual arts
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
9 Contemporary Issues--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 9: Technology (M: 6)**
Creates work that reflects a sound knowledge of technology as it relates to visual art
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity  

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty  
4.3 Technology  
6.2 Undergraduate Experience  

**SLO 10: Health and Safety (M: 8)**
Carries out safe studio practices that are informed by complete knowledge of the health and safety issues in the visual arts  
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9 Contemporary Issues--major  

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity  

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience  

**SLO 11: Contemporary Issues (M: 9)**
Demonstrates contextual knowledge of art theory and critical issues in contemporary art  
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major  
9 Contemporary Issues--major  

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity  

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience  

**SLO 12: Historical Knowledge (M: 13)**
Knowledge of broad factors that influence art  
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major  
3 Oral Communication--major  
7 Critical Thinking--major  

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity  

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience  

**SLO 13: Multi-cultural awareness (M: 7)**
Indicates an awareness of the diversity of cultural influences and cultural histories in the visual arts  
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9 Contemporary Issues--major  

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness  
1.3 Quality professional programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 14: Professional Preparation in the Arts (M: 14)**

Knowledge relating to professional practices in the visual arts as demonstrated in artist’s statement, professional resume and portfolio presentation.

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major (O: 3)**

Written essay submitted that details information about the student’s portfolio of art and why the student has chosen this art discipline.

**Target for O3: Communication**

Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to area disciplines as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to selected majors. Students not accepted into a major have the option to reapply or pursue the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 103 students evaluated 76% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.5. The target score goal is 4.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

76% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 3.5 exceeded the minimum goal.

**M 2: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 5)**

Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.

**Target for O5: Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level**

Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to area disciplines as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to selected majors. Students not accepted into a major have the option to reapply or pursue the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 103 students evaluated 64% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.3. The target score goal is 4.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

64% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 3.3 exceeded the minimum goal.

**M 3: BFA Art Exhibition (O: 1)**

A group art exhibition of artwork by all BFA candidates.

**Target for O1: Collaborative/ Group Skills - Senior Level**

Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 80% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.2. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

80% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 4.2 exceeded the minimum goal.

**M 4: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 6)**

Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.

**Target for O6: Quantitative Skills**

Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to area disciplines as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to selected majors. Students not accepted into a major have the option to reapply or pursue the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 103 students evaluated 68% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score
was 3.4. The target score goal is 4.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
68% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 3.4 exceeded the minimum goal.

**M 5: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 8)**
Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.

**Target for O8: Interdisciplinary Knowledge**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 74% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.6. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
74% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 4.6 exceeded the minimum goal.

**M 6: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork on CD (O: 9)**
Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950 submitted on CD.

**Target for O9: Technology**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 90% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.2. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
90% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 4.2 exceeded the minimum goal.

**M 7: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 13)**
Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.

**Target for O13: Multi-cultural awareness**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 93% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.7. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
93% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 4.7 exceeded the minimum goal.

**M 8: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 10)**
Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.

**Target for O10: Health and Safety**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 91% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.6. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
91% of the students met the goal. The average score of 4.6 exceeded the target goal.

**M 9: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 11)**
Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 70% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
70% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score was 4.

**M 10: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 4)**
Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.

**Target for O4: Analytical Skills**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to area disciplines as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to selected majors. Students not accepted into a major have the option to reapply or pursue the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 103 students evaluated 70% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.4. The target score goal is 4.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
70% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 3.4 exceeded the minimum goal.
M 11: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 2)

Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills

Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to area disciplines as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to selected majors. Students not accepted into a major have the option to reapply or pursue the AB in Studio Art degree. Out of the 103 students evaluated 72% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.5. The target score goal is 4.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

72% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 3.5 exceeded the minimum goal.

M 12: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 7)

Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.

Target for O7: Technical Skill

Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 72% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.5. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

72% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 4.5 exceeded the minimum goal.

M 13: Senior Level Final Artist Statement (O: 12)

Senior level artist’s statement submitted with final portfolio as evidence of knowledge and understanding of ones own artistic practice and competence in writing and communication skills.

Target for O12: Historical Knowledge

Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 83% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.3. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

83% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 4.3 exceeded the minimum goal.

M 14: Professional Resume (O: 14)

Professional artist resume submitted.

Target for O14: Professional Preparation in the Arts

Scoring from 1 - 6. Students evaluated were seniors accepted into the BFA program. Out of the 47 students evaluated 87% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.7. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met

87% of the students met the minimum goal. The average score of 4.7 exceeded the minimum goal.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Faculty/Committee Meetings

Area faculty will meet with Associate Director Conne Thalken as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Art Exhibition</td>
<td>Collaborative/ Group Skills - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork</td>
<td>Analytical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Resume</td>
<td>Professional Preparation in the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Artist Statement</td>
<td>Historical Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork on CD</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Early Spring 2007

Responsible Person/Group: Assoc. Director C. Thalken and faculty representatives of all studio disciplines

Additional Resources: As yet undetermined. Will have better idea after meeting.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Progress is seen in quality in all areas of student work and effort after courses taken within the major. Student work shows greater
Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
The Ernest G. Welch school of Art and Design showed strong performance in all areas of evaluation in 2005-2006. Faculty members were active in professional development with a number of exhibitions in major venues, many articles published and numerous conference presentations. Two faculty members received important external grants: Florencia Bazzano – Nelson received a Getty Foundation grant for $20,000. 00; and Ruth Stanford received a Heinz Foundation grant for $27,000.00. Both grants were given to support research. The Gallery was awarded a prestigious Warhol Foundation Grant of $50,000.00 to support “Potentially Harmful: Art of the Counterfeit” exhibition and related activities. In teaching Maria Gindhart received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award and Cheryl Goldsleger received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award. George Beasley was honored with the Phoenix Award from the City of Atlanta. Several faculty members lead Studies Abroad programs to Egypt, France, Ghana, Italy and Russia. Integration continues to find exciting ways to integrate technology into the academic experience. Director Ralph Gilbert was appointed Associate Dean for the Fine Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences as of July 1 and Cheryl Goldsleger was appointed Director of the School of Art and Design as of the same date. Work to complete the renovations begun in the summer of 2005 is still underway and, although not complete, progress has been made. All faculty members in the Arts and Humanities Building anticipate a much better facility upon completion and are diligently working toward that end. Work has also begun in the Sculpture Building to improve safety, ventilation and work environment. The Learning Outcomes Assessment process met with greater success this year with all faculty participating. All sophomore level students applying to BFA major disciplines were evaluated and all graduating senior students were evaluated this year. The report should allow for greater insights into curricular issues. On a final note, the Chandler family added another $10,000.00 to the endowment fund to support graduate students that they started a few years ago. And, we celebrated the 100th birthday of Ernest G. Welch on May 3rd with an enjoyable luncheon party.

Contributions to the Institution

Highlights
a. Stan Anderson 1. Nominee, University Instructional Innovation Award, the Center for Teaching and Learning, GSU b. Florencia Bazzano-Nelson 1. J. Paul Getty Postdoctoral Research Fellowship in History of Arts and Humanities c. George Beasley 1. Phoenix Award, City of Atlanta, Shirley Franklin, Mayor of Atlanta, Feb. 4, 2005 (for education and professionalism in Sculpture) 2. Recognition Award, Sloss National Historic Landmark, Birmingham, AL, April 7, 2005 (for co-founding Metal Arts Program) d. Craig Dongoski 1. CENCIA (Collaborative) Grant, ($4,200.00) from College of Arts and Sciences, GSU – biofeedback machine to use collaboratively to produce soundtracks for two performances and to use in classes exploring how the act of drawing affects brainwaves e. Paula Eubanks 1. CENCIA grant ($4500) with Michael White and Richard Laub for a project involving Plum Orchard on Cumberland Island e. Maria Gindhart 1. Received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award, 2005 2. Awarded Writing Across the Curriculum grant f. Cheryl Goldsleger 1. Received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award, GSU g. Melinda Hartwig 1. 2005 Nominee for Outstanding Junior Faculty h. Melody Milbrandt 1. Division Director – Elect, Higher Education Division, National Art Education Association i. Kathy King 1. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Denmark. 2. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Hungary. 3. Residency Recipient, Haystack Mountain School of Crafts, Deers Isle, Maine, Fall 2005 j. Pam Longobardi 1. Commission, Benziger Winery, Sonoma, CA 2. Commission, Lyn Kocen Architect, Richmond, VA k. Joe Peragine 1. Nomination, Louis Comfort Tiffany Foundation Award l. Ruth Stanford 1. Artist Residency Grant, Heinz Foundation, Creative Heights with the Mattress Factory Museum, Pittsburgh, PA m. Matthew Sugarman 1. Honorable Mention, Bird 2005 International Award, 2. Work acquired by the Beijing Natural Culture Center, China n. Conne Thalken 1. 2005 Outstanding Teaching Award Nominee, College of Arts and Sciences, GSU College Development o. $10,000.00 donation from the Winnie Chandler Foundation, Atlanta Alumni Relations p. Celebrated 100th birthday with a party for Ernest G. Welch, alumni and benefactor of the School of Art and Design, May 3, 2006

Challenges
Implementation of New Methods for assessing learning a. The School of Art and Design instituted a new method of collecting data for the Learning Outcomes Assessment project. This new method required each discipline within the School submit an area annual report. Reports were turned in to the Director as of May 15 and are being processed for the School of Art and Design Learning Outcomes Assessment report due in August. b. Reports indicate areas assing undergraduates at the entry level to their chosen art program and at graduation. Please refer to Learning Outcomes Assessment Report as of August 1, 2006. Implementation of academic and non-academic process changes a. Requests have been made to reclassify staff to address work load distribution and academic advising needs within the school. This reclassification came about due to the death of Tim Lodzinski, an A&D staff member, this past year. This reclassification will provide staff for excellence in academic advising in art and for better student-faculty interaction. 2. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Denmark. 3. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Hungary. 4. Residency Recipient, Haystack Mountain School of Crafts, Deers Isle, Maine, Fall 2005 j. Pam Longobardi 1. Commission, Benziger Winery, Sonoma, CA 2. Commission, Lyn Kocen Architect, Richmond, VA k. Joe Peragine 1. Nomination, Louis Comfort Tiffany Foundation Award l. Ruth Stanford 1. Artist Residency Grant, Heinz Foundation, Creative Heights with the Mattress Factory Museum, Pittsburgh, PA m. Matthew Sugarman 1. Honorable Mention, Bird 2005 International Award, 2. Work acquired by the Beijing Natural Culture Center, China n. Conne Thalken 1. 2005 Outstanding Teaching Award Nominee, College of Arts and Sciences, GSU College Development o. $10,000.00 donation from the Winnie Chandler Foundation, Atlanta Alumni Relations. Celebrated 100th birthday with a party for Ernest G. Welch, alumni and benefactor of the School of Art and Design, May 3, 2006

maturity from sophomore level work to senior level work. The majority of student exceed goals in most areas of evaluation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention? Not all students meet minimum goals. Stronger performance desired by larger percentage of students.
safety concerns in the Edgewood facility. $200,000.00 has been allocated from the University to fix ventilation and safety problems in the Sculpture Building on Edgewood Ave. The following list of progress is a result of this project. a. Downdraft welding and cutting tables are currently being installed in the sculpture facility b. Stop brakes for grinders: one has been installed and is working properly; the other was not working properly and has been reordered. c. Wax working area wall has been built d. Welding curtain has been installed e. Improvements to the ventilation system have not yet been installed. Contractor plans to start pre-construction meetings after the 2005 NASAD Convention. 2. 220Volt circuits have been added. c. Stainless steel fume hood in art metal patina area - Not yet addressed h. Chemical vent hood for metal patina area - Not yet addressed 5. Major findings from self studies and peer reviews regarding institutional effectiveness a. The major findings from the Self Study / peer review included: converting 3 visiting lecturer positions to tenure-track positions, hire 5 additional tenure track faculty members; safety improvements, upgrade ventilation and renovate facilities; improve advising. 2. Please see facilities improvements listed in A. 4. 3. 2005-2006 hired new tenure track faculty in interior design and sculpture 4. Proposal put forward to reclassify current staff member as a full-time art academic advisor allowing for more individualized advising during reclassification 5. Proposal to hire a full-time safety and maintenance technician for sculpture facility to meet NASAD progress requirements. 6. Response to effectiveness – related accreditation requirements established by SACS, etc. 1. We continue to make progress and submit progress reports to NASAD on the items noted in the last NASAD report. Responses to improvements and upgrades to facilities have been very positive.

Teaching Activities
a. Craig Dongoski 1. Faculty, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy b. Melinda Hartwig 1. Study Abroad Course, “Egypt in the Age of the Pharaohs” at sites in Cairo, Luxor, Aswan, Egypt. May 2005 c. Pam Longobardi 1. Program Director, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy 2. Host, Brian Reffin Smith, Visiting Artist/Scholar, UK d. Melody Milbrandt 1. Led Study Abroad Program to Russia, Summer 2005 e. Teresa Bramlette-Reeves 1. Faculty, Univ. of West Georgia Study Abroad in France, Bayeux and Paris, France f. Miriama Ross 1. Program Director, Ghana Study Abroad Program, Summer Semester. g. GSU Technology for Instruction a. Art Education 1. Initiated use of i-Earn, a commercial educational website, designed to link teachers globally b. Art History 1. Developed use of ARTstor image database funded by Student Technology fee - $12,500.00 renewed for upcoming year. 2. Increased use of web pages for dissemination of digital images related to courses 3. Continue to develop digital database with Visual Resources Center 4. Student Technology Fee grant to provide hardware and software for storage, distribution and scholarly research. c. $73,747.00 c. Ceramics 1. R2400: Form and Surface. Introduction and innovative use of digital technology with Photoshop and digital imaging techniques for ceramic decal production and application techniques. d. Drawing, Painting and Printmaking 1. DP 4000: Special Topics – Animation Impulse, introduced students to Photoshop, Flash and iMovie software e. Graphic Design 1. Liz Throop was the primary investigator for 2005 Technology fee grant, $111,500.00 awarded. 2. Taught GR 4310 students Flash MX04 software f. Interior Design 1. Developed and applied for Student Technology Fee Grant for GSU IDEAS lab (Interior Design Electronically Assisted Studio) installation. Received 75% of funding requested g. Design 1. Received $221,000. Designed and developed a new graduate tech lab as part of redesign of east side of A&H third floor a. Graduate: 4 computer stations dedicated to grad students. g. Creative Media Center 1. Received Student Tech Fee grant for updating shared resources for media center. Includes upgrades for hardware and software. $190,366.00 h. Room 211 upgrades. 1. Upgrade software in lab room 211.

Research and Scholarly Activities

Public/Community Service
a. Stan Anderson 1. Field trip for students to Claxton Printers one of the southeast’s oldest printers b. Florencia Bazzano – Nelson

Research and Scholarly Activities

Public/Community Service
a. Stan Anderson 1. Field trip for students to Claxton Printers one of the southeast’s oldest printers b. Florencia Bazzano – Nelson

International Activities
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Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Studio Art MFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible graduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways:

- Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills
- Expand students understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts
- Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world
- Engage and collaborate with local state, regional and national institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Research and Critical Thinking (M: 6)

High Level of competence in one medium including relevant technical, historical and critical theory issues

Relevant Associations:

- National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Critical Thinking--major
4. Contemporary Issues--major
Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Cross Disciplinary knowledge (M: 2)
Cross Disciplinary and experimental approaches to studio practice
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Collaboration (M: 1)
Relating to interdisciplinary projects within the studio practice
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Communication (M: 4)
Broad awareness of contemporary art and critical issues
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Advanced Research Skills (M: 3)
The ability to do advanced research in studio practice with regard to context, history, contemporary issues, materials and techniques
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 6: Professional Skills (M: 5)
Professional skills relating to all aspects of presentation of own artwork.
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: MFA Solo Exhibition (O: 3)
A solo exhibition of work done in last two to four semesters of graduate study.

Target for O3: Collaboration
Scoring from 1 - 6. Out of the 17 students evaluated 88% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.5 for outcome. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
88% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.
M 2: Portfolio (O: 2)
Graduate final portfolio of artwork completed during final two years of program of study including thesis year work.

**Target for O2: Cross Disciplinary knowledge**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Out of the 17 students evaluated 88% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.7. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
88% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 3: Thesis Paper (O: 5)
Written paper detailing multiple aspects of studio practice.

**Target for O5: Advanced Research Skills**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Out of the 17 students evaluated 76% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.5 for outcome. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
76% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 4: Thesis Paper (O: 4)
Written paper detailing multiple aspects of studio practice.

**Target for O4: Communication**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Out of the 17 students evaluated 88% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.6 for outcome. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
88% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 5: Professional Resume (O: 6)
Professional artist resume highlighting educational and professional accomplishments

**Target for O6: Professional Skills**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Out of the 17 students evaluated 82% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.9 for outcome. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
82% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 6: Portfolio (O: 1)
Graduate final portfolio of artwork completed during final two years of program of study including thesis year work.

**Target for O1: Research and Critical Thinking**
Scoring from 1 - 6. Out of the 17 students evaluated 94% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 4. The average score was 4.6. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
94% of the students met the goal with the average score. The area faculty members seek stronger performance.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Area Faculty/Committee Meetings**
Area faculty will meet with Associate Director Conne Thalken as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Cross Disciplinary knowledge
- Measure: Critical Thinking
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Research Skills
- Communication

**Implementation Description:** Early Spring 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Assoc. Director C. Thalken and faculty representatives of all studio disciplines
**Additional Resources:** As yet undetermined. Will have better idea after faculty committee meeting.
Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
The Ernest G. Welch School of Art and Design showed strong performance in all areas of evaluation in 2005-2006. Faculty members were active in professional development with a number of exhibitions in major venues, many articles published and numerous conference presentations. Two faculty members received important external grants: Florencia Bazzano – Nelson received a Getty Foundation grant for $20,000.00; and Ruth Stanford received a Heinz Foundation grant for $27,000.00. Both grants were given to support research. The Gallery was awarded a prestigious Warhol Foundation Grant of $50,000.00 to support “Potentially Harmful: The Art of Censorship” exhibition and related activities. In teaching Maria Gindhart received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award and Cheryl Goldsleger received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award. George Beasley was honored with the Phoenix Award from the City of Atlanta. Several faculty members lead Studies Abroad programs to Egypt, France, Ghana, Italy and Russia. Technology integration continues to progress with more students learning new and varied ways to integrate technology into the artistic and academic work. Director Ralph Gilbert was appointed Associate Dean for the Fine Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences as of July 1 and Cheryl Goldsleger was appointed Director of the School of Art and Design as of the same date. Work to complete the renovations began in the summer of 2005 is still underway and, although not complete, progress has been made. All faculty members in the Arts and Humanities Building anticipate a much better facility upon completion and are diligently working toward that end. Work has also begun in the Sculpture Building to improve safety, ventilation and work environment. The Learning Outcomes Assessment process met with greater success this year with all faculty participating. All sophomore level students applying to BFA major disciplines were evaluated and all graduating senior students were evaluated this year. The report should allow for greater insights into curricular issues. On a final note, the Chandler family added an additional $10,000,000.00 to the endowment fund to support graduate students that they started a few years ago. And, we celebrated the 100th birthday of Ernest G. Welch on May 3rd with an enjoyable luncheon party.

Contributions to the Institution

Highlights
a. Stan Anderson 1. Nominee, University Instructional Innovation Award, the Center for Teaching and Learning, GSU b. Florencia Bazzano-Nelson 1. J. Paul Getty Postdoctoral Research Fellowship in History of Arts and Humanities c. George Beasley 1. Phoenix Award, City of Atlanta. Shirley Franklin, Mayor of Atlanta, Feb. 4, 2005 (for education and professionalism in Sculpture) 2. Recognition Award, Sloss National Historic Landmark, Birmingham, AL, April 7, 2005 (for co-founding Metal Arts Program) d. Craig Dongoski 1. CENCIA (Collaborative) Grant, ($4,200.00) from College of Arts and Sciences, GSU – biofeedback machine to use collaboratively to produce soundtracks for two performances and to use in classes exploring how the act of drawing affects brainwaves e. Paula Eubanks 1. CENCIA grant ($4500) with Michael White and Richard Laub for a project involving Plum Orchard on Cumberland Island e. Maria Gindhart 1. Received the Distinguished Honors Professor Award, 2005 2. Awarded Writing Across the Curriculum grant f. Cheryl Goldsleger 1. Received the University Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award, GSU g. Melinda Hartwig 1. 2005 Nominee for Outstanding Junior Faculty h. Melody Milbrandt 1. Division Director – Elect, Higher Education Division, National Art Education Association i. Kathy King 1. Finalist, National Council for Education in the Ceramic Arts International Residency, Fall 2005. Selected as finalist and invited to apply for international residency in Hungary. 2. Residency Recipient, Haystack Mountain School of Crafts, Deer Isle, Maine, Fall 2005 j. Pam Longobardi 1. Commission, Benziger Winery, Benziger Winery Museum, Sonoma, CA 2. Commission, Lyn Kocen Architect, Richmond, VA K. Joe Peragine 1. Nomination, Louis Comfort Tiffany Foundation Award 1. Ruth Stanford 1. Artist Residency Grant, Heinz Foundation, Creative Heights with the Mattress Factory Museum, Pittsburgh, PA m. Matthew Sugarman 1. Honorable Mention, Bird 2005 International Award, 2. Work acquired by the Beijing Natural Culture Center, China n. Conne Thalken 1. Outstanding Teaching Award Nominee, College of Arts and College Development a. $10,000.00 donation from the Winnie Chandler Foundation, Atlanta Alumni Relations a. Celebrated 100th birthday with a party for Ernest G. Welch, alumni and benefactor of the School of Art and Design, May 3, 2006 Challenges

Implementation of New Methods for assessing learning a. The School of Art and Design established a new method of collecting data for the Learning Outcomes Assessment project. This new method requires each discipline within the School submit an area annual report. Reports were turned in to the Director as of May 15 and are being processed for the School of Art and Design Learning Outcomes Assessments report due August 1. Reports included input from all area faculty members assessing undergraduates at the entry level to their chosen art program and at graduation. Please refer to Learning Outcomes Assessment Report as of August 1, 2006. Implementation of academic and non-academic process changes a. Requests have been made to reclassify staff to address work load distribution and academic advising needs within the school. This reclassification came about due to the death of Tim Lodzinski, an A&D staff member, this past year. This reclassification will provide staff for excellence in academic advising in art and for superior facilities management. b. A request has been submitted to the College for a new staff member in charge of safety, maintenance and shop procedures for the Sculpture area on Edgewood Avenue 4. Evidence of improvement in specific area as a result of assessment based changes a. The National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), our accreditation organization, required facilities and health and safety improvements in the Arts and Humanities Building. Also, based on student and alumni responses to Self-Study survey questions that became part of the Action Plan, improvements to the facilities were rated highly necessary. 1. State Funding provided $3,560,000.00 to improve HVAC, elevators, and building infrastructure upgrades to correct unsafe working conditions in the School of Art and Design. Renovations to the A&D Building during the summer and fall of 2005

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
More than 50% of MFA students meet or exceed our target goal of a score of 5 for each outcome.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Faculty committee will investigate ways to satisfy our target goal at 100% and present ideas at a Learnig assessment forum for the School of Art and Design to be held in early Spring 2007.
achieved improved ventilation in areas that were poorly ventilated, noise reduction and studio and lighting configuration improvements. A net square footage gain for the School of Art and Design within the Arts and Humanities Building improves studios and labs for visual arts undergraduate and graduate students and allows for studio spaces for graduate students in the areas of photography, art education, interior design and graphic design for the first time. Currently follow up on unfinished, overlooked and incorrectly completed modifications during the renovation are underway. These are being addressed through complaints filed with the contractors, College assistance and with donations from Art and Design funds permit. Areas with critical problems due to incorrect renovations are ceramics and photo. 2. After a recommendation from NASA and a $20,000.00 study assessed major health and safety concerns in the Edgewood facility, $200,000.00 has been allocated by the University to fix ventilation and safety problems in the Sculpture Building on Edgewood Ave. The following list is a summary of progress with this project.

### Teaching Activities

1. Craig Dongoski 1. Faculty, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy b. Melinda Hartwig 1. Study Abroad Course, "Egypt in the Age of the Pharaohs" at sites in Cairo, Luxor, Aswan, Egypt. May 2005 c. Pam Longobardi 1. Program Director, Study Abroad, Santa Reparata International School of Art, Florence, Italy d. Melody Milbrandt 1. Led Study Abroad Program to Russia, Summer 2005 e. Teresa Bramlette-Reeves 1. Faculty, Univ. of West Georgia Study Abroad in France, Bayeux and Paris, France f. Miriama Ross 1. Program Director, Summer Study Abroad Program, Summer Geometry, GSU Technology for Instruction a. Art Education 1. Initiated use of I-Earn, a commercial educational website, designed to link teachers globally b. Art History 1. Doubled use of ARTstor image database funded by Student Technology fee - $12,500.00 renewal for upcoming year. 2. Increased use of web pages for dissemination of digital images related to courses 3. Continued development of digital database to provide software for storage, distribution, and presentation of images and scholarly material. $23,747.00 c. Ceramics 1. CER 4200: Form and Surface. Introduction and innovative use of digital technology with Photoshop and digital imaging techniques for ceramic decreal production and application techniques. d. Drawing, Painting and Printmaking 1. DP 4000: Special Topics – Animation Impulse, introduced students to Photoshop, Flash and Movie software e. Graphic Design 1. Liz Throop was the primary investigator for 2005 Technology fee grant, $111,500.00 awarded 2. Taught GRD 4310 students Flash MX04 software f. Interior Design 1. Developed and applied for Student Technology Fee Grant for GSU IDEAS lab (Interior Design Electronically Assisted Studio) including AutoCAD instruction. Received 75% of funding requested: $221,000. Designed all aspects of lab for Spring 2006 realization a. Undergraduate: 16 student computer stations, 1 instructor station 2. Developed a new graduate tech lab as part of redesign of east end of A&B 3rd floor lab a. Graduate: 4 computer stations dedicated to grad students g. Creative Media Center 1. Received student Technology Fee Grant for updating shared resources for media center. Includes upgrades for hardware and software h. $190,366.00. v. Room 211 upgrades. 1. Upgrade software in lab room 2. Upgrade software in lab room.
Jacksonville, Florida and The Morris Museum, Morristown, New Jersey x. Liz Throop y. Michael White 1. Completed Phase I for Medium Blue, a high tech start up in Atlanta. 5000 sq. ft. interior design

Public/Community Service


International Activities


Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section

2005-2006 Taxation MTX

As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The Master of Taxation (M.Tx.) program offers a variety of courses that provide students with opportunities to develop research, technical, and communication skills that tax professionals need to excel in their careers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Program Objective (M: 3)
To develop ability to conduct research
Relevant Associations: AACSB

SLO 2: Program Objective (M: 4)
The student should be able to locate relevant authority for resolving tax issues.
Relevant Associations: AACSB
**SLO 3: Program Objective (M: 5)**
The student should be able to evaluate relevant authority for resolving tax issues.
Relevant Associations: AACSB

**SLO 4: Program Objective (M: 1)**
Students should be able to correctly interpret tax authorities and apply them in unfamiliar settings.
Relevant Associations: AACSB

**SLO 5: Program Objective (M: 2)**
Students should be able to communicate effectively in writing and orally.
Relevant Associations: AACSB

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Performance on exams or other assignments. (O: 4)**
Performance on exams or other assignments in Taxation of Partnerships and Partners (Tx 8080) or Taxation of Corporations and Shareholders (Tx 8120).

**Target for O4: Program Objective**
Average score on each exam will be at least 70 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Maymester, the average scores on Exam 1, Exam II and the Final Exam were 77, 79, and 87 percent, respectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Effective Executive Communication (O: 5)**
Performance in Effective Executive Communication (BCom 8250) or communication assignments in an 8000-level course.

**Target for O5: Program Objective**
Students completed 4 exercises requiring them to write both a tax brief and tax memorandum on a related set of facts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on the initial year’s average performance, the target average score for the class is 80%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Performance on projects in Tax Research (O: 1)**
Performance on projects in Tax Research Tx8030).

**Target for O1: Program Objective**
Students in spring semester completed four exercises requiring them to identify tax issues related to a set of facts. Since this was the first semester we used these exercises, we plan to use this year’s average performance as the initial benchmark going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average performance score equaled 71 percent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average performance score equaled 71 percent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030) (O: 2)**
Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030)

**Target for O2: Program Objective**
Students in fall and spring semesters completed 20 exercises requiring them to formulate Boolean search requests to retrieve relevant cases and rulings for resolving specified tax issues. Since this was the first year we used these exercises, we plan to use this year’s average performance as the initial benchmark going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average performance score equaled 49 percent in fall and 44 percent in spring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030) (O: 3)**
Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030)

**Target for O3: Program Objective**
Students in fall and spring semesters completed 10 exercises requiring them to interpret tax law and reconcile conflicting provisions. Since this was the first year we used these exercises, we plan to use this year’s average performance as the initial benchmark going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Average performance score equaled 87 percent in fall and 79 percent in spring.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Tx 8030**
Provide more hands-on, in-class experiences for students in locating relevant cases and rulings as a follow-up to the exercises they complete outside class.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Summer 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of the course

**Tx 8120**
Since there is insufficient time to cover all current topics, consider eliminating the corporate tax return project or providing it as an additional exercise for students desiring the compliance experience.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Summer 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of the course

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Average performance was good given the difficult level of the exercises. Average performance was similar for the two semesters and may be adequate given the difficult level of the exercises. Average performance during the first year seems to be good. Technical skills of students in M.Tx program are strong.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
N/A

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Teaching & Learning EdS**

(As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 4)**
Educators demonstrate commitment to students and their learning and/or development.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

** Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 5)**
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

** Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 1)**
The educator demonstrates responsibility for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 2)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Participates in profession`s learning communities (M: 3)
The educator demonstrates how his/her personal growth is impacted through membership in one or more learning communities.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S program completers who were rated on Stars Standard 3 scored above an intermediate level (3) with regard to their ability to manage and monitor their students` learning and development.

M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S program completers who were rated on Stars Standard 4 scored above an intermediate level (3) with regard to their ability to reflect on and learn from their professional experiences.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

Target for O5: Participates in profession`s learning communities
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S program completers who were rated on Stars Standard 5 scored above an intermediate level (3) with regard to their participation in professional learning communities.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development**

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the Ed.S students who were rated on Stars Standard 1 with respect to their commitment to their students’ learning and development met the standard.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 2)**

A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development**

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of the Ed.S program completers who were rated on Stars Standard 2 scored above an intermediate level (3) with regard to their ability to apply expertise to ensure students’ learning and development.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Examination of Core Content and Delivery**

The Ed.S in Teaching and Learning has a core of courses taken by Ed.S students across concentrations. Faculty in the varying concentrations have expressed interest in a re-examination of the content of these courses in light of the recent move in the state to GPS and a desire to move to an e-portfolio system. There is an interest in also offering these courses in an online version. A restructuring of this content has the potential to address all objectives and to be assessed through all measures.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating</td>
<td>Is committed to student learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating</td>
<td>Can apply expertise for learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating</td>
<td>Manages and monitors student learning/development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating</td>
<td>Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating</td>
<td>Participates in profession’s learning communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** 2006-2007 school year

**Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT division chairs will facilitate this discussion.

**Increase Data Collection within All Concentrations**

Some concentrations have not yet implemented the assessment system. In 2006-2007 efforts will be made to assess all Ed.S. students who are at the midpoints of their programs and who are program completers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating</td>
<td>Is committed to student learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating</td>
<td>Can apply expertise for learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating</td>
<td>Manages and monitors student learning/development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating</td>
<td>Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating</td>
<td>Participates in profession’s learning communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** 2006-2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Ed.S. Faculty: All Concentrations

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

All Ed.S completers who were rated by faculty at the end of their programs scored above the intermediate level on all objectives.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Program concentrations within the Teaching and Learning degree currently have small numbers. As the undergraduate teacher education programs in secondary education move to MAT programs, we believe the demand for this program will increase. MAT graduates will then look to the Ed.S level for their graduate coursework. There is a need for our faculty to consider how to continue high levels of student performance when the sizes of the individual concentrations begins to increase.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Teaching & Learning PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Demonstrates Research Competence (M: 1)**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Demonstrates Social & Psych. Knowledge (M: 2)**
The Ph.D. candidate develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological and economic influences that affect education today.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Engages in Scholarship in Major Field (M: 3)**
The Ph.D. candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field (M: 4)**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in the major discipline of inquiry.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 5: Demonstrate Knowledge in Cognate (M: 5)**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in a cognate area that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 6: Contributes to the Profession (M: 6)**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates a professional identity by his/her contributions to the community of scholars and educators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Faculty Rating of Standard 1 (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, and dissertation performance will be determined for Standard 1 by the students’ doctoral and dissertation committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Demonstrates Research Competence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers who were assessed for research competence met Standard 1 with a score of at least 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Faculty Rating of Standard 2 (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, and dissertation performance will be determined for Standard 2 by the students’ doctoral and dissertation committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrates Social &amp; Psych. Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers who were assessed their understanding of the social and psychological foundation of their work met Standard 2 with a score of at least 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Faculty Rating of Standard 3 (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, and dissertation performance will be determined for Standard 3 by the students’ doctoral and dissertation committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Engages in Scholarship in Major Field</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers who were assessed with respect to their scholarship in their major field met Standard 3 with a score of at least 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Faculty Rating of Standard 4 (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, and dissertation performance will be determined for Standard 4 by the students’ doctoral and dissertation committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O4: Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers who were assessed for their knowledge of the major field of their concentration met Standard 1 with a score of at least 3.

**M 5: Faculty Rating of Standard 5 (O: 5)**

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, and dissertation performance will be determined for Standard 5 by the students’ doctoral and dissertation committee.

Target for **O5: Demonstrate Knowledge in Cognate**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers who were assessed for their knowledge within their cognate met Standard 5 with a score of at least 3.

**M 6: Faculty Rating of Standard 6 (O: 6)**

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, and dissertation performance will be determined for Standard 6 by the students’ doctoral and dissertation committee.

Target for **O6: Contributes to the Profession**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers who were assessed for their involvement and contributions to their profession met Standard 6 with a score of at least 3.

**M 7: Faculty Rating of Standard 7 (O: 7)**

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, and dissertation performance will be determined for Standard 7 by the students’ doctoral and dissertation committee.

Target for **O7: Is Involved in Teaching & Professional Development**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers who were assessed for their involvement in teacher education and/or inservice teacher professional development met Standard 7 with a score of at least 3.

**M 8: Faculty Rating of Standard 8 (O: 8)**

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, and dissertation performance will be determined for Standard 8 by the students’ doctoral and dissertation committee.

Target for **O8: Uses Technology in Teaching and Learning**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers who were assessed for use of technology as a tool for inquiry for teaching and learning met Standard 8 with a score of at least 3.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Assessment of Teacher Education/Prof Dev. Involve**

Ph.D. students in teaching and learning are expected to be involved in either teacher education or in professional development activities for teachers. Currently involvement is assessed through examination of a residency report and assigning a rating based on involvement. In 2006-2007, faculty will consider ways to redesign this measure to take into account teaching effectiveness.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 7 | Outcome/Objective: Is Involved in Teaching & Professional Development
- **Implementation Description:** 2006-2007 school year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** PhD Teaching and Learning Faculty
Increase Data Collection by All Concentrations

Some concentrations have not yet implemented the assessment system. In 2006-2007 efforts will be made to assess all Ph.D students upon completion of comprehensive exams and upon graduation.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Research Competence
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 2 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Social & Psych. Knowledge
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Engages in Scholarship in Major Field
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 4 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Knowledge in Cognate
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 6 | Outcome/Objective: Engages in Scholarship in Major Field
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 7 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Research Competence
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Uses Technology in Teaching and Learning

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: PhD faculty in Teaching and Learning: All Concentrations

Increase Scholarly Productivity

Although all students met expectations, faculty are interested in increasing involvement in both state and national presentations and in ensuring students are involved in the publication process prior to graduation.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Research Competence
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Engages in Scholarship in Major Field
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 4 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 6 | Outcome/Objective: Contributes to the Profession
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 7 | Outcome/Objective: Is Involved in Teaching & Professional Development
- Measure: Faculty Rating of Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Uses Technology in Teaching and Learning

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: Ph.D Faculty in Teaching and Learning concentrations

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
All program completers exceeded expectations on all standards by the end of their programs. Program completers' written products, residency reports, and oral defenses indicate students have a strong background in the major and are successful completing independent research.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although all students met all standards, review of students’ residency work have led faculty to increase emphasis on involvement in publications and presentations throughout the preogram.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Urban Policy Studies BS
As of 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
It is the mission of the Bachelor of Science in Urban Policy Studies (BS/UPS) degree program of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to prepare students who understand the roles of cities as the sites of policy activity in all sectors of modern societies and have the knowledge and skills needed to understand a specialized policy area as it operates in relation to the broader urban environment. Note: This program is currently being discontinued.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Structure of Local Goverments in the U.S. (M: 2, 4, 6, 7)
Describe the structure of local governments in the United States and the important influences in making decisions in cities.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
- 12 Quantitative Skills--core
### SLO 2: Public Policy Process (M: 8, 9, 10, 11)
Identify the major steps in the public policy process that include agenda setting, policy formulation, budgeting, implementation, and evaluation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
- 12 Quantitative Skills--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 3: Urban Policy Research Methods (M: 12, 13, 14, 15)
Apply the variety of research methods applicable to the study of urban policy.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
- 12 Quantitative Skills--core
- 14 Technology--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 4: Quantitative Research Methods & Statistics (M: 16, 17, 18)
Demonstrate basis skills in the quantitative research methods used in the study of urban policy.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 6 Collaboration--core
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience
SLO 5: Urban Policy Specialization
Demonstrate a specialized understanding of one the major areas of urban policy: Local Government Management, Planning and Economic Development, or Public Policy.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 6: Urban Policy Studies (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students able to identify the contributions of the social sciences and other academic disciplines to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Written Communication--core
4 Oral Communication--core
6 Collaboration--core
8 Critical Thinking--core
10 Contemporary Issues--core
12 Quantitative Skills--core
14 Technology--core

Institutional Priority Associations
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 7: Urban Political Economy (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)
Explain the role of the economy in shaping the structure of the urban environment.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Written Communication--core
4 Oral Communication--core
6 Collaboration--core
8 Critical Thinking--core
10 Contemporary Issues--core
12 Quantitative Skills--core
14 Technology--core

Institutional Priority Associations
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Field of Urban Policy Studies (O: 6)
Students will be able to understand contributions of the social sciences to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies.

Target for O6: Urban Policy Studies
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.
During the previous academic year, 81.58% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 94.08% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 2: Describe Policy Issues Facing Cities (O: 1, 6)**

Students will be able to describe important policy issues facing cities.

**Target for O1: Structure of Local Governments in the U.S.**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 73.68% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 93.42% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Target for O6: Urban Policy Studies**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 73.68% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 93.42% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 3: Urban Policy Writing Assignment (O: 6)**

Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to complete an urban policy writing assignment.

**Target for O6: Urban Policy Studies**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 63.16% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 90.13% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 4: Examine Political Processes and Institutions (O: 1, 7)**

Students will examine the workings of political processes and institutions at the local level.

**Target for O1: Structure of Local Governments in the U.S.**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 47.56% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 92.68% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Target for O7: Urban Political Economy**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 47.56% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 92.68% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 5: Define and Identify Market Failures (O: 7)**

Students will be able to define and identify market failures.

**Target for O7: Urban Political Economy**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 47.56% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 92.68% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.
M 6: Collective Action Issues and Solutions (O: 1, 7)
Students will be able to analyze and identify the issues and solutions associated with collective action.

Target for O1: Structure of Local Goverments in the U.S.
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 47.56% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 93.90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Target for O7: Urban Political Economy
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 47.56% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 93.90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 7: Understand Urban Growth (O: 1, 7)
Students will be able to understand the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth.

Target for O1: Structure of Local Goverments in the U.S.
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 47.56% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 92.68% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Target for O7: Urban Political Economy
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 47.56% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 92.68% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 8: Describe Public Policy Process (O: 2)
Students will be able to describe the components of the public policy process.

Target for O2: Public Policy Process
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 90.24% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 95.12 % of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 9: Analyze Public Policies (O: 2)
Students will be able to analyze how public policies are developed and implemented in the U.S.

Target for O2: Public Policy Process
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 81.71% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 92.68% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 10: Define Areas of U.S. Public Policy (O: 2)
Students will be able to define the major areas of U.S. public policy.

Target for O2: Public Policy Process
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 87.80% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 96.34% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 11: Frame Alternative Policy Options (O: 2)**

Students will be able to frame alternative policy options in a substantive policy area.

**Target for O2: Public Policy Process**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 82.93% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 93.90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 12: Understand Urban Policy Research Methods (O: 3)**

Students will be able to understand scientific methods as applied to urban policy.

**Target for O3: Urban Policy Research Methods**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 61.64% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 95.89% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 13: Ethics, Politics, and Theory in Social Research (O: 3)**

Students will be able to define the link between ethics, politics, and theory in social research.

**Target for O3: Urban Policy Research Methods**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 57.53% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 93.45% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 14: Demonstrate Various Research Techniques (O: 3)**

Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to use observational techniques in experiments, survey research, qualitative field research, unobtrusive research and evaluation research.

**Target for O3: Urban Policy Research Methods**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 63.01% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 90.41% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 15: Write a Research Proposal (O: 3)**

Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to write a research proposal.

**Target for O3: Urban Policy Research Methods**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

During the previous academic year, 56.16% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 84.93% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 16: Quantitative Research Methods and Statistics (O: 4)**
Students will become familiar with basic concepts concerning measures and data sets.

**Target for O4: Quantitative Research Methods & Statistics**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

During the previous academic year, 52.38% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 88.10% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 17: Apply Introductory Statistical Techniques (O: 4)**

Students will learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

**Target for O4: Quantitative Research Methods & Statistics**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

During the previous academic year, 41.67% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 78.57% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 18: Perform Basic Statistical Analysis (O: 4)**

Students will develop skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**Target for O4: Quantitative Research Methods & Statistics**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1 = skill not demonstrated, 2 = skill partially demonstrated, and 3 = skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Not Met**

During the previous academic year, 38.10% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 70.24% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Faculty Group Meetings**

We will split the faculty into smaller groups that are responsible for teaching in BS/UPS program. Faculty groups will be responsible for considering ways of improving outcomes specific to their courses. These groups of faculty will be expected to meet informally, with formal meetings at the discretion of each group.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Analyze Public Policies | Outcome/Objective: Public Policy Process
- Measure: Apply Introductory Statistical Techniques | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative Research Methods & Statistics
- Measure: Collective Action Issues and Solutions | Outcome/Objective: Structure of Local Governments in the U.S.
- Measure: Urban Political Economy
- Measure: Define and Identify Market Failures | Outcome/Objective: Urban Political Economy
- Measure: Define Areas of U.S. Public Policy | Outcome/Objective: Public Policy Process
- Measure: Describe Policy Issues Facing Cities | Outcome/Objective: Structure of Local Governments in the U.S.
- Measure: Urban Policy Studies
- Measure: Describe Public Policy Process | Outcome/Objective: Public Policy Process
- Measure: Examine Political Processes and Institutions | Outcome/Objective: Structure of Local Governments in the U.S.
- Measure: Urban Political Economy
- Measure: Field of Urban Policy Studies | Outcome/Objective: Urban Policy Studies
- Measure: Frame Alternative Policy Options | Outcome/Objective: Public Policy Process
- Measure: Understand Urban Growth | Outcome/Objective: Structure of Local Governments in the U.S.
- Measure: Urban Political Economy
- Measure: Urban Policy Writing Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Urban Policy Studies

**Implementation Description:**

October 1, 2006 - March 1, 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** ALL PAUS Faculty

**Initial faculty meeting to discuss outcomes**

We will meet as a faculty to talk about all of the results of this endeavor. We will highlight areas of particular strength, as well as areas where improvement is needed. We will formulate a plan through which we will examine ways to improve upon all indicators and make a special effort to focus on improved teaching and learning in the areas of identified weakness (quantitative research methods, urban political economy, ethics, politics, and theory in social research).
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We set a high bar for success, requiring 90% of students to fully demonstrate skills in order to consider a target to be met. We consider a target to be partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrate core skills in our courses. Using these goals as guidelines, the program partially met fourteen of eighteen targets and did not meet the other four. That the majority of all eighteen targets were at least partially met speaks to the strength of our students and program. We would like to continue to make progress on all eighteen indicators and will be meeting as a faculty to discuss ways that we can improve student outcomes. Sets of faculty responsible for course content in the areas of weakness will be charged with formulating ways to improve student outcomes in their areas of expertise.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Several of our outcomes came very close to fully meeting our target objective of requiring 90% of students to fully demonstrate skills in our core courses, none of our outcomes were fully met. The most problematic areas are those relating to quantitative research.
We will be talking about ways that we can work as a faculty to improve this issue in two ways: First, we are considering ways that faculty can address deficiencies in mathematics and make students more comfortable with quantitative research methods, statistics, and research design. We may also meet with faculty from the Math. Dept. to discuss possible prerequisites for our courses. Second, we are working as a faculty group to address improved approaches to teaching and learning in these two areas. The shortcomings identified by this process will be the focus of our meetings as a faculty.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2005-2006 Urban Policy Studies MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
It is the mission of the Master of Science in Urban Policy Studies (MS/UPS) degree program of the Andrew School Young School of Policy Studies to prepare graduates for leadership roles in urban policy organizations and to provide them with the knowledge and skills needed to understand the urban policy environment and specialized policy areas within this context.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Urban Policy Studies Core (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17)
To learn social science concepts and to apply these insights in the formulation of urban policies as identified in course learning objectives.
Relevant Associations: There are no accreditation organizations in the field of urban policy studies. The program had been recognized as a top-ranked (#12) program in the U.S. News and World Reports’ category of Urban Management and Policy.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Urban Policy Studies - Specializations
The MS/UPS degree has four career tracks: Nonprofit and Civic Leadership; Planning and Economic Development; Policy Analysis; or Social Policy.
Relevant Associations: Not applicable.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Literature for Urban Policy Research (O: 2)
Examine major sources of literature for urban policy research

Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 92.86% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 2: History of Urban Planning (O: 2)
Become acquainted with the history of urban planning in the United States and the legal and administrative context in which planning takes place.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 91.67% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 3: Issues and Techniques of Planning Practices (O: 2)**
Become familiar with important issues and techniques of planning practices in a variety of contexts.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 91.67% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 4: Models of Planning Processes (O: 2)**
Learn about several models of planning processes, including roles for professional planners and citizens, and consider their appropriateness under different circumstances, and their implications for outcomes.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 91.67% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 5: Statistics - Basic Concepts (O: 2)**
Become familiar with basic concepts concerning measures and data sets.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 71.62% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 95.95% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 6: Introductory Statistical Techniques (O: 2)**
Learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 71.62% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 95.95% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**M 7: Basic Statistical Analysis (O: 2)**
Develop skills is using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 70.27% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 95.95% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.
demonstrated the skill.

M 8: Applied Research Methods and Statistics (O: 2)
Develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 71.62% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 95.95% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 9: Microeconomics (O: 2)
Learn about market economy and the application of theories to current policy issues.

Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 62.50% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 96.87% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 10: Microeconomics - Legal and Political Framework (O: 2)
Learn the legal and political framework that underlies the market economy.

Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 62.50% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 96.87% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 11: Microeconomics - Tools of Government Intervention (O: 2)
Describe the basic tools of government intervention in the economy, including the supply of public goods, subsidy and taxation of the private sector, regulation of markets, cost-benefit analysis, and the fostering of property rights and new markets.

Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met
During the previous academic year, 62.50% of students fully demonstrated the skill. 96.87% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 12: Understand Context of Local Governance (O: 2)
Understand the context of local governance.

Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
During the previous academic year, 100% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 13: Differentiate Types of Local Governments (O: 2)
Differentiate among the roles of different types of local governments.

Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.
## Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
During the previous academic year, 100% of students fully demonstrated the skill.

### M 14: Know Principle Actors in Local Governance (O: 2)
Know the principle actors in local governance, including elected and appointed officials.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
During the previous academic year, 100% of students fully demonstrated the skill.

### M 15: Describe Contemporary Problems of Local Governance (O: 2)
Describe some contemporary problems of local governance and possible approaches to solving these problems.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
During the previous academic year, 100% of students fully demonstrated the skill.

### M 16: M.1 Urban theory and policy (O: 2)
Describe major urban theories and the application of these theories to policies.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 92.86% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

### M 17: M.2 Understand urban context (O: 2)
Understand the urban context in which policy decisions are made.

**Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core**
Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 98.51% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Faculty Meetings
We will bring together the faculty that are responsible for teaching in MS/UPS program. Faculty members will be responsible for considering ways of improving outcomes specific to their courses. These groups of faculty will be expected to meet informally, with formal meetings at the discretion of each group.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

#### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Applied Research Methods and Statistics | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** Basic Statistical Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** History of Urban Planning | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** Introductory Statistical Techniques | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** Issues and Techniques of Planning Practices | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** Literature for Urban Policy Research | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** M.1 Urban theory and policy | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** M.2 Understand urban context | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** Microeconomics | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** Microeconomics - Legal and Political Framework | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
- **Measure:** Microeconomics - Tools of Government Intervention | **Outcome/Objective:** Urban Policy Studies Core
We would like to continue to make progress on all fifteen indicators and will be meeting as a faculty to discuss ways that we can improve student outcomes. Sets of faculty responsible for course content in three areas will be charged with formulating ways to improve student outcomes in their areas of expertise.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

We set a high bar for success, requiring 90% of students to fully demonstrate skills in order to consider a target to be met. We consider a target to be partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrate core skills in our courses. Using these goals as guidelines, the program met one of fifteen targets and partially met the other fourteen. That all targets were at least partially met speaks to the strength of our students and our program. We would like to continue to make progress on all fifteen indicators and will be meeting as a faculty to discuss ways that we can improve student outcomes. Sets of faculty responsible for course content in three areas will be charged with formulating ways to improve student outcomes in their areas of expertise.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

While only one outcome was fully met, many outcomes were very close, and we will be talking about ways that we can work as a faculty to improve this. The most problematic areas are those relating to economics, quantitative methods and statistics. We are working on this issue in two ways: First, we are working to recruit a highly-qualified student population with strong backgrounds in mathematics. Second, we are considering ways that faculty can address deficiencies in mathematics and make students more comfortable with quantitative methods.
## Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Policy Studies is to develop educational scholars and leaders through innovative strategies with a foundation built upon relevant knowledge and effective practice. The mission of the Educational Leadership Programs is to educate and prepare school leaders with the capacity to transform schools and to improve student learning. Many urban children, families and communities are caught in cycles of despair and oppressed by poverty and racism (Wilson, 1978). According to Haberman (1995), five forces influence children in poverty: lack of trust in adults, violence, feelings of hopelessness, bureaucratic mindlessness, and a culture of authoritarianism. These forces can give rise to feelings of hopelessness in both urban teachers and their students. Consequently, the mission of the Urban Teacher Leadership Masters of Science Degree Program is to empower students and teachers by promoting educational excellence in urban schools. The UTL creates a cadre of teachers who will become change agents in their schools by providing a series of academic and field experiences that provides leadership development in collaboration, reflective thinking, problem solving, urban education advocacy and action research.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Students perform as change agents in schools (M: 1)**

Students effectively perform as change agents by positively impacting the culture of the school by facilitating effective dialogue among colleagues, administrators and community members challenging old paradigms of teaching and learning and creating new plans of action. These students will also actively participate in creating a school climate conducive to change through a process of redefining roles and relationships, rethinking goals, developing excellence through planning, inquiry and collaboration. They will also engage in the politics of creating excellence in urban schools so that children from diverse groups will be academically successful. These students will also complete a leadership project which institutes change in their schools or school communities.

Relevant Associations: In Standards for Programs in Educational Leadership, Standard 1.0 states that candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who develop a vision of learning for a school that promotes the success of all students. Candidates base this vision on relevant knowledge and theories, including but not limited to an understanding of learning goals in a pluralistic society, the diversity of learners and learners’ needs, schools as interactive social and cultural systems, and social and organizational change. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards’ Core Propositions state that teachers are members of learning communities and that they work with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development and that teachers also work collaboratively with parents and engage them productively in the work of the school.

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Students recognize and employ research methods (M: 1, 3)**

Students engage in a process of critical inquiry involving the asking of questions and the collection, analysis and sharing of the data which drives an action to be taken. They engage in continuous action research projects that enhance the opportunity for academic excellence of urban children. Students will identify research methods, procedures, assessments and research design. Students will also design a major research study.

Relevant Associations: The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards’ Core Propositions state that teachers are familiar with learning strategies with a foundation built upon relevant knowledge and effective practice. The Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership state that candidates demonstrate the ability to use appropriate assessment strategies and research methods to understand and accommodate diverse school and community conditions and dynamics. The standards also state that candidates demonstrate an understanding of how to use appropriate research strategies to promote an environment for improved student achievement.

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Students employ critical perspectives in education (M: 2)**

Students can employ normative, interpretative and critical perspectives in education. Students will effectively use pedagogies appropriate for economically disenfranchised children of color to increase academic achievement. Students will also use strategies from proven instructional programs that have produced excellence in urban educational settings. These students will draw on the best practices of effective leaders in urban education, business and communities to ensure the academic success of diverse groups of students.

Relevant Associations: The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards state that teachers are familiar with learning
Institutional Priority Associations
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Students understand approaches to learning (M: 4)

- Target:
Met 85 percent of the students are above the targeted performance level.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
85 percent of the students are above the targeted performance level.

Relevant Associations: The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards core propositions state that teachers are committed to students and learning. They are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. The standards also state that teachers understand how students develop and learn recognizing the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and they take account for these differences in their practice. Teachers have skill and experience in teaching specific content and are familiar with the skills gaps and preconceptions students may bring to specific content areas. The Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership standards state that candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who demonstrate the ability to analyze the complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages and their effects on families, communities, children and learning.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Practicum Project Rubric, reading, presentations (O: 1, 2)

- Target:
Met 80-90 percent of the students earning 90 - 100 pts. on the practicum project, position presentation

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
85 percent of the students are above the targeted performance level.

Target for O3: Students employ critical perspectives in education
80-90 percent of students score above 80 pts.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Quality professional programs
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.2 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.2 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Relevant Associations: The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards core propositions state that teachers are committed to students and learning. They are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. The standards also state that teachers understand how students develop and learn recognizing the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and they take account for these differences in their practice. Teachers have skill and experience in teaching specific content and are familiar with the skills gaps and preconceptions students may bring to specific content areas. The Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership standards state that candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who demonstrate the ability to analyze the complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages and their effects on families, communities, children and learning.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Practicum Project Rubric, reading, presentations (O: 1, 2)

EPEL 7680 - On the practicum project, students are graded on a portfolio which includes the following: internship plan (0-15 points), internship log (0-20 pts.), career development plan (0-10 pts.), personal leadership profile (0-10 pts.), self-assessment essay relating 8 roles of leadership (0-10 pts.), school improvement action research proposal (0-35 pts.) EPS 8970A-students are graded on class participation (0-50 pts.), prepared, read assignments, knows material, demonstrates authentic interest in subject matter, participates frequently; 39-44pts - prepared/read assignments, knows most of the material, demonstrates interest in the subject matter, participates frequently, (33-38pts)-semi-prepared, semi-read assignments, demonstrates uncommitted approach to subject matter and participates only occassionally, (0-32pts) - not prepared and did not read material, does not know the material and does not participate in class. Students are also graded on a position paper and presentation (0-50pts),(45-50pts) - demonstrates thorough reading of material with careful analysis and critical insight. Presentation is clear, interesting, engaging and thoughtful. Handout is clear, concise and virtually error-free. (39-44pts)-demonstrates a standard analysis and typical insight. Presentation is generally clear, somewhat engaging, but handout is unclear. (33-38pts) student demonstrates little reading, cursory analysis and vague insight. Presentation is generally unclear and difficult to follow. Handout is unclear and has numerous errors. (0-32pts) demonstrates no reading, poor analysis. Presentation is unrelated to the text. Handout is not present.

Target for O1: Students perform as change agents in schools
80-90 percent of the students earning 90 - 100 pts. on the practicum project, position presentation

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
85 percent of the students are above the targeted performance level.

Target for O2: Students recognize and employ research methods
80-90 percent of the students earning 90 - 100 pts. on the practicum project, position presentation

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
85 percent of the students are above the targeted performance level.

M 2: Course activities-papers, projects, presentations (O: 3)

EPSF 7120 - students are graded on interview papers (0-20pts.), peer-reviewed group presentations (0-25 pts.), position papers (0-35pts.), journals (0-20 points). EPEL 7410 - Students are graded on instructional supervision issue (issue paper -0- 20 pts); issue paper presentation (0- 20 pts.), mid-term exam -(0- 30pts), final exam -(0- 30 pts). EPSF 7450- students are graded on: reform model curriculum handout (0-10pts) reform model curriculum presentation (0-15pts), educative experience paper (0-25pts.), history of curriculum timeline (0-10 pts) history of curriculum paper (0-15pts), curriculum position paper (0-25pts).

Target for O3: Students employ critical perspectives in education
EPSF 720/EPEL 7410/EPSF 7450 - 80 - 90 percent of students score above above 80 pts.
**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

80 - 90 percent of all students are above the targeted performance level.

**M 3: Research project rubric (O: 2)**

These are applied courses and the assignments are action oriented. In EPRS 7910 - Students are graded on: research journal (20pts.), exam (20pts.), action research project (60 pts.), research journals (20pts.) - action research presentation. In EPS 7990 the students earn credit for supervised development and preparation of the master’s project. Students receive an “S”, “IP” or “F”.

**Target for O2: Students recognize and employ research methods**

85 percent of the students will earn a grade at or above 80pts. in EPRS 7910 and they will earn an "S" in EPS 7990.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

80 - 90 percent of the students are above the targeted performance level.

**M 4: Course activities- presentations, quizzes, papers (O: 4)**

EPEL 8620 - students are graded on: philosophy paper (0-20pts.), compare and contrast paper (0-20pts.), quizzes (0-20pts.), leadership self-assessment presentation (0-20pts.), leadership handbook (0-20pts.). EPY 8250 - students are graded on written reviews of articles and listening guides (0-20pts.); interviews (0-20pts.); group assignments (0-20pts.); position presentations (0-30pts.).

**Target for O4: Students understand approaches to learning**

Students will score at or above 80 points in both courses.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

80- 90 percent of the students are above the targeted performance levels.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Maintain and monitor**

Faculty will continue to implement the programs as designed, while monitoring all current student learning outcomes in the 2006-2007 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Course activities- presentations, quizzes, papers
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Students understand approaches to learning
- **Measure:** Course activities-projects, presentations
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Students employ critical perspectives in education
- **Measure:** Practicum Project Rubric, reading, presentations
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Students perform as change agents in schools
- **Measure:** Research project rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Students recognize and employ research methods

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

The curriculum and instructors in the Urban Teacher Leadership Master’s Degree Program are effective in changing pejorative teacher beliefs and creating change agents, teacher/leaders, and advocates for children who attend urban school.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The assessment has identified that through instruction, the program could be more instructive in preparing teachers, who lack the acumen, to go into their schools to begin the dialog for creating parallel leadership responsibilities between the principal and the teachers.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2005-2006 Womens Studies BA**

(As of: 12/13/2016 02:41 PM EST)

**Mission / Purpose**

Women’s Studies proceeds from feminist perspectives that recognize the full humanity of everyone. These perspectives examine how able-bodiedness, age, class, ethnicity, nationality, race, and sexuality intersect with each other and with gender differently in different cultures and at different times. As the interdisciplinary practice of feminist scholarship, Women’s Studies interrogates and envisions
alternatives to social structures, institutions, ideologies, relationships, and perceptions of gender in traditional academic disciplines.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Apply feminist/womanist perspectives to contemporary sociocultural issues

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

**SLO 2: Written Argument (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Use appropriate evidence to develop a written argument

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

**SLO 3: Intersectionality (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Demonstrate conceptual understanding of the intersections among oppressions, including sexism, racism, imperialism, homophobia, and classism

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 10 Contemporary Issues--core

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
- 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

**SLO 4: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Demonstrate critical thinking skills by evaluating main arguments, evidence, and the chain or reasoning present in a text

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 2 Written Communication--core
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Poor (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Student did not complete assignment, or the quality of the assignment was so poor that sufficient knowledge was not demonstrated

**Target for O1: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives**

70% achieve 4 or 5

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

Learning Outcome 1 - 0/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 1/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 1/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 1/37

**Target for O2: Written Argument**

70% achieve 4 or 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 0/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 1/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 1/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 1/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Intersectionality**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 0/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 1/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 1/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 1/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Critical Thinking Skills**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 0/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 1/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 1/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 1/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Fair (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Student work was not up to standards expected for this assignment. The assignment was incomplete, late, or had many errors. The student did not meet the content requirement for the assignment.

**Target for O1: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 6/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 4/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 7/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 3/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Written Argument**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 6/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 4/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 7/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 3/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Intersectionality**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 6/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 4/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 7/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 3/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Critical Thinking Skills**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 6/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 4/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 7/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 3/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Good (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Student work was acceptable for the assignment. Student completed basic tasks of the assignment, but there may be errors and content was average.

**Target for O1: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 13/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 17/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 13/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 16/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Written Argument**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 13/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 17/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 13/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 16/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Intersectionality**

70% achieve 4 or 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2005-2006</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 - 13/28 Learning Outcome 2 - 17/41 Learning Outcome 3 - 13/42 Learning Outcome 4 - 16/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 4: Excellent (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Student work was excellent in that the student developed the ideas clearly and carefully. There are few errors.

M 5: 5 Outstanding (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Student work was truly outstanding. Student expanded on the assignment given, or demonstrated exceptional creativity or content knowledge. There are almost no errors.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Assignment Re-selection
Select more appropriate assignments to evaluate
Class assignment re-alignment
Explore possibilities of changing class assignments to align more directly with learning outcomes

Improve rubrics
Consider implementing more explicit criteria to define rubrics for student assignments

Modify assessment
Departmental Conversation about evaluators’ interpretations of measures and/or the measures themselves
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our biggest difficulty in assessing our progress involves the lack of baseline data to work with; because this is the first year we have used these learning outcomes, we do not have previous years' data as a basis for comparison. We have made progress, though, in terms of clarifying the formulations of our learning outcomes. We have also been more explicit in our effectiveness indicators. We are currently planning to modify our assignments and the criteria for these assignments in accordance with the results of the assessments. In that way, we plan to measure assignments that more directly attach themselves to specific learning outcomes. Moreover, we will include more specific attention to learning outcomes in the rubrics we use to evaluate our assignments in WSt 2010, Introduction to Women's Studies. On a side note, until this year, we have done two separate evaluations - one of the introductory level course and one for the capstone course to evaluate our majors. The technology did not allow us to separate out the learning outcomes here, so we chose to report the results from the 2010 course because we had much more data for that course than the others.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The major problem that we have in terms of what our assessments demonstrate is that the program (WEAVE) does not measure the effectiveness with which we have achieved our learning outcomes because the findings are matched to the specific measures instead of the outcomes themselves. We have realized from the process, however, that our assessment has been excessively stringent. The assessors have a propensity toward the middle of the measures, so that perhaps skewed our results downward, somewhat. We will modify our assessment techniques in order to provide a more accurate picture of the degree to which our students fulfill the learning outcomes in the future.
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Mission / Purpose
Women's Studies proceeds from feminist perspectives that recognize the full humanity of everyone. These perspectives examine how able-bodiedness, age, class, ethnicity, nationality, race, and sexuality intersect with each other and with gender differently in different cultures and at different times. As the interdisciplinary practice of feminist scholarship, Women's Studies interrogates and envisions alternatives to social structures, institutions, ideologies, relationships, and perceptions of gender in traditional academic disciplines.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Feminist/Womanist Theory (M: 1, 2)
Students will describe and evaluate major schools of feminist theory as well as the historical evolution of feminism as both critical thought and social movement; students will include womanism in these discussions.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Globalization and Women (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate understanding of globalization and its implications for women, sex, gender, sexuality, feminism, and womanism.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
**SLO 3: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements (M: 1, 2)**

Students will explain how feminism and womanism articulate with different critical perspectives and social movements and the implications of these articulations for emerging trends in feminism and womanism.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology (M: 1, 2)**

Students will understand feminist and womanist critiques of research methodology and will apply one or more tenets of feminist or womanist methodology in their own scholarship.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Original Research Project in Women’s Studies (M: 1, 2)**

Students will conduct an original research project in an area of specialization within women’s studies.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs  
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning  
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition  
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community  
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Students will complete a comprehensive exam portfolio containing an essay and a thesis proposal -- OR -- students will complete a sitting comprehensive exam (depending on year of entry into the WSI program).

**Target for O1: Feminist/Womanist Theory**

All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who took the exam passed the exam.

**Target for O2: Globalization and Women**

All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who took the exam passed the exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who took the exam passed the exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Original Research Project in Women’s Studies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who took the exam passed the exam.

---

**M 2: Master’s Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Students will complete an original study or scholarly paper of approximately 60pp in an area of women’s studies and successfully defend this paper before their thesis committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Feminist/Womanist Theory</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who completed a thesis passed their thesis at their defense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Globalization and Women</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who completed a thesis passed their thesis at their defense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who completed a thesis passed their thesis at their defense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who completed a thesis passed their thesis at their defense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Original Research Project in Women’s Studies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met**

All 8 students who completed a thesis passed their thesis at their defense.

---

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Annual Evaluation of Students**

As of Spring 2006, the WSI instituted an annual review of all M.A. students for the purpose of providing appropriate feedback about academic progress to students and stimulating students to finish their studies and thesis more quickly and energetically.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Comprehensive Exam | Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements
- Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology | Feminist/Womanist Theory | Globalization and Women | Original Research Project in Women’s Studies
**Update Comprehensive Exam Procedure**

In order to more fully separate the evaluation of the thesis from evaluation of material learned in the core curriculum, effective during the 2006-07 academic year we will be instituting a 3-day, 3-question, sitting comprehensive examination. This will replace the comprehensive exam portfolio. Students who matriculated prior to the 2005-06 academic year will be able to use the old method, however.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology</td>
<td>Feminist/Womanist Theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** 2006-07 Academic Year

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director (Layli Phillips)

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

We graduated a banner number of M.A. students this year due to the implementation of our new annual student evaluation process. The change in our comprehensive exam procedure, which must be grandfathered in, will allow us to better evaluate and track students’ learning in our core classes as well as their preparation for independent research.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Since we still have students who have been matriculating for a long time, continued encouragement and support towards graduation will be required and offered. The new programs we have in place, particularly as they will affect re-entry students, will likely produce the desired outcomes.